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Abstract

Social justice has received growing attention in the field of school psychology within the last ten years. However, the literature base is largely conceptual and revealed only three empirical studies exploring social justice from the perspective of school psychology trainees. All of these studies focused on the impact of various elements of social justice training models (e.g., service learning experiences), but did not address how individual trainee and training characteristics of pre-service school psychologists might predict social justice self-efficacy and commitment. The current study contributed to this gap in the research by exploring the relationships between various personal and training variables and the social justice beliefs of school psychology trainees and examining if differences existed among school psychology trainees who were or were not exposed to social justice training.

The purpose of the present study was three-fold: (1) to describe the perceived beliefs related to social justice, and hypothesized related constructs, of a cross-sectional sample of school psychology graduate students; (2) to examine potential differences in the social justice beliefs of school psychology trainees and (3) to identify possible predictors of their social justice self-efficacy and social justice commitment.

Empirical support for relationships between social justice self-efficacy and commitment and trainees’ moral beliefs, multicultural personality and program training environment was found. Findings from the present study highlighted important
differences between doctoral and non-doctoral students in terms of their social justice self-efficacy. Results also indicated that affiliation with a social justice and/or multicultural-focused program was positively related to a more supportive training environment related to social justice as perceived by students. These findings provide fundamental insights into the social justice beliefs of school psychology trainees and may have important implications for training and practice with the ultimate goal of preparing school psychologists to serve as advocates for marginalized youth in schools. Implications of the results are discussed as well as limitations of the present study and directions for future research.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Problem Context

Despite the goal of our public education system to educate and enrich the lives of all young people, many children, adolescents, and their families are failed each year. The achievement gap between minority and nonminority children is well documented and supported by the literature (Lee, 2006; Singham, 2003). Fewer Latino and African American youth graduate from high schools each year across the United States (Aud et al., 2012) and, still worse, many fall victim to the school-to-prison pipeline (ACLU, 2008). Latino students, which constitute the largest group of English Language Learners, have the lowest graduation rate of all students (Ruiz-de-Velasco & Fix, 2000). African American and Native American students are disproportionately represented in the special education referral and placement process (Losen, 2002; MacMillan & Reschly, 1998; Patton, 1998). Close to half of secondary students with learning disabilities lag more than three grade levels behind their enrolled grade in core academic areas such as reading and math (Wagner et al, 2003).

Students of color also experience greater difficulty in accessing mental health services, with as many as 85% of minority children not receiving needed mental health support services (Kataoka, Zhang, & Wells, 2002; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1999). African American males receive more severe and frequent disciplinary infractions when compared to their White counterparts (Fenning & Rose, 2007; Skiba & Knesting, 2001; Skiba, Michael, Nardo & Peterson, 2002). Lesbian, gay, bisexual,
transgender, and queer/questioning (LGBTQ) youth report being bullied in schools in greater numbers than their heterosexual peers (Kosciw, Greytak, Bartkiewicz, Boesen, & Palmer, 2012) and may be 2-3 times more likely to commit suicide (Juhnke, Granello, & Granello, 2011). Research has demonstrated the strong connection between mental health, learning, and academic achievement (Johnson, Malone, & Hightower, 1997) and the impact that mental health has on academic achievement and success in school (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1999). Students who are mentally healthy or are able to have their mental health needs addressed are more likely to experience academic success. All of these facts point to two simple conclusions: (a) inequities continue to plague our nation’s public education system and (2) school districts and staff have an active role to play in remedying these injustices.

The construct of social justice has historical roots in philosophy and religion and, more recently, education and psychology. Although many definitions of social justice exist, most definitions are predicated on three central notions - fairness, equity, and the protection of rights for all individuals (Shriberg et al., 2008). Central to its application, social justice is not a passive construct, but rather, one that requires individuals to engage in advocacy and committed action to be a part of the change s/he would like to see on a systems level (e.g., civil disobedience during the Civil Rights Movement in the U.S). Social justice is primarily focused on advocating with and empowering members of marginalized groups and helping all to see the role that power and privilege play in the oppression of others. In doing so, individuals share a collective goal of working toward the creation of a more just society. Shifting from a focus on individual students to a systems-level problem-solving model, and related notions of social justice have received
growing attention in the last ten years in the field of school psychology (Shriberg et al., 2008). Some argue that school psychologists have acted as social justice advocates by providing services to children with special needs in schools since the dawn of the profession. Others argue that the advocacy required by social justice is new to school psychologists, albeit a central role to the professional identity of the contemporary school psychologist. Training future school psychologists to act as social justice advocates has been offered as a viable opportunity for school psychology to work toward the creation of schools that are more socially just (Rogers & O’Bryon, 2008; Shriberg, Wynn, Briggs, Bartucci, & Lombardo, 2011). Although there is no magic bullet that will fix all of the public school system’s complex dilemmas, integrating social justice into the professional identity and development of all school psychologists signifies a critical step in the right direction.

**Statement of the Problem**

At the core of school psychology is the underlying belief that all children can benefit from, and have a right to, a quality education. However, what constitutes a *quality* education for one student does not necessarily hold true for another. School psychologists receive extensive training about the ways in which individual factors (e.g., ability, learning preferences, mental and physical health, etc.) affect a student’s ability to be successful in school. However, as ethical practitioners, trainers, and scholars, school psychologists also need to be cognizant of the ways in which history, culture, privilege, status, and other contextual forces have influenced and continue to influence educational decisions at the system-level, thereby impacting individual students. Recognizing the role
of institutional power in educational decision-making is central to our understanding of what applied social justice means within school systems.

As the diversity of school-age children and adolescents in the United States continues to increase, the need for culturally competent school psychologists trained in socially just practice is critical. The U.S. Department of Education reports that more than 46% of students in K-12 public school settings come from diverse backgrounds (Aud et al., 2012). From 1990 to 2010, the number of Latino/a students in U.S. schools rose from 5.1 to 12.1 million, and the percentage of Latino/a public school students increased from 12% to 23%. Although the number of African American students fluctuated during this time period, the percentage of African American students in public schools decreased from 17 to 15 percent, with African Americans accounting for 7.8 million public school students. During the same time period, White students decreased from 67% to 54% of all public school students. In 2009-10, 4.7 million public school students were identified as English language learners (ELL) and constituted 10% of the total public student population. In four states – Texas, New Mexico, Nevada, and California – ELL students made up 14 percent or more of all public school students, with ELL students constituting 29% of public school enrollment in California. In stark contrast to the diversity of the U.S. public school student population, in a recent survey of NASP members, only 10% of all practicing school psychologists identified as non-White (Curtis, Castillo, & Gelley, 2012). This mismatch in service providers and their client base has been referred to as ethnic incongruence and can be cause for concern if training related to working with diverse students and families is left unaddressed (Loe & Miranda, 2005). Others (e.g., see Graves, Proctor & Aston, 2014; Lewis, Truscott & Volker, 2008) have pointed out
that professional demographic surveys only sample their members and may, therefore, underestimate the percentage of racially and ethnically diverse school psychology practitioners. However, there appears to be a general consensus that racially and ethnically diverse school psychologists still represent a minority within the field and efforts to recruit and retain diverse practitioners is an important goal for the field of school psychology (NASP, 2009).

In addition to the challenges facing school psychologists in meeting the needs of an increasingly diverse student population, grave inequities within school systems are showing no signs of disappearing. For example, students of color continue to have depressed graduation rates (Aud et al., 2012) and academic performance (Lee, 2006; Singham, 2003). These students also experience higher rates of, and more severe, disciplinary infractions (Fenning & Rose, 2007; Skiba & Knesting, 2001; Skiba et al., 2002), as well as more frequent referrals and placements within special education (Losen, 2002; MacMillan & Reschly, 1998; Patton, 1998). Students from other historically marginalized groups such as LGBTQ students are at increased risk of negative academic and psychosocial outcomes (NASP, 2011) including increased risk of suicide (Juhnke et al., 2011) and bullying (Kosciw et al., 2012). Although multicultural competency is important to meet the needs of diverse students and their families, students should also be trained as social justice advocates to prepare them to address inequities in schools and ensure that all students receive a quality education.

Within the last five years, the two leading professional organizations for school psychology, Division 16 (School Psychology) of the American Psychological Association (APA) and the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), have established
working groups dedicated to social justice. Additionally, the field has witnessed a growing, albeit still limited, research base focused on social justice. Despite growing attention to social justice in the field of school psychology, little is known about school psychology students’ beliefs related to social justice and pedagogy aimed at preparing students to act as social justice advocates. The first empirical study to examine the impact of social justice training on school psychology students’ perspectives on social justice found that experiential training (e.g., field-based work in diverse schools and discussion with peers about their diverse school-based experiences) helped students to adopt a social justice vision consistent with the program’s mission (Briggs, McArdle, Bartucci, Kowalewicz, & Shriberg, 2009). This finding is also supported by research in the field of education regarding the benefits of service learning in promoting college students’ social justice development (Engberg, 2004; Wang & Rodgers, 2006). Other findings in the education field suggest that college students’ experiences with diverse individuals also help to facilitate social justice development (Broido & Reason, 2005; Mayhew & Fernandez, 2007; Waters, 2010). However, it is unclear if these findings are generalizable to training and practice for school psychology students. There is also no research in the field of school psychology that examines the degree to which personal and training characteristics relate to trainees’ social justice-related beliefs. Furthermore, despite the hypothesized link between multiculturalism and social justice (Shriberg et al. 2008, Vera & Speight, 2003), no empirical studies examining the relationship between the two exist within the field school psychology. Although empirical studies in related fields such as counseling psychology have contributed to the understanding between students’ social justice beliefs and engagement and various demographic characteristics,
moral beliefs, and training characteristics, no such studies exist in the field of school psychology. This signifies a critical need within the field of school psychology to better understand social justice as experienced by school psychology trainees (Rogers & O’Bryon, 2008). In learning more about the correlates of social justice self-efficacy and commitment, the field stands to gain important insights about personal characteristics that might increase the odds of social justice engagement for school psychology trainees and how student advocacy might be shaped through training experiences during graduate school.

**Purpose of Study and Research Questions**

The purpose of the present study was three-fold: (1) to describe the perceived beliefs related to social justice and hypothesized related constructs of a cross-sectional sample of school psychology graduate students; (2) to examine potential differences in the social justice beliefs of school psychology trainees and (3) to examine the relationships between school psychology trainees’ social justice self-efficacy and social justice commitment and a number of demographic, personality, and training characteristics. The goal of this exploratory study was to identify variables that could possibly be predictive of social justice self-efficacy and commitment among pre-service school psychologists. In doing so, the researcher extended the field’s knowledge of social justice and related constructs from the vantage point of pre-service school psychologists, which has the potential to inform recruitment and training practices for future school psychologists. Developing a more nuanced understanding of social justice both as an intrapersonal phenomenon and as a training outcome is a critical next step to respond to the recent call for school
psychologists to become change agents. Specifically, the current study aimed to answer the following research questions:

1. How do school psychology trainees perceive themselves in terms of their social justice self-efficacy and commitment? How do they perceive their personal moral imperative, multicultural personality, and social justice training environment?

2. Do school psychology trainees’ perceived (a) social justice self-efficacy and (b) social justice commitment differ based on participant demographics (i.e., age, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, political party affiliation, religious affiliation) and training demographics (i.e., year in program, student status, degree type, and affiliation with a social justice and/or multicultural-focused program)?

3. Is there a relationship between affiliation with a social justice and/or multicultural-focused program and student perceived social justice training environment?

4. Will measures of self-perceived (a) personal moral imperative, (b) domains of multicultural personality, and (c) social justice training environment predict self-perceived (a) social justice self-efficacy and (b) social justice commitment?
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Although social justice is an important goal for school psychologists and an area that is garnering more and more support over recent years, it is still an emerging area that is characterized by a very limited research base. The social justice-focused scholarship within school psychology has been largely conceptual with the goal of providing exemplars for how social justice principles might be applied within the field of school psychology. Several empirical studies have made important contributions including a discipline-specific definition of social justice and development of social justice training models. Although this is indeed important work, greater attention needs to be given to understanding social justice from the perspective of school psychology trainees and validating training models. School psychology students, arguably, yield the greatest potential to become social justice change agents as future school psychologists, researchers, and academics. Therefore, developing a better understanding of trainees’ social justice-related beliefs and related constructs has important research, training and practical implications for the field as a whole.

Social Justice and School Psychology

Scholars have noted that the construct of social justice is not new to the fields that serve children, such as education (Shoho, Merhcant & Lugg, 2005) and psychology (Fouad, Gerstein, & Toporek, 2006); however, a resurgence of the topic has taken place in recent years (Briggs, 2009; Shriberg & Fenning, 2009). Organizations such as the
American Psychological Association (APA), the American Counseling Association (ACA), the American Educational Research Association (AERA) and the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) have committed to a social justice agenda in varying degrees (AACU, 2002; Shriberg & Fenning, 2009). Scholars have noted the long history that school psychologists have had in advocating for and serving disenfranchised students, namely students with disabilities (Gutkin & Song, 2013; Power, 2008). In addition to advocating for equal opportunities for students with disabilities, Power (2008) points to efforts within the field to raise awareness for other underserved groups including minority students (Manz, Fantuzzo, & Power, 2004), English Language Learners (de Ramirez & Shapiro, 2006), children of poverty (Fantuzzo, Perry, & McDermott, 2004), bullying victims (Bradschaw, Sawyer, & O’Brennan, 2007), and students who identify as LGBTQ (Espelage & Swearer, 2008).

Recently, the field’s two largest professional organizations, the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and Division 16 of APA, have also recognized the growing interest in social justice issues within school psychology by forming the NASP Social Justice Interest Group in 2007 and APA Division 16’s Social Justice and Child Rights working group in 2010. NASP’s stated purpose for Social Justice Interest Group is, “to organize school psychologists interested in social justice issues and further the awareness of social justice issues within the field of school psychology” (n.d.). According to Division 16 of APA the goal of the Social Justice and Child Rights working group is to “facilitate professional development of school psychologists in the promotion of social justice and child rights” (n.d.).
The NASP Model for Comprehensive and Integrated School Psychological Services (2010a), also known as the NASP Practice Model, serves as the organization’s official policy regarding the delivery of school psychological services. Social justice is directly referenced four times in the practice model in describing the foundational aspects of school psychologists’ service delivery. One of the principles states, “School psychologists ensure that their knowledge, skills, and professional practices reflect understanding and respect for human diversity and promote effective services, advocacy, and social justice for all children, families, and schools (p. 3).” In describing how school psychologists approach service delivery in a manner that respects diversity in development and learning, it is stated that school psychologists “promote fairness and social justice in educational programs and services (p. 8).”

Although the term social justice in not directly used in the NASP Principles for Professional Ethics (2010b), key concepts of the construct are addressed in Principle I. For example, in explaining the principle of respecting the dignity and rights of all persons, NASP states

In their words and actions, school psychologists promote fairness and justice. They use their expertise to cultivate school climates that are safe and welcoming to all persons regardless of actual or perceived characteristics, including race, ethnicity, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, immigration status, socioeconomic status, primary language, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, disability, or any other distinguishing characteristics. (p. 5).
Furthermore, advocacy has also been referred to as a “central defining feature of the role of the contemporary school psychologist” (Rogers & O’Bryon, 2008, p. 495) and as the foundation upon which the ethical code rests.

