2004

Relationships among queer theory pedagogy, sexual orientation competency, and multicultural environment in counselor education training programs

Dennis Allen Frank
*William & Mary - School of Education*

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd

Part of the [Psychiatric and Mental Health Commons](https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd) and the [Student Counseling and Personnel Services Commons](https://scholarworks.wm.edu/etd)

Recommended Citation


This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, & Master Projects at W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations, Theses, and Masters Projects by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.
RELATIONSHIPS AMONG QUEER THEORY PEDAGOGY, SEXUAL ORIENTATION COMPETENCY, AND MULTICULTURAL ENVIRONMENT IN COUNSELOR EDUCATION TRAINING PROGRAMS

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the School of Education

The College of William and Mary in Virginia

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Dennis Allen Frank, II

July 2004
Thank you to all of the courageous gay men, lesbians, bisexual men and women, transgendered people, and all the other queers that have paved the path that allowed me to conduct this research.

And Reason, that old man, said to her, "Silence! What do you hear?"

And she listened intently, and she said, "I hear a sound of feet, a thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands, and they beat this way!"

He said, "They are the feet of those that shall follow you. Lead on! make a track to the water's edge! Where you stand now, the ground will be beaten flat by ten thousand times ten thousand feet." And he said, "Have you seen the locusts how they cross a stream? First one comes down to the water-edge, and it is swept away, and then another comes and then another, and then another, and at last with their bodies piled up a bridge is built and the rest pass over."

She said, "And, of those that come first, some are swept away, and are heard of no more; their bodies do not even build the bridge?"

"And are swept away, and are heard of no more--and what of that?" he said.

"And what of that--" she said.

"They make a track to the water's edge."

"They make a track to the water's edge--." And she said, "Over that bridge which shall be built with our bodies, who will pass?"

He said, "The entire human race."

And the woman grasped her staff.

And I saw her turn down that dark path to the river.*

---

* Olive Schreiner, Dreams (1910) Boston: Little
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ABSTRACT

The field of multicultural counseling is in the midst of a debate as to the scope of the definition of “multiculturalism”. The two sides are debating whether or not sexual orientation should be included as part of this definition. The consequence of this debate is that many graduate level counselors are graduating without having sufficient levels of self-awareness and knowledge regarding gay men and lesbians and that the majority of counseling trainees and professionals have received little or no training about gay and lesbian issues. Sexual minority individuals seek out counseling services two to four times more often than heterosexual individuals do. However, approximately 50% of gay men and lesbians report dissatisfaction with the services they received due to the counselor’s professional conduct.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of Counselor Education faculty members concerning the multicultural environment in the program in which they teach. The study examined attitudes, knowledge, and skills toward gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals, and to what degree queer theory influences their pedagogical approach to counselor education. The study also investigated what, if any, relationship existed between these factors. The theoretical framework for this research was queer theory. For data collection, three self-report research instruments were used: the Multicultural Environmental Inventory – Revised (MEI-R), the Sexual Orientation
Counselor Scale (SOCS), and a researcher developed Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale, which was attached to the researcher designed demographic form.

All the data was analyzed using SPSS 12.0 with alpha levels set at .05. The data was analyzed using Pearson’s Correlations and Stepwise Regression Analysis. It was concluded that the positive relationship did exist between the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale and the MEI-R and SOCS respectively. There was also a significant relationship found between the MEI-R and the SOCS. Further research is needed to better understand how these variables relate to one another so that counselor education training programs may be improved to better address the needs of sexual minority individuals and the other diverse clients in society today.

DENNIS ALLEN FRANK, II
DEPARTMENT OF COUNSELOR EDUCATION
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY IN VIRGINIA
CHAPTER 1

Overview

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of Counselor Education faculty members concerning the multicultural environment in the program in which they teach. The study examined attitudes, knowledge, and skills toward gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals, and to what degree queer theory influences their pedagogical approach to counselor education. The study also investigated what, if any, relationship existed between these factors. This chapter will give a brief overview of the history of sexual orientation and the counseling profession, a brief review of the current need for counselor educators to be inclusive of diversity issues in counselor preparation courses and pedagogy, and a summary of Queer Theory and how this may be conceptualized in counselor education. A description of the research hypotheses and questions, definition of terms, and a discussion of the sample, research methods, and limitations to the proposed study are included in this chapter as well.

Introduction

The governing board of the American Counseling Association (ACA), a professional counseling organization dedicated to the enhancement of human development throughout the life span, addressed the issue of sexual orientation in March 1998 by approving a motion that states “the association opposes portrayals of lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth and adults as mentally ill due to their sexual orientation; and supports the dissemination of accurate information about sexual orientation, mental health, and appropriate interventions in order to counteract bias
that is based in ignorance or unfounded beliefs about same-gender orientation” (ACA, 2003).