In the NASP Standards for Graduate Preparation of School Psychologists (2010c), social justice is referenced five times. In describing an expected skill area that pre-service school psychologists should demonstrate upon completion of their program, NASP states

In schools and other agencies, [school psychologists] advocate for social justice and [recognize] that cultural, experiential, linguistic, and other areas of diversity may result in different strengths and needs; promote respect for individual differences; recognize complex interactions between individuals with diverse characteristics; and implement effective methods for all children, families, and schools to succeed. (p. 15).

Preceding the development of the NASP Professional Standards, the Blueprint series of documents have served as vision statements for the field of school psychology (Ysseldyke et al., 1997; Ysseldyke et al., 2006; Ysseldyke, Reynolds, & Weinberg, 1984). First published in 1984 (Blueprint I), then revised in 1997 (Blueprint II) and again in 2006 (Blueprint III), they have helped to shape the field of school psychology and informed the latest iteration of the NASP Professional Standards. In discussing the impetus for the most recent iteration of School Psychology: A Blueprint for Training and Practice III it is stated that, “School psychology as a field has matured from its roots in educational assessment and psychology to a broad-based model of service delivery and system change, within a prevention focused context” (Ysseldyke et al., 2006, p. 2).
discussing the context for the document and current state of the field, it is acknowledged that

Increasingly, there is consensus that schools must find solutions to address the relatively poor outcomes for students of color, those from backgrounds of poverty, children and youth with mental health concerns, and non-native speakers of English in such areas as school completion, least restrictive environment, and suspension and expulsion. Identifying where these inequities persist and analyzing the factors that contribute to them allow educators to determine where and how to direct resources to obtain the desired results. (Ysseldyke et al., 2006, p. 7-8).

Although the term social justice does not appear in this document, it, as well as NASP standards and position statements (NASP 2010a; 2010c; 2011; 2012), encourage school psychologists to participate in systems-level change efforts to advocate for students’ rights consistent with a social justice agenda (Shriberg et al., 2008).

While a professional commitment to advocacy is clear, scholars have noted that there is minimal literature dedicated to how advocacy can be included in school psychology practice, with even less focused specifically on social justice advocacy. Rogers and O’ Bryon (2008) state, “what is not discussed is how advocacy happens, what the process of advocacy is, and what the empirical evidence shows about what advocacy strategies work best at what levels” (p. 495).
Social Justice Research in School Psychology

To date, there have been only seven empirical studies where pre-service school psychologists’ opinions about social justice were examined; school psychology students comprised a majority of participants in only three of them. Further, all three of these studies were conducted within school psychology training programs that have a social justice training focus and all focused on the impact of the training approach. Therefore, little is known about (a) the social justice beliefs of school psychology students, overall, (b) how personal characteristics might shape beliefs related to social justice, and (c) if important differences exist based on the type of training trainees have been exposed to.

Defining social justice. Despite growing interest in social justice within school psychology, for some time the field lacked a common definition that could serve as an anchor for school psychologists to describe and advocate for socially just school psychological services. In a seminal article, Shriberg and colleagues (2008) conducted a Delphi study of cultural diversity experts to explore what social justice meant from a school psychology perspective. Drawing inspiration from research in related fields such as psychology and education that found cultural diversity and culturally responsive practice as a precursor for social justice (Arredondo & Perez, 2003), the researchers chose to enlist cultural diversity experts within the field to define social justice through a school psychology lens.

Findings supported a discipline-specific definition of social justice that focused on the importance of ensuring the protection of rights and opportunities for all with an understanding of the role of institutional power in social justice work. As one panelist succinctly stated, “It is critically important for school psychologists to understand that
those who have power make the rules and that those who have power are the most
reluctant to make change because it will diminish their place. It maintains the status quo”
(Shriberg et al., 2008, p. 464). Adding further support to the link between social justice
and cultural diversity, 80% of respondents referenced one or more aspects of cultural
diversity when asked about key topics related to social justice in school psychology.
Panelists also confirmed the need for school psychologists to engage in advocacy and
equity work that supports the rights of all students while recognizing systemic and
institutional barriers to equitable opportunities for all. Finally, the lack of diversity in the
field of school psychology was identified as the biggest obstacle to social justice work
within the field; reaffirming the critical need to promote the recruitment and retention of
culturally and linguistically diverse school psychologists (NASP, 2009).

In a follow-up study, Shriberg et al. (2011) surveyed a random sample of NASP
members to examine how they might define, prioritize and apply social justice principles
within their practice. While definitions were consistent with the Delphi study (Shriberg
et al., 2008), this study offered several new ideas for practical ways for school
psychologists to incorporate social justice into their practice in schools. The three main
actions that were identified included (a) promoting best practices in school psychology,
(b) conducting culturally fair assessments and, (c) advocating for the rights of children
and families. Shriberg and colleagues also found that younger respondents were more
likely to have been exposed to social justice issues, but were less willing than their older
colleagues to take personal risks in advancing social justice goals. This finding signifies
the need for additional research focused on better understanding students’ social justice
beliefs and training needs.
Social justice as a training goal. As interest around social justice within the field of school psychology continued to build, researchers and scholars began to focus on social justice and advocacy as training goals. Despite this growing interest, there remains a dearth of research examining training issues related to social justice in school psychology, most notably the empirical study of training characteristics and approaches that might predict or explain social justice attitudes and behavior. McCabe and Rubinson (2008) conducted an exploratory study to examine the ways in which graduate students in education and fields related to education (i.e., counseling and school psychology) were being trained to create and support equal and safe learning environments for students who identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT). Using the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB; Ajzen, 1985; Ajzen & Madden, 1986; Madden, Scholder Ellen, & Ajzen, 1992), the researchers examined if students’ awareness and knowledge of issues facing LGBT youth was sufficient to cultivate actual attitudinal and behavioral change to address injustices. They found that while the majority of graduate students held positive attitudes about promoting social justice in schools, they did not initially recognize LGBT harassment as an area of social injustice for youth or feel it necessary to intervene if they witnessed LGBT harassment in a school setting. Participants perceived a lack of support from important referent groups such as teachers and administrators in addressing LGBT harassment due to a perceived or real negative attitude held by most toward LGBT youth within schools. Participants also believed that creating a safe, more socially just learning environment for LGBT students was outside of their realm of control, which most likely was due, in part, to their negative attitudes toward LGBT issues and a lack of support from important social referent groups (McCabe & Rubinson, 2008). Graduate students
cited feelings of powerlessness as social justice advocates due to their novice teacher or intern status, lack of seniority, and ineligibility for union support.

According to McCabe and Rubinson (2008), in the context of TPB, it is highly unlikely that participants would act to address social injustice in schools in the absence of perceived control of the behavior and the behavioral intention to do so. However, it is important to note that school psychology students were not the majority participant group \( (n = 9; N = 81) \) in this study. Therefore, additional study is warranted before determining the generalizability to school psychology trainees. Considered in tandem with Shriberg et al.’s (2011) finding that early career school psychologists were less likely to act in situations of injustice when personal risks were involved, these findings do, however, identify a critical gap in our understanding of pre-service and early career school psychologists’ social justice beliefs and behavior.

In a follow-up study, McCabe, Rubinson, Dragowski, and Elizalde-Utnick (2013) extended their earlier line of inquiry by surveying a nationally representative sample \( (N = 968) \) of school psychologists \( (n = 293) \), teachers, and school counselors with regard to their behavioral intention to advocate for sexual minority youth in the presence of harassment and bias. A key finding included factor analytic support that the three TPB components (attitude, subjective norm, and perceived behavioral control) accurately predicted behavioral intention to advocate for LGBTQ youth. McCabe and colleagues found that attitudes were the strongest predictor of their intention to engage in LGBTQ advocacy. This suggests that those who believed advocacy to be a rewarding and valuable experience indicated the strongest intentions to advocate. Subject norm was the next best predictor of intention to advocate, which highlights the influence of others (e.g.,
colleagues, friends, and family) on educators’ advocacy decisions related to sexual minority students. While intervening to prevent the harassment of LGBTQ students is only one example of applied social justice work in the schools, findings from this study demonstrate the important role that attitudes, subject norm and perceived behavioral control play in an individual’s decision to engage in socially just practice.

In addition to the empirical work by McCabe and colleagues examining individuals’ intention to act as social justice advocates, several scholars have focused on how to train pre-service school psychologists, more generally, as social justice advocates. In 2009, the *Trainers’ Forum* featured a special topic issue on social justice in school psychology. In his introduction, Shriberg (2009a) argued that school psychologists are uniquely prepared to act as social justice advocates within schools and described the critical need for additional research about how to best embed social justice within school psychology graduate training programs. He argued that the fundamental question facing trainers and researchers was how to transform the aspirational nature of social justice into effective practice in school psychology graduate education.

Radliff, Miranda, Stoll, and Wheeler (2009) presented a training model from The Ohio State University as an exemplar for social justice education. The researchers described how they integrated social justice principles into their existing training structure by focusing on five key areas of implementation: (a) program mission statement; (b) student body, including admittance criteria and interview techniques; (c) course content, specific courses, and assignments focused on social justice; (d) community partnering; and (e) student and faculty involvement in community-based projects focused on social justice issues. Radliff et al. (2009) encouraged trainers to
promote social justice as a mindset and to provide experiential training opportunities focused on giving students the practical skills as well as a personal connection to issues of social justice. This article contributed to the social justice literature significantly by presenting a clear conceptual framework and detailed examples for programs interested in infusing social justice into their existing school psychology graduate training models. However, since efforts to evaluate changes in students’ beliefs about social justice had not yet commenced, evidence of the model’s effectiveness was lacking.

In the second training example, Li et al. (2009) described Northeastern University’s three-pronged approach to infusing social justice in their school psychology program. Similar to Radliff et al.’s (2009) model, two of the three prongs described the integration of social justice content into curricular and extracurricular student activities such as involving students and faculty in the application of social justice in real-world settings. However, the third prong differed slightly from the previously discussed model in its additional curricular focus on involving students in research and scholarship with a social justice orientation. The researchers encouraged trainers to explicitly communicate their commitment and passion for social justice to graduate students in their research and scholarship, as well as infusing these issues in both curricular and extracurricular activities (e.g., practica, community partnerships, encouraging participation in social justice groups, etc.). The underlying assumption of Northeastern University’s school psychology training model is that “a commitment to the advancement of social justice is integral to being an effective and ethical school psychology” (Li et al., 2009, pp. 30-31). Although this model also provided illustrative ways of integrating social justice into
existing training programs, it did not present data demonstrating the effectiveness of its approaches.

In the final training example in the special topic issue, advanced graduate students and trainers from Loyola University Chicago’s (LUC’s) school psychology program examined students’ perspectives on LUC’s social justice training (Briggs et al., 2009). This investigation marked the first empirical study in the field of school psychology focused on the professional preparation of students related to social justice training efforts, where school psychology students represented the primary participant group. LUC’s social justice program mission was premised on North’s (2006) model of social justice, which includes three reciprocal spheres of social justice: (a) redistribution/recognition, (b) sameness/difference, and (c) macro/micro (see North, 2006). The researchers used focus groups to investigate graduate students’ perspectives on social justice, how a program with a social justice mission might have impacted students’ perspectives, and how programs might be able to cultivate social justice perspectives in students.

In defining social justice, participants focused on notions of equality, equity and distributive justice – defined as “equal opportunity through equitable distribution of resources” (Briggs et al., 2009, p. 43). Students also articulated a vision of socially just practice that included interventions on the individual and systems-level, which was consistent with the micro/macro sphere outlined by North (2006) and guidelines set forth for school psychology practice (Ysseldyke et al., 2006). In discussing how their training at LUC impacted their beliefs about social justice, students strongly emphasized the importance of their experiential training in schools (i.e., through practica, service learning
and internship). This finding is supported by research in the field of education regarding the benefits of service learning in promoting college students’ social justice development (Engberg, 2004; Wang & Rodgers, 2006). Participants believed that direct exposure in schools helped to shed light on injustices within and across school districts, which might have been more difficult to recognize from the “ivory tower” of a higher education classroom. They also noted that discussions with classmates about their school-based experiences in diverse settings helped them to consider multiple perspectives, while developing their own views and opinions. This finding is also supported by research in the education field suggesting that college students’ experiences with diverse individuals help to facilitate social justice development (Broido & Reason, 2005; Mayhew & Fernandez, 2007; Waters, 2010). In considering some potential areas of growth to more positively impact students’ perspectives on social justice, participants stated the need for a more explicit connection between classroom activities and social justice. The need for a greater number of student placements in schools with higher student needs was also discussed, although students seemed to recognize the potential trade-off of adequate supervision due to a lack of resources that is often associated with higher needs schools.

This study served as an important first step in evaluating the impact of social justice training in a school psychology graduate program on students’ perspectives on social justice. The results provided preliminary support for programs that wish to impact students’ social justice beliefs by adopting a social justice mission. This was a positive finding given research in the education field that suggests isolated approaches such as a workshop or class on social justice may have a limited impact in changing professionals’ beliefs and practices if they are not part of a larger, coordinated training effort (Wideen, 2010).
Mayr-Smith, & Moon, 1998). However, additional information about what constitutes a “social justice mission” and explicit training approaches and pedagogy related to social justice were not discussed. Continuing to identify effective training models and pedagogical strategies that help students to develop a socially just practice orientation represents an important area for future research, especially given prior research highlighting the need for programs to go beyond simply adopting a social justice orientation to prepare students to act in socially just ways when faced with ethical dilemmas (McCabe & Rubinson, 2008).

Following the special issue that highlighted how school psychology programs infused social justice within their graduate training, two additional empirical studies (Miranda, Radliff, Cooper, & Eschenbrenner, 2014; Moy et al., 2014) have examined the impact of social justice training from the perspective of pre-service school psychologists. Using a concurrent explanatory mixed methods design, Miranda et al. (2014) collected individual and small-group data from three cohorts of school psychology graduate students (N=36) to evaluate the effectiveness of training in social justice. Students’ self-perceived cultural competence and comfort engaging in social justice advocacy were collected via individual responses and student-led, small-group discussions guided by a researcher-developed interview protocol. Results indicated that students rated themselves as above average to high on cultural competence following two years of exposure to a curriculum characterized by a social justice and urban specialty foci and field-based practicum in an urban setting. The following four themes were identified as factors that are integral to developing cultural competency and led to development of a model for social justice training: (a) commitment to a lifelong pursuit, (b) ecological model, (c)
awareness, and (d) empathy. Students identified (a) coursework and training experiences, (b) specific assignments and class activities, and (c) interactions with faculty and peers as important training components for understanding socially just practice. The social justice model included both foundational aspects of the training program (i.e., mission statement) that “lay the groundwork for infusing a philosophy of social justice throughout training” (p. 359) as well as dynamic components (e.g., courses, student-led projects, etc.) that contributed to students’ understanding of social justice by engage in socially justice practice during training.

Moy et al. (2014) collected data from four cohorts over three years to investigate school psychology graduate students’ (N=37) understanding of social justice. Using consensual qualitative research methods, trainees’ perspectives were collected via semi-structured focus group interviews. The focus groups were moderated and facilitated by EdS- or PhD-level trainees. The research team members did not facilitate or moderate focus groups comprised of members of their own training cohort or students for whom they served as a teaching assistant. Participants were asked to define social justice, discuss applications of social justice related to school psychology practice and evaluate their social justice training. Similar to Miranda et al.’s (2014) finding, students reported fieldwork as one of the most crucial training experiences in helping them to define social justice and understand its application. Service learning was also identified as an important aspect of social justice training, especially when experiences were shared with and supported by faculty and peers. Consistent with earlier research findings (Caldwell & Vera, 2010, Briggs et al., 2009), Moy and colleagues found that program-facilitated
opportunities that provided students with increased awareness and exposure to social justice issues influenced their overall understanding of social justice.

These studies, when combined with the earlier work of Briggs et al. (2009), marked the first attempts to investigate how social justice is introduced and explored in school psychology programs with an explicit emphasis on social justice. Findings lend support to the importance of training characteristics in cultivating cultural competency and contributing to students’ understanding of social justice in school psychology. However, an important limitation of these studies is that the samples only included students enrolled in training programs with an explicit emphasis on social justice. Therefore, the results may not be generalizable to all school psychology students. Additional research is needed to examine potential differences in the social justice beliefs of pre-service and practicing school psychologists who have or have not had significant training experiences related to social justice and who may or may not identify with a social justice orientation.

**Social Justice and Multiculturalism**

The argument that social justice is typically preceded by an awareness and commitment to multiculturalism and culturally responsive practice has the support of researchers in the fields of education and psychology (Arredondo & Perez, 2003). In fact, many scholars have postulated that cultural diversity, multicultural practice, and social justice advocacy are directly related. In explaining how social justice relates to notions of diversity, Prilleltensky (1997) argued that in the absence of justice and equality “human diversity cannot flourish” (Vera & Speight, 2003, p. 261). Within the field of
school psychology, social justice has been framed as the natural progression of a multicultural movement spanning several decades in psychology (Shriberg, 2009b). Clare (2009) argues that, “social justice is the aspiration, culturally competent advocacy is the strategy, and human diversity is the context” (p. 9). When defining social justice and discussing applications in school psychology, practicing and pre-service school psychologists as well as experts in the field reference the strong link between diversity, cultural competency and social justice (Miranda et al., 2014; Moy et al., 2014; Shriberg et al., 2008, 2011).

In considering this intertwined relationship, some refer to the “multicultural-social justice movement” contending that multicultural competency is too difficult to separate from social justice because it strongly influences a professional’s ability to engage in advocacy related to social justice (e.g., Chung, Bemak, Ortiz, & Sandoval-Perez, 2008; Constantine, Hage, Kindaichi, & Bryant, 2007; Kiselica & Robinson, 2001). Others suggest that social justice and multiculturalism are two distinct constructs, while acknowledging many areas of overlap and how one may help to facilitate the other (Pieterse, Evans, Risner-Butner, Collins, & Mason, 2009). In discussing one such area of overlap, Arredondo and Rosen (2007) explain that since social justice is action-oriented we are most likely to see overlap in the skills domain of the tripartite model. For example, advocacy skills and knowing how and when to take professional risks are areas likely to be encountered both as a culturally competent and socially just practitioner.

Although many scholars lend support to the relationship between multiculturalism and social justice, differences between the two have also been noted. Vera and Speight (2003) have argued that counseling psychologists need to extend their multicultural
competencies to include notions of social justice citing how counselors have traditionally focused on providing psychotherapy at the individual level, rather than working toward social change by engaging in advocacy, prevention and outreach efforts. By focusing on change at the individual level, rather than working at the systems level to change the social context, some have argued that counseling “joins the forces that perpetuate social injustice” (Albee, 2000, p. 248). Within school psychology, the shift from traditional service delivery at the individual level to a systems level presents an opportunity for school psychologists to engage in advocacy, prevention and outreach related to social justice (Shriberg et al., 2008; Vera & Speight, 2003; Ysseldyke et al., 2006). Another way social justice is distinguished from multiculturalism within the counseling field is by its “recognition of the impact of unearned privilege and discriminatory oppression on clients’ mental health” (Singh et al., 2010, p. 767). In a similar vein, school psychology would consider the impact of unearned privilege and oppression on a child’s academic experience, in addition to their social and psychological well-being. Despite widespread recognition of a strong link between multiculturalism and social justice, no empirical research examining the nature of this relationship among school psychology students or practitioners exists.

Social Justice and Counseling Psychology

Given the dearth of research examining potential correlates of social justice beliefs among school psychology trainees, a review of the literature in the related field of counseling psychology was conducted to identify possible predictors of social justice advocacy. Miller et al. (2009) employed social cognitive career theory (SCCT; Lent et
al., 2001, 2005; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994; Lent, Brown, et al., 2003; Lent, Lopez, Lopez, & Sheu, 2008), a widely used academic and vocational theory, to explain college students’ social justice engagement in five domains: (a) social justice self-efficacy beliefs, (b) social justice outcome expectations, (c) social justice interest, (d) social justice commitment, and (e) social justice social supports and barriers. Although this study’s population was comprised of 274 college students, a follow up study was later conducted with doctoral-level counseling psychology students. A key finding of this study was that social justice self-efficacy and outcome expectations had a direct effect on students’ social justice interest. In other words, the higher an individual’s social justice self-efficacy and more positively one views outcome expectations, the greater gains he or she will develop in social justice interest. The researchers also found that students’ interest in social justice impacted their commitment to social justice. That is, the higher a student’s social justice interest, the more likely he or she would be to engage in social justice activities in the future. Consistent with prior SCCT research, evidence supporting an indirect relationship between social justice social supports and barriers and social justice commitment was also found (i.e., social justice social supports enhance social justice commitment by increasing one’s social justice self-efficacy).

The researchers also found that social justice supports and barriers had an indirect effect on social justice commitment through outcome expectations. That is, lower social barriers resulted in more positive outcome expectations regarding social justice issues, thereby impacting an individual’s interest and commitment to social justice. This relationship was not found in previous research focusing on SCCT as applied to academic and vocational areas, indicating that it may be possible that a unique relationship exists.
between the role of social supports and barriers and outcome expectations related to social justice. For example, given the actual or perceived personal risks commonly associated with social justice advocacy, it seems likely that a high level of social barriers might negatively impact social justice interest and commitment by lowering one’s expectations of positive outcomes. Shriberg et al.’s (2011) finding provides preliminary support of this relationship in observing that younger school psychologists, while more familiar with social justice issues, were less likely to pursue social justice goals when personal risks were involved. Exploring the role that social supports and barriers might play in developing one’s sense of social justice commitment, especially in the context of a training environment, represents an important area for future research given the number of potential barriers that practitioners might face when engaging in equity work in schools. These findings suggest that training programs should look for ways to foster students’ social justice self-efficacy, as a means of increasing professional confidence and competence to better prepare trainees to engage in social justice advocacy when facing potential risks.

In a follow-up study designed to investigate the utility of the social-cognitive model of social justice with counseling psychology students, Miller and Sendrowitz (2011) sampled 229 doctoral-level counseling psychology trainees. In addition to exploring the five cognitive constructs of SCCT theory, the researchers also investigated the role of (a) program training environment and (b) personal moral imperative as factors in students’ social justice development based on earlier research (Caldwell & Vera, 2010; Kiselica & Robinson, 2001; Talleyrand, Chung, & Bemak, 2006; Toporek & McNally, 2006) that indicated the importance of these two variables in cultivating positive social
justice beliefs among students. In describing their exposure to social justice, 95% of participants reported they had at least one course that incorporated social justice; however, 42% reported that their program offered no course specifically focused on social justice. The majority of students (58%) indicated they felt that student participation in social justice advocacy was strongly encouraged by their programs, although 67% reported reading social justice literature somewhat inconsistently. These findings supported the generalizability of the social-cognitive model in explaining counseling psychology trainees’ social justice interest and commitment. In examining the relationship between program training environment and students’ social justice commitment, the researchers found that the training environment impacts students’ social justice commitment indirectly through self-efficacy. This finding contradicted earlier research (Palmer & Parish, 2008; Singh et al., 2010) suggesting a direct causal link between training environment supports and barriers and counseling trainees’ social justice development. Another key finding was that higher personal moral imperative led to an increased likelihood that trainees would engage in future social justice activities, which was consistent with prior research (Gainor, 2005; Kiselica & Robinson, 2001).

Nilsson and Schmidt (2005) conducted a study of 134 graduate counseling students to examine the relationship between various personal and academic variables and social justice advocacy. The goal of this exploratory study was to identify variables that could possibly be predictive of social justice advocacy among counseling students. The researchers tested variables found to be predictive of social justice advocacy in earlier research with college students (e.g., age and political interest) and possible predictors associated with counselor training values (e.g., problem solving skills and
A series of multiple regressions was conducted to predict (a) desire to engage in social justice work and (b) actual social justice engagement.

Results indicated that students who were more interested in politics were more likely to be interested in being involved in social justice advocacy. Similarly, students who were more interested in politics and indicated a greater desire to be involved with social justice work tended to actually engage in more social justice activities. Regarding differences among groups, male, and lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) students indicated a stronger desire for involvement in social justice work when compared to their female and heterosexual counterparts, respectively. However, no differences on level of actual engagement were found for either group. Although all variables (age, political interest, courses taken, problem solving style, worldview orientation, and social interest) were predictive of desire to engage in social justice work (accounted for 30% of variance) and actual social justice engagement (accounted for 40% of variance), political interest (in both regression models) and desire to be involved in social justice (in the actual engagement regression model) were the only individual variables to explain unique variance in the models. This suggests that these two variables may be especially helpful in understanding students’ social justice development. The relationship between students having knowledge of and a positive attitude toward social justice and involvement in social justice activities is consistent with previous findings in education and counseling psychology as well (Broido, 2000; Lee, 1997; Miller & Sendrowitz, 2011).

Nilsson, Schale, and Khamphakdy-Brown (2010) conducted a qualitative study with 12 counseling/counseling psychology student trainees who participated in a mental health outreach program for refugee and immigrant women. The researchers’ goals were
to contribute to the limited knowledge about “best practices” for teaching multiculturalism and social justice advocacy among counseling students and to address a growing body of research suggesting that students engaged in service learning can develop into social justice advocates (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, & Yess, 2001; Ngai, 2006; Rocha, 2000; Wang & Rodgers, 2006). Previous research has found that service learning can contribute to students’ self-awareness and understanding of others, including issues related to diversity, social injustices, and a desire to get involved in systemic change efforts (Astin et al., 2001; Ngai, 2006; Rocha, 2000). Similarly, Moy and colleagues (2014) found service learning to be a valuable way to incorporate cultural diversity into an otherwise homogeneous student cohort.

The researchers found that being involved in the outreach program facilitated students’ development of social justice advocacy and multicultural competence. Specifically, the trainees’ experiences of working with, and advocating for, culturally diverse and disadvantaged clients helped them to: (a) increase their cultural knowledge (i.e., learning about the customs and beliefs of different cultures, the challenges of acculturation, and the importance of culture); (b) make gains in counseling-related skills such as listening, empathizing and displaying warmth; and (c) grow in the area of self-awareness including a critique of personal biases and recognizing their own privilege in society. These findings support prior research that service learning is an effective pedagogical tool in increasing students’ self-awareness and understanding of different cultures through intentional exposure to underprivileged groups (Astin et al., 2001; Ngai, 2006) and demonstrate the need for research to examine the relationship between training characteristics and social justice beliefs among school psychology trainees.
To better understand students’ perceptions of social justice training in academic programs, Singh et al. (2010) conducted a qualitative study with 66 doctoral students in counseling psychology. The researchers found that 85% of the sample had not taken a course focused on issues of social justice and, perhaps not surprisingly, had difficulty defining what social justice meant within the counseling field. However, participants discussed how social justice training through outside experiences such as practica, training, and conferences helped them to increase their knowledge of social justice issues, seek out educational opportunities related to social justice, and engage in advocacy on campus and in the community. In highlighting areas of improvement for training programs, respondents discussed the need for increased resources to be allocated to social justice research such as time and opportunities to work with other disciplines on social justice issues, in addition to faculty mentoring. This study was important in that it was, to this researcher’s knowledge, the first to examine how counseling psychology students experience training efforts focused on social justice. Compared to a similar study conducted with school psychology students (see Briggs et al., 2009 discussed briefly above), common themes emerged such as the need for more resources dedicated to social justice and stronger connections between classroom-based activities and real world applications of social justice.

The empirical research base in counseling psychology has important implications for programs interested in training pre-service school psychologists as change agents given that the fields of school and counseling psychology are closely related. However, additional research is needed to examine the ways in which personal and training characteristics uniquely relate to the social justice beliefs of school psychology trainees.
given the distinctions among roles, functions, and practice settings between the two professions.

Social justice has received growing attention in the field of school psychology within the last ten years. However, the literature base is largely conceptual and revealed only three empirical studies exploring social justice from the perspective of school psychology trainees, where they constituted the majority participant group. All of these three studies focused on the impact of various elements of social justice training models (e.g., practicum and service learning experiences), but did not address how the personal characteristics of pre-service school psychologists might predict social justice beliefs, specifically beliefs related to self-efficacy and commitment. The current study contributed to this gap in the research by exploring the relationships between various personal and training variables and the social justice beliefs of school psychology trainees and examining if differences existed among pre-service school psychologists who were or were not exposed to social justice training.
Chapter 3: Methodology

The primary objective of this exploratory study was to describe the perceived beliefs related to social justice, and hypothesized related constructs, of a cross-sectional sample of school psychology trainees and to identify possible predictors of their social justice self-efficacy and social justice commitment. A secondary objective was to examine potential differences in the social justice beliefs of school psychology trainees based on a number of personal and training demographic variables of interest. Specifically, the current study aimed to answer the following research questions:

1. How do school psychology trainees perceive themselves in terms of their social justice self-efficacy and commitment? How do they perceive their personal moral imperative, multicultural personality, and social justice training environment?

2. Do school psychology trainees’ perceived (a) social justice self-efficacy and (b) social justice commitment differ based on participant demographics (i.e., age, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, political party affiliation, religious affiliation) and training demographics (i.e., year in program, student status, degree type, and affiliation with a social justice and/or multicultural-focused program)?

3. Is there a relationship between affiliation with a social justice and/or multicultural-focused program and student perceived social justice training environment?
4. Will measures of self-perceived (a) personal moral imperative, (b) domains of multicultural personality, and (c) social justice training environment predict self-perceived (a) social justice self-efficacy and (b) social justice commitment?

Participants

Participants in this study were graduate students of NASP and/or APA-approved (if doctoral only) school psychology programs. Due to the nature in which student participants were recruited from programs, a small number of recent graduates (within last three years) also participated ($n = 19$). For the sake of simplicity, participants will be described as students throughout this paper. The participants were recruited in two waves. In the first wave of participant recruitment, the directors of 50 school psychology graduate programs received invitations for their students to participate in the study. Twenty-five of the 50 invited programs were identified as having a social justice (SJ) and/or multicultural (MC) training focus. The other 25 school psychology programs were invited to participate to approximate a comparison group. These programs were selected based on the degrees offered in school psychology and geographic region in which the program was located to approximate the programs in the target group.

Programs with a social justice training focus were identified through a two-step process which included the following: (a) consultation with an expert in the field of school psychology in the area of social justice to develop a list of known and potential social justice-focused programs and (b) researching program websites and/or handbooks for evidence of the term *social justice* in the program mission statement, training philosophy, and/or coursework to expand the list of potential programs. Known social
justice-focused programs were identified by an expert in the area of social justice based on a number of factors including, but not limited to, the following: (a) knowledge of the program’s training philosophy, (b) knowledge of the program faculty’s research interests/productivity related to social justice, (c) knowledge of the program faculty’s teaching interests in social justice, and (d) faculty/student involvement in social justice service-related professional activities (e.g., NASP’s Social Justice Interest Group). Seven programs were identified through this step. Next, an Internet search using the keywords “school psychology” and “social justice” was conducted to identify additional social justice-focused programs. If evidence of the term social justice was found on the program’s webpage (e.g., program mission statement, training philosophy, and/or coursework) and the program was NASP or APA-approved (if doctoral only), it was added to the list of social justice-focused programs. Three programs were added through this step. Only programs that met the criteria as being NASP-approved (or APA-approved if doctoral program only) training programs were considered eligible for participation in the study.

In addition to the social justice-focused programs, fifteen NASP-approved (or APA-approved if doctoral program only) programs with a multicultural training focus were enlisted to participate based upon the hypothesized link between social justice and multiculturalism in an effort to increase the sample size for the study. These programs were designated on NASP’s website as programs specializing in multiculturalism and/or bilingualism.

To approximate comparison groups, twenty-five NASP (or APA-approved if doctoral only) programs were identified based on similarities with the SJ/MC-focused
programs in terms of the type of degrees that they offer and the geographic region in which they are located. All students from these programs were invited to participate in this study.

Due to a lower response rate than expected during the first wave of recruitment, participation in the study was opened up to all school psychology graduate students who were Student Affiliates in School Psychology (SASP) members regardless of their program affiliation. SASP is the national student organization of Division 16 (School Psychology) of the APA and recruitment through its listserv provided access to a diverse group of school psychology students (e.g., degree type, geographic region, training models, etc.). Invitations to participate in the study were disseminated using a snowball technique in which the invitation letter was posted to the SASP listserv and recipients were encouraged to forward the invitation to other school psychology graduate students.

Following the two waves of recruitment, 253 school psychology graduate students and recent graduates participated in the study. After eliminating partial survey responses that did not meet criteria for data analysis, the final participant pool consisted of 188 individuals. Demographic characteristics of the participant pool are detailed in Table 1. Table 2 displays the total sample by race/ethnicity and gender.
Table 1

Demographic characteristics of sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>White/Caucasian</th>
<th>134</th>
<th>71.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Race</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGBTQ Identity</th>
<th>LGBTQ</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>5.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-LGBTQ</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Party</th>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>46.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unaffiliated</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Affiliation</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>47.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unaffiliated</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>7.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EdS</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PsyD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EdD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Table 1: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year in Program</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Status</th>
<th>Graduate Student (pre-internship)</th>
<th>Intern/Graduate Student</th>
<th>Recent Graduate (graduated within last 3 years)</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Affiliation</th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th>SJ/MC Program</th>
<th>Did Not Identify</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample can be considered to be a fair representation of school psychology graduate students as a whole. In the most recent demographic survey of school psychology graduate students, Thomas (1998) found that approximately 80% of school psychology graduate students were female and 17% identified as racial/ethnic minorities. As noted in the table above, approximately 82% of the graduate students in the participant pool are female and approximately 21% identify as racial/ethnic minorities. These data are also consistent with data suggesting that there has been an increase in the
enrollment of racial/ethnic minority and female students in school psychology training programs (Curtis, Chesno, & Hunley, 2004), further suggesting that the graduate student sample recruited for this study is a fair representation of school psychology graduate students as a whole.

Table 2
Total sample by race/ethnicity and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Race</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training director responses. Of the fifty invitations sent to program training directors to complete the program survey, only 16 directors participated (32% overall response rate). Of the ten original programs invited to participate based upon their reputation as a social justice-focused training program, seven completed the survey resulting in a 70% response rate. Additionally, six of the fifteen programs identified as having a multicultural training focus participated resulting in a 40% response rate. Of the 25 programs selected for the comparison group based upon no explicit social justice or multiculturalism training focus known to the researcher, only three programs participated resulting in a 12% response rate.
Design and Procedures

This was an exploratory study examining the factors related to the perceived social justice self-efficacy and commitment of school psychology trainees. The study was completed using an online survey from a cross-sectional sample of school psychology students and recent graduates from NASP and/or APA-approved training programs. The study design was non-experimental, meaning that there was no manipulation of variables. Rather, the exploratory design is a form of descriptive research, which seeks to describe the school psychology students’ social justice beliefs and its correlates. This type of design is appropriate when the researcher’s goal is to gain insight into a phenomenon in the preliminary stages of investigation and for which there are few or no earlier studies to refer to (Privitera, 2013).

Program directors from 50 NASP- and/or APA-approved school psychology programs were contacted and provided with information about the purpose of the study. Specifically, 25 programs with social justice and/or multicultural training foci were invited to participate. An additional 25 programs were invited to participate to approximate a comparison group. Contact information for program directors was available online through universities’ websites. All program directors were asked to complete a brief questionnaire to examine the extent to which social justice and multiculturalism is integrated in their training approach. As a secondary recruitment strategy, school psychology students were recruited through the SASP listserv regardless of program affiliation. The secondary recruitment strategy was used given that the number of valid responses was less than 250 after the first wave of recruitment, which
was the minimum desired sample size to meet a preferred ratio of 20:1 valid cases to independent variables for multiple regression (Privitera, 2013).

Email messages with information about the study, informed consent, and the survey link were sent to all selected program directors, who were asked to forward the information to their school psychology students. Program directors received the aforementioned training director questionnaire in a separate email, which was not sent to participants. The participant email included information about the purpose of the study and informed consent, the drawing that participants could enter to win a gift card, and a link to the anonymous online survey (which was completed through the Qualtrics online survey program). A flyer containing information about the purpose of the study and survey link was also included in case the programs preferred to distribute flyers for research solicitation purposes. The decision to use the flyer in combination with the email, or simply to distribute the flyer was left up to individual program directors. Three identical versions of the survey were used in this study; one link was sent to participants enrolled in social justice and/or multicultural-focused programs, another to students in the comparison group, and a third to students who were SASP members. Participants recruited via the SASP listserv were recruited using the same materials. Following approval from the SASP Executive Board, the SASP Communication Liaison sent the study information to the SASP listserv and the researcher did not have direct contact with the study participants. Students recruited from the SASP listserv were then either assigned to either the SJ/MC or the comparison group based on the name of the training program that they provided.
Two follow-up emails were sent to the program directors and SASP Communication Liaison at weekly intervals as a reminder to increase the chances of obtaining a larger, more representative sample of students. Since the survey was anonymous, knowing which participants completed and which did not was impossible, therefore, reminders were sent to all participants. Following the initial e-mail invitation to participate, participants received two follow-up e-mails (once per week) reminding them to complete the survey by a specific date. The third and final e-mail reminder let participants know that the survey link would be closing in two days.

The online survey provided privacy and confidentiality because students were not directly contacted by the researcher. Additionally, no identifying information such as names or identification numbers was collected. However, students were asked to provide the name of their training program to allow the researcher to analyze the data unique to each program. To further ensure confidentiality, Internet protocol (IP) addresses were not saved. All participants that begin the survey were given the opportunity to enter a drawing for a chance to win a $50 Amazon.com© gift card and a free copy of *School Psychology and Social Justice: Conceptual Foundations and Tools for Practice*. Individuals who were interested in entering the drawing were invited to click on a separate link at the end of the survey, where they were asked to provide their contact information. This information was not linked to their survey responses, was housed in a separate database, and was only used for drawing purposes. Participant drawing information was deleted once the drawing was complete.
Measures

Permission was obtained from the developers of the following instruments by the researcher for use in this study.

**Social Issues Questionnaire (SIQ; SJSE and SJC subscales).** Participants’ social justice self-efficacy (SJSE) and social justice commitment (SJC) served as the dependent variables and were measured by extracting the Social Justice Self-Efficacy and Social Justice Commitment scales of the Social Issues Questionnaire (SIQ; Miller et al., 2007, 2009). The SIQ was originally used to measure the development of social justice interest and commitment among college students by adapting an instrument of academic behavior based on SCCT theory (Lent et al., 2001, 2005, 2008; Lent, Brown, et al., 2003). After a review of the social justice literature (e.g., Toporek, Gerstein, Fouad, Roysircar, & Israel, 2006; Vera & Speight, 2003), Miller et al. (2007) adapted the existing instrument to develop a social justice instrument which consisted of four domains that were synthesized from social justice frameworks in the literature postulating from three to five social justice domains (cf. Bronfenbrenner, 1977; Goodman et al., 2004; Neville & Mobley, 2001; Vera & Speight, 2003).

The social justice self-efficacy domain of the SIQ was based on Bandura’s social-cognitive theory (1986) and was defined by Miller et al. (2009) as a “dynamic and domain-specific set of beliefs regarding an individual’s perceived ability to perform particular tasks across intrapersonal, interpersonal, community, and political/institutional” (p. 497). This was operationalized as 20 questions on the SIQ asking respondents to rate their confidence in their abilities to engage in various activities on a scale ranging from 0 (no confidence at all) to 9 (complete confidence). In the current
study, a 5-point scale was used, ranging from 1 (no confidence at all) to 5 (complete confidence). A total mean score was calculated by summing the item responses and dividing them by the number of items on each scale.

Social justice commitment was defined as the “choice-content goals or the domain-specific activities related to social justice advocacy one plans on pursuing” (Lent & Brown, 2006; Miller et al., 2009, p. 497). Social justice commitment was operationalized as four statements where respondents are asked to indicate their level of agreement with statements about future social justice goals and activities on a scale ranging from 0 (strongly disagree) to 9 (strongly agree). In the current study, a 5-point scale was used, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). A total mean score was calculated by summing the item responses and dividing them by the number of items on each scale.

Content validity of the SIQ was established by creating an initial pool of items from a panel of experts in social justice and SCCT (Miller et al., 2009). Criterion-related evidence for construct validity for the SJSE scale was demonstrated by the theory-consistent relationship between SJSE scores and social justice outcome expectations, social justice interest, and social justice commitment scores (Miller et al., 2007). SJC scores produced internal consistency estimates ranging from .92 to .94 and theory-consistent relations with social justice self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and interest (Miller et al., 2007). Further convergent/divergent validity is supported by Miller et al.’s (2007) findings that SJC was negatively related to higher degrees of color-blind racial attitudes and positively associated with openness to diversity. Internal consistency is appropriate to assess reliability of questions measured on an interval/ratio scale. Miller et
al. (2009) reported strong internal reliability for the subscales used in the current study (social justice self-efficacy, $\alpha = .94$ and Social justice commitment, $\alpha = .93$). Similarly, strong internal reliability for the measures was found in the present study (social justice self-efficacy, $\alpha = .90$ and Social justice commitment, $\alpha = .83$).

**Personal moral imperative.** In an extension of their social justice work with counseling psychology students, Miller and Sendrowitz (2011) developed and empirically tested measures of personal moral imperative and program training environment. Personal Moral Imperative describes the process in which individuals become aware of certain injustices that compel them to action (Gainor, 2005; Kiselica & Robinson, 2011). This scale was operationalized as three statements where respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement using a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) Likert-type scale. A total mean score was calculated by summing the item responses and dividing them by the number of items on each scale. PMI scores produced an internal consistency estimate of .81 with a sample of counseling graduate students (Miller & Sendrowitz, 2011) and criterion-related evidence was established with theory-consistent relationships between PMI scores and social justice interest and social justice commitment scores (Miller & Sendrowitz, 2008). In the present study, PMI scores produced an internal consistency estimate of .76.

**Program training environment.** Students’ perceptions regarding their social justice training environment was measured using a modified version of the Program Training Environment measure developed by Miller and Sendrowitz (2011). Program training environment was characterized as the extent to which training programs offer support and leadership related to social justice activities. The original scale was
operationalized as four statements where respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement regarding social justice training environment supports and barriers using a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) Likert-type scale. To create a more nuanced version of program training environment, the researcher developed five additional questions after consultation with experts in the area of social justice in an effort to assess additional areas important to the development of social justice (see Radliff et al., 2009; Miranda et al., 2014). A total mean score was calculated by summing the item responses and dividing them by the number of items on each scale. The original Program Training Environment scale has good reliability with counseling students ($\alpha = .87$). Similarly, the modified version used in the present study demonstrated good reliability with school psychology students ($\alpha = .90$).

**Multicultural Personality Questionnaire- Short Form (MPQ-SF).**

Multicultural personality was measured using the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire-Short Form (MPQ-SF; van der Zee, van Oudenhoven, Ponterotto, & Fietzer, 2013). The MPQ-SF is a 40-item questionnaire that measures five traits relevant to intercultural success: cultural empathy, open-mindedness, social initiative, emotional stability, and flexibility. These traits were derived from an extensive review of the literature on cross-cultural adaptability and intercultural relations. Participants were asked to respond to personal descriptors attached to the sentence stem: “To what extent do the following statements apply to you?” Each item was scored a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (totally not applicable) to 5 (completely applicable). To score the MPQ SF-40, a total mean score was calculated by summing all of the item responses (after reverse scoring) and dividing them by the number of items. Mean scores for each of
the five subscales were scored in the same manner. Higher scores indicate that an individual has a disposition towards successfully navigating personal adjustment, professional effectiveness, and intercultural interactions in unfamiliar cultures. The MPQ SF-40 consists of the same five subscales as the MPQ. The subscales are listed below with their attendant items (items in parentheses were reversed scored):

Cultural Empathy: 1, 6, 18, 23, 27, 32, 36, and 37
Flexibility: (5), (14), (17), (24), (26), (28), (35), (39)
Social Initiative: (3), (4), 7, 8, 10, (22), 29, 33
Openmindedness: 2, 9, 12, 13, 15, 19, 30, 40
Emotional Stability: 11, (16), (20), (21), (25), (31), 34, (38)

Reliability and validity are well established for the longer, 91-item MPQ (van der Zee & van Oudenhoven, 2000, 2001) and preliminary results for the short form support its use as a valid and reliable tool with counseling and psychology graduate students (van der Zee et al., 2013). Adequate to strong internal reliabilities for the five subscales were found in the present study with internal consistency estimates as follows: Cultural Empathy ($\alpha = .750$); Flexibility ($\alpha = .856$); Social Initiative ($\alpha = .848$); Open-mindedness ($\alpha = .667$); and Emotional Stability ($\alpha = .826$).

**Demographic questionnaire for participants.** Participants of the present study were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire. Participants were asked to provide the following information: age (ratio; open-ended); gender (categorical; open-ended); race/ethnicity (categorical; open-ended); LGBTQ identified (dichotomous; where 0 = No and 1 = Yes); political party affiliation (categorical; where 1 = Democrat, 2 = Republican, 3 = Independent, 4 = Unaffiliated and 5 = Other); religious affiliation (categorical; where
1 = Christian, 2 = Islam, 3 = Hindu, 4 = Judaism, 5 = Buddhism, 6 = Unaffiliated and 7 = Other); degree type (categorical; where 1 = MA, 2 = EdS, 3 = PhD, 4 = PsyD, 5 = EdD and 6 = Other); year in program (interval; where 1 = 1st, 2 = 2nd, 3 = 3rd, 4 = 4th, 5 = 5th and 6 = Other); student status (ordinal; where 1 = Pre-internship, 2 = Intern, 3 = Recent graduate and 4 = Other). Participants were also asked to indicate the name of their current training program to indicate group membership with the training information provided by their training program directors. The researcher assigned a program affiliation dichotomous variable for all possible participants, where 0 = Comparison group and 1 = Affiliation with a SJ/MC program based upon pre-determined values at the program level following the steps outlined in an earlier section of this chapter. Since individuals from the SASP listserv were not recruited from previously identified programs, they were assigned program affiliation values based upon the name of the training program they provided (i.e., if their program matched one of the programs previously identified as part of the SJ/MC or comparison group, then they were assigned the same value). If no program name was provided, the program affiliation value was not assigned and these participants were excluded from the analysis that included this variable.

**Training questionnaire for program directors.** Information regarding the demographic and social justice training characteristics of the training programs were collected to provide descriptive data for the sample. Specifically, program directors were asked the following questions: (a) number of students in program, (b) number of culturally/linguistically diverse students, (c) number of full-time faculty, (d) number of culturally/linguistically diverse faculty, (e) number of full-time faculty with teaching/research interests in social justice, (f) geographic region of training program, (g)
geographic setting of training program, (h) training model of program, (i) program training foci, (j) degrees offered by training program, (k) social justice course offered, and (l) type of social justice training offered.

Variables

**Descriptive variables.** Program directors were asked to describe the program’s demographics. Additionally, program directors were asked to provide information about the training experiences, both generally and related to social justice and multiculturalism, offered to students enrolled in their program (please refer to Appendix C for a complete list of questions).

**Demographic variables.** Student participants were asked to provide the following demographic information: age, gender, race/ethnicity, LGBTQ identity, political party affiliation, religious affiliation, degree type, year in program, student status, and name of training program. Program affiliation was an additional demographic variable that was assigned by the researcher based on group membership according to the process described earlier in this chapter.

**Dependent variables.** Two dependent variables were measured in this study. Social justice self-efficacy as measured by the SJSE subscale of the Social Issues Questionnaire was an interval variable, where 1 = No confidence at all and 5 = Complete Confidence. Social justice commitment as measured by the SJC subscale of the Social Issues Questionnaire was an interval variable (where 1 = Strongly disagree and 5 = Strongly agree).
**Independent variables.** Seven independent variables were measured in this study. Personal moral imperative was an interval variable (where 1 = Strongly disagree and 5 = Strongly agree). Social justice training environment as measured by the Program Training Environment scale was an interval variable (where 1 = Strongly disagree and 5 = Strongly agree). Multicultural personality as measured by the Multicultural Personality Questionnaire was an interval variable (where 1 = Totally not applicable and 5 = Completely applicable). Multicultural personality yielded a total score and the following five subscales: Cultural empathy, flexibility, social initiative, open-mindedness, and emotional stability. The five subscales were used as discrete independent variables in the current study.

**Data Analysis**

To address the research questions for this study, several statistical procedures were utilized and are outlined below. All data analyses were carried out using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

**Research question one.** To answer the research question of how school psychology trainees perceived themselves in terms of their social justice self-efficacy, social justice commitment, personal moral imperative, multicultural personality, and social justice training environment, descriptive statistics including frequencies and overall means of the dependent and independent variables were calculated. Mean scores and frequencies by participant and training demographic groups were also calculated. Selected responses from training directors related to the type of social justice training provided to trainees were also summarized.
Research question two. To answer the second research question of whether or not school psychology trainees’ perceived (a) social justice self-efficacy and (b) social justice commitment differed based on participant and training demographics, factorial ANOVAs were examined. Specifically, four three-way factorial ANOVAs were computed using selected demographic variables (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, LGBTQ identity, year in program, student status, and degree type) across social justice self-efficacy and social justice commitment to determine whether there were significant differences between the groups. Several demographic variables were not included in the ANOVA analyses given the small numbers of participants in some of the groups and the fact that these data could not be re-coded in a meaningful way. Three assumptions of normality, homogeneity of variance, and independence were examined to ensure the data were appropriate for the analysis (Lomax, 2007). To test these assumptions normal probability plots were developed and Levene’s Test for Equality of Variance were calculated and interpreted for each variable resulting in no serious violations of the assumptions. The assumption of independence was met by the nature of the design of this study.

Research question three. To determine if a relationship between affiliation with a social justice and/or multicultural-focused program and student perceived social justice training environment existed, correlational analyses were utilized. First, the sample was divided into two groups by program affiliation: “SJ/MC-focused Program” and “Comparison Group” according to the procedures described earlier in this chapter. Respondents that were recruited from the SASP listserv and did not identify the name of their training program were excluded from this analysis (N = 38). A Pearson’s product
moment correlation was utilized to explore the relationship between program affiliation and social justice training environment. To further investigate this relationship, a one-way ANOVA was conducted and interpreted given the significant correlation.

**Research question four.** To examine if measures of self-perceived (a) personal moral imperative, (b) domains of multicultural personality, and (c) social justice training environment predicted self-perceived (a) social justice self-efficacy and (b) social justice commitment in school psychology trainees, individual simultaneous multiple regression analyses were conducted with respect to each dependent variable. As a prerequisite step for research question four, correlational analyses were utilized to examine relationships between the variables. First, the relationships between the dependent variables and the independent variables were examined. Then, the sample was divided by gender, race, LGBTQ identity, degree type, and student status to determine if additional variables should have been entered into the regression model. Pearson’s product moment correlational analyses were conducted for all relationships.

Next, regression models were ran for each of the dependent variable, yielding one parsimonious model for each of the dependent variables. For each multiple regression model, the correlated independent variables were entered simultaneously to obtain a simultaneous regression model. This method of entry was chosen because predictor variables were chosen a priori and this method allowed for simultaneous estimation of the regression parameters (Lomax, 2007). This method was chosen over other methods, such as hierarchical, because this study was exploratory and there was no method of determining a logical hierarchy of entry. For each of the models, six assumptions were
examined according to the following procedures to determine the appropriateness of multiple regression for the data (Lomax, 2007).

**Independence.** The first assumption was that the observations were independent of each other. To test for independence, plots of the residuals versus the predicted dependent variable and of the residuals versus each independent variable were examined.

**Homogeneity.** The second assumption was homogeneity of variance. For multiple regression, this assumption is that the conditional distributions have a constant variance for all values of the independent variables (Lomax, 2007). To examine homogeneity a plot of the dependent variable scores or the residuals versus the independent variables was made.

**Normality.** The third assumption was normality, which states that the conditional distributions of the scores on the dependent variable, or the prediction errors, are normal in shape. To test this assumption a normal probability plot was developed.

**Linearity.** The fourth assumption tested was linearity, which means there is a linear relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variables (Lomax, 2007). This assumption was tested through the examination of residual plots.

**Fixed X.** The fifth assumption was that the values of the independent variables are fixed, not random (Lomax, 2007). The models were only valid for the sample that was observed and only predicted the dependent variable values of the sample obtained; there was no extrapolation beyond the sample predictor data of this study.

**Noncollinearity.** The last assumption was noncollinearity. The variance inflation factor (VIF) was calculated for each predictor to test for collinearity. If the VIF value was close to 10.00 for an independent variable, then collinearity would have been considered
a problem and the variable would have been removed from the model; however, that was not the case in the present study. After all the assumptions were tested and the decision was made that multiple regression was appropriate for the data, all correlated independent variables were simultaneously entered into the model.
Chapter 4: Results

In this chapter, results of the quantitative analyses are presented. First, results of descriptive analyses are presented to answer to research question one. To address the second research question, several three-way ANOVAs were computed comparing demographic groups across the social justice domains to determine whether there were significant differences between the groups. For research questions three and four, correlational analyses were utilized to examine the relationships between program affiliation and social justice training environment and between the independent and dependent variables. Finally, research question four was addressed by the use of regression analyses for each dependent variable.

Results for Research Question One

How do school psychology trainees perceive themselves in terms of their social justice self-efficacy and commitment? How do they perceive their personal moral imperative, multicultural personality, and social justice training environment?

To address the first research question, how do school psychology graduate students perceive their social justice beliefs, personal moral imperative, multicultural personality and social justice training environment, descriptive statistics were calculated. Overall means of social justice self-efficacy, social justice commitment, personal moral imperative, social justice training environment, and the five domains of multicultural personality are presented in Table 3.
Table 3

Means (M) and standard deviations (SD) of social justice self-efficacy (SJSE), social justice commitment (SJC), personal moral imperative (PMI), social justice training environment (SJTE), and multicultural personality (MP; including five subscales) for total sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SJSE</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJC</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMI</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJTE</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP Total</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP Cultural Empathy</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP Flexibility</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP Social Initiative</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP Open-mindedness</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP Emotional Stability</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher mean scores on the social justice self-efficacy scale represent higher levels of one’s perceived ability to perform specific social justice tasks across intrapersonal (e.g., self-awareness), interpersonal (e.g., getting others involved in advocacy), community (e.g., developing and implementing an outreach program), and political/institutional (e.g., changing discriminatory policies) domains. Higher mean scores on the social justice commitment scale indicate stronger endorsement of specific choice-goals one plans on pursuing related to social justice advocacy. Lent et al. (2003) contend that commitment is important because it compels behavior in order to attain a specified goal. Higher mean scores on the personal moral imperative scale indicate higher perceived levels of moral imperative and personal responsibility specific to social justice.
Higher mean scores on the social justice training environment scale indicate one’s perception of a training environment that is committed to social justice by providing opportunities, experiences and resources related to social justice. Higher scores on the multicultural personality measure represent a greater likelihood that an individual will be successful in diverse environments. Specifically, higher scores on the Cultural Empathy subscale reflect higher levels of “interest and sensitivity towards others feelings and beliefs”; higher scores on the Open-mindedness subscale indicate the “absence of rigid prejudices towards other cultural groups, their behaviors and cultural habits and an open attitude towards those groups”; higher scores on the Social Initiative subscale indicate individuals who are more likely to lead social action; higher scores on the Emotional Stability subscale indicate an increased ability to “stay calm when facing stressing environments and events and performing effectively under stressful circumstances”; and higher scores on the Flexibility subscale reflect an increased ability to switch from “habitual and long held behaviors to new standards and procedures that promote adaptation to the new cultural environment” (Leone, Van der Zee, van Oudenhoven, Perugini, & Ercolani, 2005, p. 1450-1451).

Overall school psychology graduate students agreed with statements that were reflective of a commitment to engage in social justice activities ($N=183, M=3.85, SD=.69)$. Similarly, trainees reported moderate levels of confidence regarding their perceived ability to perform specific social justice tasks ($N=188, M=3.57, SD=.56$). School psychology trainees, overall, reported high levels of perceived personal moral imperative ($N=183, M=4.31, SD=.642$). Students were asked to indicate their level of agreement regarding social justice training environment supports and barriers and,
overall, reported moderately supportive training environments \((N=183, M=3.61, SD=.788)\). Related to multicultural personality, students reported high levels of perceived cultural empathy \((N=180, M=4.32, SD=.392)\), followed by open-mindedness \((N=180, M=3.70, SD=.450)\) and social initiative \((N=180, M=3.53, SD=.636)\). The two domains of multicultural personality in which students rated themselves lowest were emotional stability \((N=180, M=3.21, SD=.645)\) and flexibility \((N=180, M=2.71, SD=.621)\).

Mean scores for all demographic groups were calculated and can be found in Table 4. Although differences among groups were observed on the social justice self-efficacy and commitment measures, the results of the factorial ANOVAs presented later in this chapter revealed only one significant difference for the effect of degree type on social justice self-efficacy. Personal moral imperative was highest among students who were younger, female, African-American, LGBTQ-identified, or in their 1st year; however, the significance of these differences was not explored since moral imperative was not used as a dependent variable in the present study. Interestingly, both perceived social justice training environment and personal moral imperative was highest among 1st year students and appeared to decrease over time with the exception of 4th year students for personal moral imperative only. Students enrolled in programs with SJ/MC foci reported higher levels of perceived multicultural personality and social justice training environment. The effect of program affiliation on social justice training environment was analyzed further using a one-way ANOVA and is presented later in this chapter.

Additionally, nine of the 16 training directors that completed the training director survey indicated that their program had a social justice training focus and five reported that the program offered a required course on social justice. The most common ways in
which social justice training was delivered to trainees by their programs was infusing social justice content throughout the program and exposure to social justice issues during field-based experiences and university-community partnerships.
Table 4

Means (M) and standard deviations (SD) of social justice self-efficacy (SJSE), social justice commitment (SJC), personal moral imperative (PMI), social justice training environment (SJTE), and multicultural personality (total score) by demographic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (in years)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SJSE M</th>
<th>SJSE SD</th>
<th>SJC M</th>
<th>SJC SD</th>
<th>PMI M</th>
<th>PMI SD</th>
<th>SJTE M</th>
<th>SJTE SD</th>
<th>MP (Total) M</th>
<th>MP (Total) SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.90 .50</td>
<td>4.50 .38</td>
<td>4.00 .41</td>
<td>4.11 .35</td>
<td>3.58 .27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.64 .40</td>
<td>4.00 .33</td>
<td>4.52 .43</td>
<td>4.14 .32</td>
<td>3.33 .27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.77 .49</td>
<td>3.89 .78</td>
<td>4.36 .78</td>
<td>3.79 .75</td>
<td>3.41 .28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.41 .62</td>
<td>3.92 .70</td>
<td>4.50 .41</td>
<td>3.73 .77</td>
<td>3.45 .30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.85 .66</td>
<td>3.89 .60</td>
<td>4.52 .52</td>
<td>3.65 .85</td>
<td>3.54 .31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.43 .48</td>
<td>3.75 .75</td>
<td>4.20 .72</td>
<td>3.23 .70</td>
<td>3.44 .39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.36 .52</td>
<td>3.61 .84</td>
<td>3.98 .79</td>
<td>3.48 .91</td>
<td>3.40 .35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.60 .71</td>
<td>3.95 .70</td>
<td>4.36 .50</td>
<td>3.57 .88</td>
<td>3.52 .12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.46 .60</td>
<td>3.94 .67</td>
<td>4.05 .47</td>
<td>3.63 .70</td>
<td>3.60 .40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.62 .53</td>
<td>4.04 .71</td>
<td>4.50 .41</td>
<td>3.41 .95</td>
<td>3.69 .42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.54 .50</td>
<td>3.73 .71</td>
<td>4.22 .76</td>
<td>3.57 .85</td>
<td>3.51 .36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.85 .48</td>
<td>3.63 .11</td>
<td>4.50 .43</td>
<td>4.17 .56</td>
<td>3.57 .16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.65 .21</td>
<td>3.88 .53</td>
<td>3.83 1.65</td>
<td>3.06 .39</td>
<td>3.50 .35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.35 .07</td>
<td>3.50 .00</td>
<td>4.67 .00</td>
<td>4.50 .24</td>
<td>3.33 .88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.60 .35</td>
<td>3.75 .43</td>
<td>4.33 .28</td>
<td>3.40 .34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.70 .35</td>
<td>4.00 .35</td>
<td>4.83 .24</td>
<td>4.17 .24</td>
<td>3.74 .02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.65 .50</td>
<td>3.50 .40</td>
<td>4.00 .38</td>
<td>3.89 .35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.18 .67</td>
<td>3.50 .35</td>
<td>4.33 .47</td>
<td>3.00 .00</td>
<td>3.69 .09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.97 .28</td>
<td>4.17 .14</td>
<td>4.44 .69</td>
<td>3.37 1.10</td>
<td>3.79 .14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.90 .30</td>
<td>3.00 .33</td>
<td>3.11 .31</td>
<td>3.45 .34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00 .40</td>
<td>4.00 .40</td>
<td>4.56 .46</td>
<td>3.64 .36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00 .40</td>
<td>4.50 .50</td>
<td>5.00 .46</td>
<td>4.13 .34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.80 .47</td>
<td>4.75 .50</td>
<td>3.00 .30</td>
<td>3.75 .37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.30 .42</td>
<td>4.25 .50</td>
<td>3.11 .31</td>
<td>3.73 .37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>154</th>
<th>3.56 .56</th>
<th>3.82 .65</th>
<th>4.33 .58</th>
<th>3.64 .79</th>
<th>3.47 .32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.69 .55</td>
<td>4.03 .92</td>
<td>4.29 .90</td>
<td>3.48 .83</td>
<td>3.58 .35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45 .42</td>
<td>4.25 .50</td>
<td>5.00 .40</td>
<td>3.75 .37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White/Caucasian</th>
<th>134</th>
<th>3.55 .57</th>
<th>3.80 .70</th>
<th>4.24 .65</th>
<th>3.62 .78</th>
<th>3.50 .34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black/African</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.66 .41</td>
<td>3.96 .62</td>
<td>4.74 .41</td>
<td>3.57 .89</td>
<td>3.41 .22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.89 .59</td>
<td>4.33 .60</td>
<td>4.67 .41</td>
<td>3.86 .75</td>
<td>3.55 .29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.52 .67</td>
<td>3.50 .31</td>
<td>4.13 .51</td>
<td>3.00 1.03</td>
<td>3.45 .29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.45 .43</td>
<td>3.82 .80</td>
<td>4.71 .49</td>
<td>3.70 .63</td>
<td>3.35 .33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Race</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.15 1.06</td>
<td>4.38 .88</td>
<td>4.17 1.18</td>
<td>4.61 .39</td>
<td>3.86 .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Table 4: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGBTQ Identity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-LGBTQ</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Political Party Affiliation |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Democrat       | 87 | 3.69 | .54 | 3.94 | .58 | 4.48 | .46 | 3.56 | .81 | 3.53 | .32 |
| Republican     | 16 | 3.36 | .55 | 3.58 | .57 | 4.25 | .63 | 3.77 | .67 | 3.40 | .36 |
| Independent    | 24 | 3.54 | .59 | 3.93 | .66 | 4.19 | .55 | 3.69 | .87 | 3.52 | .27 |
| Unaffiliated   | 45 | 3.44 | .57 | 3.78 | .80 | 4.19 | .70 | 3.65 | .80 | 3.42 | .36 |
| Other          | 4  | 3.73 | .68 | 3.81 | 1.57 | 4.17 | 1.67 | 3.72 | .45 | 3.51 | .13 |

| Religious Affiliation |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Christian        | 89 | 3.57 | .57 | 3.82 | .72 | 4.34 | .53 | 3.53 | .80 | 3.44 | .32 |
| Islam            | 3  | 3.65 | 1.15 | 4.17 | .72 | 4.33 | .88 | 4.07 | .97 | 3.78 | .14 |
| Judaism          | 7  | 3.75 | .46 | 3.89 | .56 | 4.19 | .38 | 3.78 | .75 | 3.73 | .34 |
| Buddhism         | 5  | 3.86 | .49 | 4.15 | .60 | 4.47 | .51 | 3.60 | .41 | 3.77 | .26 |
| Unaffiliated     | 45 | 3.50 | .54 | 3.83 | .60 | 4.33 | .68 | 3.60 | .78 | 3.48 | .33 |
| Other            | 25 | 3.64 | .58 | 3.95 | .80 | 4.39 | .80 | 3.89 | .82 | 3.52 | .32 |

| Degree Type |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| MA           | 14 | 3.60 | .63 | 3.70 | .66 | 4.29 | .78 | 3.75 | .72 | 3.53 | .26 |
| EdS          | 55 | 3.62 | .50 | 3.93 | .65 | 4.41 | .55 | 3.90 | .70 | 3.46 | .36 |
| PhD          | 77 | 3.52 | .58 | 3.82 | .74 | 4.30 | .65 | 3.41 | .81 | 3.48 | .31 |
| PsyD         | 14 | 3.51 | .69 | 3.88 | .71 | 4.31 | .65 | 3.25 | .78 | 3.53 | .35 |
| EdD          | 1  | 4.35 | .50 | 5.00 | .4    | 4.67 | .50 | .33 | .33 | .33 | .33 |
| Other        | 16 | 3.67 | .50 | 3.78 | .60 | 4.19 | .68 | 3.79 | .70 | 3.54 | .29 |

| Year in Program |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1st            | 46 | 3.61 | .63 | 3.99 | .59 | 4.47 | .60 | 3.96 | .68 | 3.46 | .28 |
| 2nd            | 36 | 3.59 | .45 | 3.89 | .72 | 4.30 | .63 | 3.70 | .79 | 3.46 | .34 |
| 3rd            | 39 | 3.45 | .56 | 3.76 | .79 | 4.23 | .73 | 3.46 | .79 | 3.51 | .29 |
| 4th            | 12 | 3.80 | .57 | 4.17 | .70 | 4.42 | .49 | 3.31 | .91 | 3.46 | .32 |
| 5th            | 17 | 3.53 | .61 | 3.62 | .66 | 4.10 | .75 | 3.31 | .80 | 3.55 | .34 |
| Other          | 24 | 3.62 | .54 | 3.71 | .65 | 4.40 | .47 | 3.49 | .79 | 3.50 | .42 |

| Student Status |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Graduate Student (pre-internship) | 112 | 3.58 | .57 | 3.92 | .68 | 4.36 | .63 | 3.64 | .82 | 3.48 | .30 |
| Intern/Graduate Student | 37 | 3.45 | .53 | 3.66 | .74 | 4.21 | .72 | 3.61 | .68 | 3.46 | .34 |
| Recent Graduate (graduated within last 3 years) | 19 | 3.69 | .57 | 3.76 | .56 | 4.28 | .45 | 3.44 | .83 | 3.57 | .44 |
| Other          | 9  | 3.83 | .58 | 4.06 | .75 | 4.48 | .50 | 3.84 | .81 | 3.55 | .26 |

(Continued)
Table 4: Continued

| Program Affiliation | Comparison Group | 31 | 3.61 | .61 | 3.88 | .70 | 4.40 | .67 | 3.25 | .74 | 3.43 | .37 |
|SJ/MC Program       | 119              | 3.54 | .56 | 3.88 | .68 | 4.36 | .58 | 3.86 | .71 | 3.50 | .32 |

Note: SJSE is social justice self-efficacy; SJC is social justice commitment; PMI is personal moral imperative; SJTE is social justice training environment; and MP is multicultural personality.
Results for Research Question Two

Do school psychology trainees’ perceived (a) social justice self-efficacy and (b) social justice commitment differ based on participant demographics (i.e., age, gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, political party affiliation, religious affiliation) and training demographics (i.e., year in program, student status, degree type, and affiliation with a social justice and/or multicultural-focused program)?

To address the second research question, four factorial ANOVAs were computed using selected demographic variables (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, LGBTQ identity, degree type, year in program, and student status) across social justice self-efficacy and social justice commitment to determine whether there were significant differences between the groups. To further investigate relationships between the variables, the effect size ($\eta^2$) was also calculated and interpreted for any effect that was significant (Cohen, 1988).

Prior to the analyses, several variables were re-coded to in order to analyze the data with inferential statistics and aid in the interpretation of the data. Specifically, race/ethnicity was re-coded as White versus students of color; degree type was re-coded as non-doctoral versus doctoral; student status was re-coded as no internship experience versus current/past internship experience. Year in program was transformed into level of training based upon students’ program year, where 1st year students were re-coded as novice, 2nd and 3rd year students were re-coded as intermediate, and students in their 4th year or higher and recent graduates were re-coded as advanced. In terms of gender, the one response that was initially coded as “other” was re-coded as female given the respondent’s gender identity of “femme.” Means and standard deviations for social
justice self-efficacy and commitment by the transformed demographic and training variables are presented in Table 5. Several demographic variables were not included in the ANOVA analyses given the small numbers of participants in some of the groups and the fact that these data could not be re-coded in a meaningful way.

Table 5
Means (M) and standard deviations (SD) of social justice self-efficacy (SJSE) and social justice commitment (SJC) subscale scores by re-scaled demographic and training variables of interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Group</th>
<th>SJSE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SJC</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students of Color</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LGBTQ Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-doctoral</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internship Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No experience</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current/past experience</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SJSE is social justice self-efficacy and SJC is social justice commitment.
As shown in Table 6, perceived social justice self-efficacy scores were subjected to a three-way analysis of variance having two levels of gender (female, male), two levels of race (White, students of color), and two levels of LGBTQ identity (LGBTQ, heterosexual). A second three-way ANOVA having two levels of degree (non-doctoral, doctoral), three levels of training (novice, intermediate, advanced), and two levels of internship experience (no experience, current/past experience) was calculated on students’ perceived social justice self-efficacy scores (see Table 7). As displayed in Table 7, there was a significant main effect for degree type, which had a small to moderate effect on social justice self-efficacy \([F(1, 169) = 4.873, p = .029, \eta^2 = .028]\). In general, non-doctoral students reported higher levels of perceived social justice self-efficacy \((M = 3.63, SD = .52)\) than did doctoral-level students \((M = 3.53, SD = .60)\). The interaction effects were non-significant.

Table 6

\[
\begin{array}{lccc}
\text{Variable and source} & F & p & \eta^2 \\
\hline
\text{Gender} & .682 & .410 & .004 \\
\text{Race} & .906 & .343 & .005 \\
\text{LGBTQ Identity} & .695 & .406 & .004 \\
\end{array}
\]

Note. Gender = men versus women; Race = students of color versus White students; and LGBTQ identity= heterosexual versus LGBTQ identified students.
Table 7

2 x 3 x 2 factorial analysis of variance for the effect of selected training demographic variables on social justice self-efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Type</td>
<td>4.873</td>
<td>.029*</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Training</td>
<td>2.415</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship Experience</td>
<td>1.692</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level

Note. Degree type = Non-doctoral (e.g., MA, EdS, MEd, MSc) versus doctoral (i.e., PhD, PsyD, EdD); Level of training = novice, intermediate, and advanced students; and Internship experience = no internship experience versus current/past internship experience.

As displayed in Tables 8 and 9, two three-way ANOVAs were also calculated on students’ perceived social justice commitment scores. No statistically significant differences were found for the effect of gender, race, LGBTQ identity, degree type, level of training, or internship experience on social justice commitment, meaning that there were no meaningful differences between the social justice commitment scores for any of this demographic groups within the present sample. Although not statistically significant, students of color reported higher levels of perceived social justice commitment ($M = 4.02, SD = .66$) than White students ($M = 3.80, SD = .70$), with a $p$ value approaching the .05 level of significance.
### Table 8

*2 x 2 x 2 factorial analysis of variance for the effect of selected demographic variables on social justice commitment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>3.384</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ Identity</td>
<td>2.223</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Gender = men versus women; Race = students of color versus White students; and LGBTQ identity = heterosexual versus LGBTQ identified students.

### Table 9

*2 x 3 x 2 factorial analysis of variance for the effect of selected training demographic variables on social justice commitment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Type</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Training</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship Experience</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Degree type = Non-doctoral (e.g., MA, EdS, MEd, MSc) versus doctoral (i.e., PhD, PsyD, EdD); Level of training = novice, intermediate, and advanced students; and Internship experience = no internship experience versus current/past internship experience.
Results for Research Question Three

Is there a relationship between affiliation with a social justice and/or multicultural-focused program and student perceived social justice training environment?

To address the third research question, a Pearson product moment correlational analysis and one-way ANOVA were conducted. Group membership within the social justice and/or multicultural-focused affiliated programs or comparison group condition was determined at the time of recruitment based on the procedures identified earlier in Chapter Three. Affiliation with a social justice and/or multicultural-focused program was moderately positively correlated with social justice training environment ($r = .322, p < .01$). As displayed in Table 10, an ANOVA showed that the effect of program affiliation was significant. Students enrolled in school psychology programs with social justice and/or multicultural training foci reported more supportive program training environments related to social justice ($M=3.86, SD=.709$) compared to students who were enrolled in training programs in the comparison group ($M=3.25, SD=.739$).

Table 10

One-way analysis of variance for the effect of program affiliation on social justice training environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable and source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>16.685</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .01 level
Results for Research Question Four

Will measures of self-perceived (a) personal moral imperative, (b) domains of multicultural personality, and (c) social justice training environment predict self-perceived (a) social justice self-efficacy and (b) social justice commitment?

To answer the fourth research question, correlational and regression analyses were conducted. Pearson product moment correlational analyses were first calculated to examine relationships between social justice self-efficacy, social justice commitment, personal moral imperative, social justice training environment, and the five subscales of multicultural personality as a prerequisite step for the regression analyses. As shown in Table 11, several significant relationships were found. Self-perceived social justice self-efficacy was significantly, positively related to personal moral imperative, social justice training environment, cultural empathy, social initiative, and open-mindedness (three subscales of multicultural personality). Self-perceived social justice commitment was significantly, positively related to personal moral imperative, social justice training environment, cultural empathy, flexibility, and open-mindedness (three subscales of multicultural personality). Social justice self-efficacy and social justice commitment were also strongly positively correlated, \( r(181) = .515, p < .01 \), which was expected given their theoretical relationship. Additionally, Cronbach’s alpha for each of the measures indicated adequate to strong levels of internal reliability with school psychology trainees in the present sample.
Table 1

Correlations for social justice self-efficacy (SJSE), social justice commitment (SJC), personal moral imperative (PMI), social justice training environment (SJTE), and multicultural personality (MP; five subscales)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SJSE</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SJC</td>
<td>.515**</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PMI</td>
<td>.362**</td>
<td>.563**</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SJTE</td>
<td>.232**</td>
<td>.360**</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. MP Cultural Empathy</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td>.147*</td>
<td>.278**</td>
<td>.243**</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. MP Flexibility</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.169*</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MP Social Initiative</td>
<td>.229**</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.150*</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. MP Open-mindedness</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>.385**</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td>.253**</td>
<td>.343**</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.400**</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. MP Emotional Stability</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.252**</td>
<td>.249**</td>
<td>.187*</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

Note: The coefficients on the diagonal in bold are the Cronbach’s alpha of each scale.
Next, to identify potential demographic variables that could also serve as predictors of social justice self-efficacy and commitment, correlational analyses were used to examine relationships between several demographic variables of interest and the dependent variables. The demographic variables that were re-coded into dummy variables (described earlier under Research Question Two in this chapter) were used for this analysis. As displayed in Table 12, no significant relationships were found between the demographic groups and the dependent variables; therefore, they were excluded from the regression analyses.

Although not statistically significant, several small relationships (i.e., .10) were observed between gender, race, LGBTQ identity, and internship experience and social justice commitment (Cohen, 1988). Male status had an insignificant, small positive relationship with social justice commitment. Males reported higher levels of social justice commitment \( (n=22, M=4.03, SD=.920, SE=.196) \) compared to females \( (n=155, M=3.83, SD=.651, SE=.052) \). Although non-statistically significant, non-white status had a small positive correlation with social justice commitment. Students of color reported higher levels of social justice commitment \( (n=41, M=4.01, SD=.658, SE=.103) \) compared to White students \( (n=133, M=3.81, SD=.701, SE=.060) \). Heterosexual identity had a small, albeit non-significant, negative relationship with social justice commitment. Heterosexual students reported lower levels of social justice commitment \( (n=164, M=3.82, SD=.693, SE=.054) \) than students who identified as LGBTQ \( (n=11, M=4.16, SD=.550, SE=.166) \). Internship experience had a non-significant, small negative relationship with social justice commitment. Students with no internship experience reported higher levels of social justice commitment \( (n=112, M=3.92, SD=.920, SE=.064) \) compared to students
who had completed or were currently on internship \((n=65, M=3.75, SD=.700, SE=.086)\).

Table 12

*Correlations for social justice self-efficacy (SJSE), social justice commitment (SJC), gender, race, LGBTQ identity, degree type, and internship experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures/Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SJSE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SJC</td>
<td>.515**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Race</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. LGBTQ Identity</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Degree Type</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.135</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Internship Experience</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>-.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Gender = men versus women; Race = students of color versus White students; LGBTQ identity = heterosexual versus LGBTQ identified students; Degree type = Non-doctoral (e.g., MA, EdS, MEd, MSc) versus doctoral (i.e., PhD, PsyD, EdD); and Internship experience = no internship experience versus current/past internship experience.
After identifying the independent variables that significantly correlated with the dependent variables, regression analyses were conducted. Two models were developed for social justice self-efficacy and two for social justice commitment, yielding a total of four regression models. For the first two models, all independent variables that significantly correlated with the dependent variables were entered simultaneously. For the final two regression models, all variables retained from the first models were entered simultaneously. For both dependent variables, Normal P-P Plots and residual plots were constructed and resulted in no serious violations of homogeneity of variance, independence, and/or normality. Linearity was satisfied by including only variables that shared a significant linear relationship with the dependent variable. Consequently, the data were deemed appropriate for regression analyses.

**Social justice self-efficacy regression models.** Variables that were found to correlate with Social Justice Self-efficacy included Personal Moral Imperative, Social Justice Training Environment, Cultural Empathy, Social Initiative, and Open-mindedness, which were all entered into the first regression model (see Model 1, Table 13). The model was significant ($F=15.628, df=5, 179, p<.001$) with all five variables explaining $31.0\% (R^2 = .310)$ of the variance. The standard deviation of the residuals, or standard error ($SE$) was $.475$. However, the unstandardized partial slopes of the variables were only significantly different from zero for two of the variables. Thus, it was determined that changes in these variables were not associated with changes in the response; therefore, they were not retained in the final regression model.

The parsimonious model used to predict Social Justice Self-Efficacy included Personal Moral Imperative and Open-mindedness as predictors. The results of the final
model (Model 2) are also presented in Table 13. The model was significant ($F=36.771$, $df=2, 179, p<.001$) with both variables explaining 29.4% ($R^2 = .294$) of the variance. The standard error ($SE$) was .477. The unstandardized partial slopes of the two variables were significantly different from zero: open-mindedness was the best predictor ($B=.514$, $t=6.203, df=179, p<.001$), followed by personal moral imperative ($B=.226$, $t=3.865$, $df=179, p<.001$). The VIF value for both variables was 1.092 indicating no problem with collinearity.

Table 13

*Summary of simple regression analyses for variables predicting social justice self-efficacy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$ B</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$B$</td>
<td>$SE$ B</td>
<td>$B$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Moral Imperative</td>
<td>.202*</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.226*</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>.431*</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice Training Environment</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Initiative</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Empathy</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>15.628*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.771*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 179$.
* $p < .01$

**Social justice commitment regression models.** Variables that were found to correlate with Social Justice Commitment included Personal Moral Imperative, Social Justice Training Environment, Cultural Empathy, Flexibility, and Open-mindedness, which were all entered into the first regression model (see Model 1, Table 14). The model was significant ($F=26.458$, $df=5, 179, p<.001$) with all five variables explaining 43.2%
\( R^2 = .432 \) of the variance. The standard deviation of the residuals, or standard error (\( SE \)) was .528. However, the unstandardized partial slopes of the variables were only significantly different from zero for four of the variables. Thus, it was determined that changes in these variables were not associated with changes in the response; therefore, they were not retained in the final regression model.

The parsimonious model used to predict Social Justice Commitment included Personal Moral Imperative, Social Justice Training Environment, Open-mindedness, and Flexibility, and the results of the final model (Model 2) are also presented in Table 14. The model was significant \( (F=32.496, df= 4, 179, p<.001) \) with all four variables explaining 42.6\% \( (R^2 = .426) \) of the variance. The standard error (\( SE \)) was .529. The unstandardized partial slopes of the four variables were significantly different from zero: personal moral imperative was the best predictor \( (B=.484, t=7.292, df=179, p<.001) \), followed by open-mindedness \( (B=.278, t=2.937, df=179, p=.004) \), flexibility \( (B=.191, t=2.925, df=179, p=.004) \) and social justice training environment \( (B=.186, t=3.442, df=179, p=.001) \). VIF values ranged from 1.045 to 1.159 indicating no collinearity problems.
Table 14

Summary of simple regression analyses for variables predicting social justice commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Moral</td>
<td>.500*</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.484*</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>.315*</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.278*</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice Training</td>
<td>.194*</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.186*</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>.176*</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.191*</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Empathy</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td></td>
<td>.426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>26.458*</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.496*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 179.
* p < .01
Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between social justice self-efficacy and social justice commitment and a number of individual trainee and program training characteristics among school psychology students. Research examining the social justice beliefs of pre-service school psychologists is extremely scarce, especially empirical research using validated measures. Only three studies to date have examined the social justice beliefs of school psychology students (Briggs et al., 2009; Miranda et al., 2014; & Moy et al., 2014); however, none of these studies examined the correlates of trainees’ social justice beliefs or specifically examined self-efficacy and commitment as they relate to social justice. Furthermore, all three of these studies utilized convenience samples, whereby participants were current students enrolled in training programs with a social justice training focus participating in research by carried out by their faculty members.

This was the first study to examine the relationship between trainees’ perceived social justice self-efficacy and social justice commitment among a cross-sectional sample of school psychology trainees. Students from 50 NASP- and/or APA-approved programs were invited to participate in the study by completing an online survey. Half of programs were identified as having a social justice and/or multicultural-focused training focus. The remaining half of programs were identified based on the types of degrees they offered and the geographic location in which they were located to serve as a comparison group. Program training directors from each of the 50 programs were invited to complete a brief
survey, which sought to collect basic demographic (e.g., number of culturally/linguistically diverse students and faculty members), general training information (e.g., training philosophy), and training information related to social justice (e.g., if they offered a social justice course) about the programs under study. Surveys were completed anonymously. A total of 253 trainees and 16 training directors participated in this study. However, due to partial responses and/or missing data, a number of student survey responses were eliminated from the final sample ($N = 188$).

**Descriptive Characteristics of Social Justice and Related Constructs**

Overall school psychology graduate students agreed with statements that were reflective of a commitment to engage in social justice activities ($N=183$, $M=3.85$, $SD=.69$). Similarly, trainees reported moderate levels of confidence regarding their perceived ability to perform specific social justice tasks ($N=188$, $M=3.57$, $SD=.56$). Earlier research has suggested that risk (perceived or actual) may prevent school psychologists from engaging in social justice advocacy despite high levels of social justice knowledge (McCabe & Rubinson, 2008; Shriberg et al., 2011). Although the social justice self-efficacy and commitment scores in the present study could not be directly compared, they appear to support earlier findings suggesting that although individuals may have the desire and/or intention to engage in social justice activities, they may feel less confident in their abilities to respond to or confront social injustices. Considered together, these findings perhaps suggest that training efforts need to go beyond simply increasing one’s awareness and knowledge related to social justice in order to effectuate behavioral change.
After transforming the scaled scores to match the original anchors, the social justice self-efficacy and social justice commitment mean scores ($M = 7.15; M = 7.70$, respectively) obtained in this study were compared to those obtained in previous studies in order to gain insight into how school psychology trainees may differ from other groups relative to social justice. Miller et al.’s (2009) sample of college students ($N = 274$) reported lower levels of social justice self-efficacy ($M = 5.66, SD = 1.57$) and social justice commitment ($M = 4.60, SD = 2.05$) compared to school psychology trainees. These findings suggest that the social justice beliefs of college students may differ in important ways from graduate students, both generally and specific to school psychology. Scores from the current study were, however, consistent with the social justice self-efficacy and social justice commitment scores reported in Miller and Sendrowitz (2011) sample ($N = 229$) of counseling psychology graduate students ($M = 6.89, SD = 1.35; M = 7.84, SD = 1.75$), respectively. Given the focus in each of these fields on client advocacy and respecting the rights and dignity of all people, it was not surprising that students perceived social justice in similar ways.

School psychology trainees, overall, reported high levels of perceived personal moral imperative ($N=183, M=4.31, SD=.64$). Counseling psychology students reported similar levels of personal moral imperative ($M = 4.36, SD = 0.68$) (Miller & Sendrowitz, 2011). This may suggest that school psychology and counseling psychology students similarly gravitate to “helping professions” based on a strong moral calling and sense of responsibility to others.

Trainees in the present study reported moderately supportive training environments ($N=183, M=3.61, SD=.79$). Perceived levels of social justice training
environment were slightly higher among school psychology trainees compared to counseling psychology students ($M = 3.14, SD = 0.99$) in the Miller & Sendrowitz (2011) study. Although it is unclear if this difference would be significant, it is interesting given that the field of school psychology is only beginning to discuss integrating social justice into training while the field of counseling psychology has reflected a commitment to social justice for some time (Vera & Speight, 2003).

Related to multicultural personality, participants in the present study reported high levels of perceived cultural empathy ($N=180, M=4.32, SD=.39$), followed by open-mindedness ($N=180, M=3.70, SD=.45$) and social initiative ($N=180, M=3.53, SD=.64$). The two domains of multicultural personality in which students rated themselves lowest were emotional stability ($N=180, M=3.21, SD=.65$) and flexibility ($N=180, M=2.71, SD=.62$). These findings point to the need for additional training for school psychology students focused on preparing them to be more adaptive to shifting cultural environments. Further, results from the social justice commitment regression model in the present study suggest that increasing the flexibility of school psychology students would predict increases in perceived social justice commitment.

In the current sample, participants’ mean scores on each of the five domains of multicultural personality were similar to those reported by Houtz, Ponterotto, Burger, and Marino (2010) where participants were graduate students in counseling and psychology enrolled in programs had been nationally recognized for their multicultural training integration. As in the present study, the Houtz et al. (2010) sample was largely young ($M$ age $= 27.8, SD = 9.5$), White (75%), and female (89%). These students rated themselves highest in the area of cultural empathy ($M = 4.24, SD = 0.45$), followed by open-
mindedness ($M = 3.76, SD = 0.48$), social initiative ($M = 3.65, SD = 0.50$), flexibility ($M = 3.15, SD = 0.52$), and emotional stability ($M = 3.13, SD = 0.48$). Similar to the Houtz et al. sample, the majority of participants in the current sample were enrolled in programs nationally recognized for having a multicultural focus and/or social justice focus. Therefore, the scores obtained from these two samples may not be representative of all school psychology and counseling psychology students given that these students likely received some specialized training related to multiculturalism and/or social justice (as an extension of multiculturalism).

**Effect of Individual Trainee and Program Training Characteristics on Social Justice**

Findings from the present study indicate that non-doctoral students reported higher levels of social justice self-efficacy than doctoral students. Although no a priori hypothesis was made regarding the effect of degree type on social justice beliefs, this finding suggests that practitioner-oriented students may feel more confident and prepared to engage in social justice activities compared to more research-orientated students. One possible explanation for lower perceived levels of self-efficacy related to social justice among doctoral students can be understood in conceiving of social justice along a developmental trajectory. Specifically, Waters (2010) proposed a developmental model of social justice allyhood that included three stages: initial, intermediate and advanced. Frequently, persons in the initial stage have only had minimal exposure working with oppressed/marginalized groups, and therefore rely upon information from sources like media, texts, and authority figures rather than direct experiences with members of the group. Therefore, these individuals may not yet be aware of the challenges associated
with engaging in social justice work and perhaps perceive themselves as overly efficacious. Conversely, although individuals at the intermediate stage may demonstrate increasing awareness of multiple perspectives and become better able to acknowledge privilege and systemic oppression, they may also begin to address feelings of guilt, anxiety, or shame regarding past behaviors or acknowledgment of dominant group membership causing them to feel particularly vulnerable or tentative in social interactions. Therefore, individuals at the intermediate stage may perceive themselves as less prepared to confront social injustice.

Another hypothesis for higher perceived self-efficacy among non-doctoral students highlights important differences between these two groups of students in terms of their course and field-based experience training sequence. For example, since doctoral-level students typically do not go on internship after completing the first two years of the training program like EdS students, they may lose whatever sense of social justice “preparedness” they felt during the first two years of training because their subsequent course content and field-based experiences do not integrate social justice as much.

The lack of relationship between many of the other demographic variables and the two social justice domains was somewhat surprising, suggesting that gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, level of training, and internship experience do not necessarily translate into attitudes associated with social justice. Previous studies with college students found that being more advanced in their training/education, and being male was associated with social justice advocacy (Kerpelman, 1969; Lee, 1997). Others have found that women, compared to men, tend to have more values associated with social justice (Hurtado, Engberg, Ponjuan, & Landreman, 2002). In a sample of graduate
counseling psychology students, Nilsson and Schmidt (2005) found that men and lesbian, gay and bisexual students reported greater desire to be involved in social justice advocacy than women and heterosexual students, respectively, but found no differences based on race/ethnicity or political ideology. In the present study, it was hypothesized that students from oppressed/marginalized groups (i.e., students of color, LGBTQ students) would report higher perceived social justice self-efficacy and commitment. Findings among the sample of school psychology students in this study showed positive trends between oppressed/marginalized group membership and higher social justice beliefs as hypothesized. Since these differences were not statistically significant, statistical theory suggests that the differences observed could be the result of sampling. However, given the small numbers of individuals that might have identified as oppressed or marginalized in the present study, future researchers should examine the role of marginalized/oppressed status using self-report measures with larger, more diverse samples to better understand these potential relationships.

Although it was expected that students further along in their training would report higher levels of perceived social justice engagement (Kerpelman, 1969), due to more exposure to social justice issues, findings suggest that no such relationship exists for school psychology students in the current study. This could be due to the way in which level of training was operationalized. For example, 2nd and 3rd year students were identified as “intermediate,” while students in their 4th year or higher were identified as “advanced.” The manner in which students move through different training tracks in school psychology complicates how to effectively measure “level of training” based on a single criterion. For example, EdS and PhD students typically follow the same sequence
of courses for the first two years, followed by internship during the third year for Eds students. However, PhD students typically do not complete internship until their 5th year. It could be argued that 3rd year EdS students have had more training based upon their internship experience; however, using a years-in-program approach, PhD students will always be identified as more advanced after having completed three years in a given program.

Another potential reason that no such relationship existed in the present study could be that more advanced students (i.e., 3rd, 4th or 5th year) did not receive additional training as they progressed in their programs to continue to prepare them as social justice advocates, resulting in negligible differences among the three groups. For example, perhaps social justice is covered exclusively during the first two years of the program when the curriculum is the same for all students regardless of degree track. If so, perhaps graduate training programs in school psychology need to consider ways to incorporate more advanced approaches to training in this area with the goal of building upon foundational knowledge and connecting research activities (for PhD students) to social justice issues.

The hypothesis for research question three suggested that school psychology trainees who were affiliated with programs with a social justice and/or multicultural training (SJ/MC) focus would have higher self-reported scores of social justice training environment than trainees in the comparison group. The results of the study supported this hypothesis indicating that trainees in SJ/MC-focused programs reported having more time, support and opportunities related to social justice at the program level than students from the comparison group. The finding also lends some initial support to the importance
of examining program training focus in relation to social justice. Future researchers that wish to examine social justice integration/commitment at the program level may benefit from the current conceptualization of program training focus as a starting point.

Relatedly, clearly identifying programs that have an articulated training focus related to social justice would be beneficial for students looking to attend a program with such a training emphasis and the findings from the current study could serve as an impetus for progress in that direction.

However, it is important to note that the process by which programs were identified as having a social justice/multicultural-focus or as part of the comparison group was characterized by an artificial dichotomy that may not exist in the real world. For example, programs in the comparison group were selected after a review of their program website confirmed the absence of an explicit, stated training focus on social justice and/or multiculturalism. However, as NASP-approved programs, it is very likely that all of these programs offer instruction on multiculturalism and perhaps social justice, to a lesser degree, given the NASP Training Standards’ emphasis on diversity and social justice. Future researchers should explore the development of a more nuanced measure of social justice integration/commitment at the program level to be used with school psychology graduate training programs.

**Predictors of Social Justice Self-Efficacy and Social Justice Commitment**

Results were not completely as expected in terms of the independent variables’ ability to predict social justice self-efficacy. Open-mindedness played the most significant role in predicting school psychology trainees’ social justice self-efficacy
lending initial support for the relationship between aspects of multicultural personality and social justice beliefs among school psychology students. Houtz and colleagues (2010) define open-mindedness as “an open and unprejudiced attitude toward culturally diverse individuals and their value systems (p. 929).” In describing an evolving theory of multicultural personality, Ponterotto posits that narrow personality traits such as open-mindedness are superior predictors of intercultural attitudes and behaviors compared to broad traits (e.g., Big Five), which present findings appear to support. The next best predictor of social justice self-efficacy was personal moral imperative. Others have found a relationship between humanitarian and moral beliefs and social justice engagement among graduate counseling psychology and college students (Kiselica & Robinson, 2001; Stiff, Dillard, Somera, Kim & Sleight, 1988); however, this finding provides some evidence specific to the field of school psychology.

Social justice training environment was also expected to hold significant predictive abilities for social justice self-efficacy given Miller and Sendrowitz’s (2011) research indicating that social justice training environment impacted social justice commitment indirectly by bolstering social justice self-efficacy beliefs (e.g., providing opportunities for social justice advocacy performance accomplishments and vicarious learning experiences). However, this was not the case in the present study. One potential hypothesis for this finding is that current social justice training approaches in the field of school psychology are focused on increasing trainees’ awareness and knowledge, but have not yet adequately addressed the skills domain, which could directly bolster one’s self-efficacy related to social justice engagement. In describing the multicultural tripartite model’s utility related to social justice, Arredondo and Rosen (2007) argue that since
social justice is action-oriented we are most likely to see overlap in the skills domain. For example, increasing trainees’ advocacy skills including knowledge of how and when to take professional risks would presumably lead to increased confidence in one’s perceived ability to confront injustice and challenge racial and religious intolerance.

Based on the results from the 16 training directors in the present study, some of the most common ways in which social justice training was delivered to trainees included infusing social justice content throughout the program and exposing trainees to social justice issues during field-based experiences and university-community partnerships, all of which present opportunities to extend knowledge outside of the classroom and focus on skill development related to social justice advocacy.

The final parsimonious social justice commitment model was perhaps the most significant finding in this study given previous research (see Lent et al., 2003) that highlights the importance of commitment in compelling goal-directed behavior. In terms of independent variables, personal moral imperative was the best predictor of social justice commitment, followed by open-mindedness, flexibility and social justice training environment, respectively. Consistent with prior theory and research (Gainor, 2005; Kiselica & Robinson, 2001), personal moral imperative for social justice was associated with increased social justice commitment. Findings from the present study also support previous research and theory that has identified the important role of the program training environment in school psychology (Briggs et al., 2009; Miranda et al., 2014; Moy et al., 2014) and counseling psychology trainees’ social justice development (Palmer & Parish, 2008; Singh et al., 2010). Results for the social justice commitment model were as
expected in terms of all independent variables contributing to the predictive ability of the model.

**Implications for Training Programs and School Psychologists**

Overall, present findings highlight the potential utility of models of school psychology trainees’ social justice self-efficacy and commitment. To the researcher’s knowledge, findings from the present study contribute the first models of social justice self-efficacy and social justice commitment for school psychology trainees and offer empirical evidence of previously unexamined relationships between individual trainee and program characteristics and domains of social justice. This information may provide valuable insight to the field of school psychology that serves to inform recruitment and training practices related to social justice and multiculturalism with the ultimate goal of preparing school psychologists to serve as advocates for marginalized youth in schools. For example, school psychology training programs may consider having prospective students complete the brief personal moral imperative inventory in the hopes of recruiting students predisposed to social justice advocacy given the importance of personal moral imperative to social justice self-efficacy and commitment. Similarly, important domains of multicultural personality (i.e., open-mindedness and flexibility) could be assessed to not only guide programs in recruiting students who are more likely to be social justice-orientated but to also assess the training needs of their current students. For example, programs may consider assessing a student’s level and type of multicultural personality and social justice-related self-efficacy (e.g., working with specific populations, settings,
etc.) as a strategic way to tailor appropriate training experiences based on the needs of the individual.

The results of the present study also provide information about the training of school psychologists. For example, evidence of important differences among doctoral and non-doctoral students’ perceived social justice self-efficacy was found. This finding suggests that practice-orientated students may feel more confident due perhaps to increased exposure to social justice issues in practice settings (i.e., internship) or based upon their developmental stage relative to social justice. This area warrants further study given the important implications it could have for more tailored training approaches.

Findings from the present study also underscore the importance of program training environment in the development of school psychology trainees’ social justice commitment. Given the important relationship between training environment and trainees’ social justice commitment, it seems prudent that programs ensure that adequate resources, time and opportunities are dedicated to the social justice training that school psychology trainees receive. Examples offered within the school and counseling psychology literature include formally integrated social justice-specific coursework, field-based experiences with diverse/under-served populations, supervised counseling experiences, outreach, and/or social justice-focused research experiences as a way to augment existing training approaches. For example, based on present findings, prior research (Briggs et al., 2009; Miranda et al., 2014; Moy et al., 2014), and recommendations of others (e.g., Miller et al., 2011; Shriberg, 2009), it is recommended that programs offer structured, social justice learning experiences that are hands-on (e.g., service learning, supervised field-based experiences, etc.) within school psychology.
training programs to facilitate trainees’ interest in and commitment to social justice. Relatedly, researchers and program directors alike should seek to evaluate the impact of program training environment on students’ social justice development over time by using validated measures, such as those used in the current study, and repeated measures designs to add to the limited extant literature base and inform future training practices.

**Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

Findings from the present study should be considered in light of a number of methodological limitations. First, the researcher acknowledges that the use of a non-random, selective sample that was composed of mostly female, White/Caucasian, heterosexual participants enrolled in school psychology programs may limit the generalizability of the results. Although this sample appears to be reflective of the field of school psychology, generally, in addition to school psychology graduate students, specifically, it has been argued that current national figures may underestimate the number of culturally and linguistically diverse school psychologists (Graves et al., 2014; Lewis et al., 2008). Therefore, this study warrants replication using a larger, random sample of school psychology trainees to increase power and generalizability of the results across diverse student populations.

Second, there may have been a self-selection bias in the school psychology trainees who chose to participate in the study. Those who responded to the research request may have been interested in social justice issues in school psychology. This pattern was observed in the first wave of data collection, as almost all of the program directors who responded to the original research request were those from programs who
were identified as having a social justice and/or multicultural training focus. Similarly, although a much smaller number of students from the comparison group chose to participate, their social justice self-efficacy and commitment mean scores were commensurate to those of students affiliated with a SJ/MC-focused training program. As such, the graduate students who chose to respond to the research request may have higher levels of social justice self-efficacy and social justice commitment than the overall school psychology trainee population.

Third, was the exclusion of potentially important variables such as personality dispositions and experience with discrimination/oppression. For example, it is possible, that degree of experienced oppression and certain personality types (e.g., social; Holland, 1997) might differentially relate to social justice beliefs and behaviors. Future research should examine aspects of personality and oppression and their relationship to social justice outcomes.

The use of cross-sectional data also represents a study limitation in that it did not allow the researcher to examine the impact of variables on the development of social justice self-efficacy and commitment over time. Future research might use longitudinal designs to examine the degree to which these variables change over time as a result of social justice exposure in training and if they predict actual social justice advocacy behavior.

Finally, social justice self-efficacy and commitment, personal moral imperative, multicultural personality and social justice training environment were measured using self-report measures and, as such, relied on the individual’s perceptions in each area that may or may not be reflective of their actual beliefs and behaviors. The researcher could
not control the way participants responded to this questionnaire. Nor was it not possible for the researcher to control for social desirability bias, which could constitute a legitimate threat given the topic under study. Future research should continue to explore using different means of collecting data related to social justice beliefs/behavior while attempting to better control for response and socially desirability biases.

Although this study provided novel information about several individual trainee and program training characteristics that predict the social justice self-efficacy and commitment of school psychology students, additional information is needed about other potentially important variables that predict the social justice beliefs and behaviors in pre-service and practicing school psychologists. Future researchers might consider using the measures used in the present study along with other behavioral measures such as the Behavioral Intention to Advocate for LGBT Youth (BIALY; McCabe, Rubinson, Dragowksi, & Elizalde-Utnick, 2013) to assess social justice beliefs and behaviors over time and examine the relationship between social justice attitudes and actual advocacy behaviors in pre-service and practicing school psychologists.

Taken as a whole, this explanatory study has contributed to the social justice literature base in school psychology by examining theoretically based domains of social justice among a cross-sectional, national sample of school psychology students. First, empirical support for relationships between social justice self-efficacy and commitment and trainees’ moral beliefs, multicultural personality and program training environment was found lending evidence to previously untested hypotheses. Second, findings highlighted important differences between doctoral and non-doctoral students in terms of their social justice self-efficacy, which future studies could investigate. Third, a positive
correlation between affiliation with an SJ/MC-focused program and social justice training environment suggests that training programs with an explicit SJ/MC training focus are perceived as more supportive related to social justice by their students. These findings provide fundamental insights into the social justice beliefs of school psychology trainees and have important implications for training and practice with the ultimate goal of preparing school psychologists to serve as advocates for marginalized youth in schools. However, future research is needed to assess the relationships between individual trainee and program training characteristics and actual engagement in social justice activities in schools. Lastly, to address the dearth of instruments designed to measure social justice and related constructs, several theory-based, empirically tested measures and a researcher-developed measure of social justice training environment were utilized to provide initial data from a school psychology sample. Future researchers may wish to study social justice beliefs and behaviors longitudinally, design replication studies with more diverse samples, and examine the psychometric properties of these measures with both pre-service and practicing school psychologists.
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Appendix A

Invitation Letter for Program Directors

Dear School Psychology Program Director,

My name is Jennifer Cooper and I am a graduate student in the School Psychology program at The Ohio State University. As a part of my dissertation, we are conducting a study about the relationship between training, personality and demographic variables and school psychology graduate students’ social justice self-efficacy and commitment. We are asking training program directors to complete a brief survey about the demographics of their training programs and the type of social justice training provided by their programs. We estimate that completing this survey will take no more than 5-10 minutes. In addition to this survey, we also ask that you forward the students/interns/recent graduates in your program an electronic letter and/or flyer inviting them to participate in this survey.

We will be collecting the names of each individual training program that completes the training survey in order to match students with their respective programs and their social justice training. However, neither you nor your program will be identified in any publication or presentation of the findings of this study.

You are free to withdraw your consent to participate and may discontinue your participation in the study at any time without penalty.

Dr. Kisha Radliff is the primary contact person for this study; please contact her if you have any questions about the survey by phone at the Ohio State University (614-292-6485) or by email at radliff.2@osu.edu

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

Thank you very much for your consideration of this research study.

Respectfully,
Kisha Radliff, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
School Psychology, The Ohio State University

Jennifer Cooper, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate/Graduate Researcher
School Psychology, The Ohio State University
Dear School Psychology Student/Intern/Recent Graduate,

My name is Jennifer Cooper and I am a graduate student in the School Psychology program at The Ohio State University.

I invite you to participate in a research study I am conducting as part of my graduate studies. **The purpose of this research study is to understand the factors that relate to the self-perceived social justice self-efficacy and commitment of school psychology graduate students.**

If you agree to participate, I would like you to complete an online survey. The survey asks for your beliefs regarding social justice, related constructs, and training and demographic information. **The survey will take approximately 10 -15 minutes to complete.** Participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time without penalty. You do not need to answer any questions you do not wish to answer.

In an effort to protect your privacy, I will use a secure web site to collect the study information and password protected computers to store the study information. I will not collect your name or any identifying information about you in the survey. I hope you will agree to complete the survey, which can be accessed by clicking on the link embedded on this flyer. **By clicking on the survey link below, you are giving informed consent for participation in the research study.**

At the end of the survey, all participants will have the opportunity to participate in a drawing to win both a $50 Amazon gift card and free copy of *School Psychology and Social Justice: Conceptual Foundations and Tools for Practice.* If you wish to enter the drawing, you will be asked to provide your name and contact information by clicking on a secure link at the end of the survey. This data will be stored separately from the survey data and will not be used for any other purpose than to select a drawing winner. If you do not wish to participate in this study, do not click on the link provided.

Dr. Kisha Radliff is the primary contact person for this study; please contact her if you have any questions about the survey by phone at the Ohio State University (614-292-6485) or by email at radliff.2@osu.edu
For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

Thank you very much for your consideration of this research study. If you agree to participate in this study, please click on the link below or place the web address in your Internet browser:

https://eheosu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_8hLNvwbod8YPpoF

Respectfully,
Kisha Radliff, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
School Psychology, The Ohio State University

Jennifer Cooper, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate/Graduate Researcher
School Psychology, The Ohio State University
Appendix C

Program Director Questionnaire

Dear School Psychology Program Director:

Thank you for your participation in our study. This survey will take approximately 5-10 minutes to complete. Please use the following definition of the term *social justice* as a guide in completing the survey.

*Social justice within school psychology focuses on the importance of ensuring the protection of educational rights and opportunities for all students, promoting nondiscriminatory practice, and understanding the saliency of institutional power (the exertion of control on individuals or groups by society’s primary institutions, [i.e., schools, local education agencies, and government]) in social justice issues* (Shriberg et al., 2008, 2011).

1. Name of school psychology program:

2. How many students are in enrolled in the school psychology program?

3. How many culturally/linguistically diverse students are enrolled in the school psychology program?

4. How many full-time faculty members does your program have?

5. How many of the full-time faculty members identify as culturally/linguistically diverse?
6. How many full-time faculty members have teaching/research interests related to social justice?

7. How many full-time faculty members have published and/or presented on social justice?

8. In what geographic region is the school psychology program located?
   - New England (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont)
   - Mid-Atlantic (New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania) East North Central (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin)
   - West North Central (Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota)
   - South Atlantic (Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Washington D.C., and West Virginia)
   - East South Central (Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee)
   - West South Central (Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas)
   - Mountain (Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming)
   - Pacific (Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington)

9. In what geographic setting is the school psychology program located?
   - Urban
   - Suburban
   - Rural

10. Please indicate the training model of the school psychology program.
    - Clinical science
    - Practitioner
    - Practitioner-scholar
    - Pragmatic
    - Scientist-practitioner
    - Other
11. Does your school psychology program have any of the following training foci (check all that apply)?

- Social justice
- Multiculturalism/diversity
- Urban populations
- Rural populations
- Specific group (i.e., ELLs, LGBTQ, etc.)
- Other

12. What degrees are offered by the school psychology program (check all that apply)?

- MA
- MS
- EdS
- PhD
- PsyD
- EdD
- Other

13. Does the school psychology program offer a course focused on social justice?

- Yes - Required
- Yes - Optional
- No

14. Please select the statement(s) that best describe the social justice training provided by your school psychology program (check all that apply). You may add additional details, if desired.

- Training in social justice is not provided by our program
- Social justice content is infused throughout our curriculum
- Specific social justice coursework is offered (either through school psychology program or outside departments)
- Exposure to social justice issues during field-based experiences
- Exposure to social justice issues through university-community partnerships
- Other