ACA’s code of ethics specifically states that counselors do not discriminate “based on age, color, culture, disability, ethnic group, gender, race, religion, sexual orientation, marital status, or socioeconomic status” (ACA, 1995, p. 2). Sexual orientation is also implicitly included in the ethical standards, which say that counselors must be respectful of differences while being aware of and avoid imposing their personal values (A.5.b); must practice only with in their competencies while continuing to “gain knowledge, expand personal awareness, sensitivity and skills pertinent to working with a diverse population” (C.2.a); recognize the impact of the client’s culture (E.5.b); and must be “sensitive to diversity and research issues with special populations” (G.1.f). The ACA also ethically charges its counselor educators to “make an effort to infuse material related to human diversity into all courses and/or workshops” (F.1.a); and that they be “responsive to their institution’s and program’s recruitment and retention needs for training program administrators, faculty, and students with diverse backgrounds and special needs” (F.2.i).

The Council for Accreditation for Counseling and Related Educational Programs’ (CACREP) 2001 standards provide the minimal criterion for the preparation of professional counselors, counselor educators, and student affairs professionals. CACREP provides accreditation for nine types of counseling programs - career; college; community; gerontological; marital, couple, and family; mental health; school; student affairs; and counselor education. Each program that has CACREP accreditation is required in its Foundations of Counseling course to provide every
student with curricular experiences that allows for demonstrated knowledge and skills related to “the role of “racial, ethnic, and cultural heritage, nationality, socioeconomic status, family structure, age, gender, sexual orientation, religious and spiritual beliefs, occupation, and physical and mental status, and equity issues in … counseling” (CACREP, 2001).

Statement of the Problem

Research has consistently demonstrated that counseling programs do not effectively train counselors to appropriately work with issues relevant to working with gay men, and lesbians. Bieschke, Eberz, Bard, & Crouteau’s (1998) research noted that “graduate counselor trainees lack sufficient levels of self-awareness and knowledge regarding … gays and lesbians” (p. 735) and that “the majority of counseling trainees and professionals have received little or no training about gay and lesbian issues” (p. 736). Flores, O’Brien, & McDermott (1995) found that although a considerable amount of research has focused on preparing counselors for “effective counseling with members of racial and ethnic groups…educational training programs have failed to train students in the area of gay and lesbian issues, and that graduates in counseling programs reported feeling incompetent to work with this population” (p. 4).

For more than twenty-five years researchers and authors have reported that graduate level counselors acknowledge being inadequately prepared to work with gay and lesbian clients. In 1977 Thomas & Fishburn found that 86% of masters’ and doctoral level mental health professionals reported that they had not received adequate training to be effective with lesbian and gay clients (as quoted in Glenn & Russell, p.
Two decades later, Phillips & Fischer's (1998) research on graduate students' training in gay issues was similar to Thomas & Fishburn. Their results indicated that training in gay and lesbian issues is still inadequate and that the vast majority of the respondents reported that they did not believe they had been adequately prepared by their graduate coursework to work with homo-oriented clients when compared to the preparation provided to work with hetero-oriented clients (p. 725).

The literature on the attitudes of mental health professionals toward homosexuality and the factors that influence these postures is extensive, yet relatively little attention has been paid to characteristics that perpetuate and maintain these positions. While counselor training programs are increasingly attending to the needs of diverse clients, recognition of the issues that impact gay, lesbian, and bisexual clients is frequently omitted or ignored for many reasons (Eliason, 2000). Some possible explanations for this exclusion are that the educators may have limited knowledge of these issues themselves, they may be reluctant to present potentially controversial information, they may not view gay and lesbian individuals to be members of a cultural (or nonethnic) minority group, or they may be uncomfortable dealing with issues of sexuality (Bieschke & Matthews, 1996; Eliason, 2000).

Another rationale that may influence counselor educators to include or exclude discussions related to sexual orientation is the organizational climate of the institution in which they work (Bieschke & Matthews, 1996; Eldridge & Barnett, 1991). Pilkington and Cantor (1996) postulated that the climate within graduate mental health training programs perpetuates and contributes to this problem. The manner in which the program treats sexual orientation in the choice of textbooks, course coverage,
clinical and research supervision, instructor comments, and the interaction between faculty and administration all have an effect on the manner and degree to which gay and lesbian topics are handled.

Buhrke & Dolce (1991) have proposed several strategies to reduce the heterosexism that is found with mental health training programs. They begin by suggesting that programs work toward creating environments that are supportive and safe for lesbian and gay students, faculty, staff, clients, and allies. This entails several factors including but not limited to: (1) identifying and evaluating personal beliefs and feelings of discomfort; (2) encouraging colleagues to do the same; (3) challenging antigay and antilesbian rhetoric or humor; (4) promoting and participating in diversity task forces to implement policies to ensure that course content and training are culturally sensitive and representative; (5) seeking external consultation to assist in heterosexism reduction efforts; (6) encouraging students and faculty to read gay and lesbian scholarship and research articles; (7) assisting faculty and students to eliminate heterosexist language in verbal and written communication; (8) organizing seminars, workshops, and guest lectures on sexual orientation research and clinical work; and (9) recognizing power differentials between faculty and students, and proposing procedures to hear concerns of bias and discrimination within the department.

Current Pedagogical Approach

Education in general is typically grounded in Western, patriarchal, able-bodied, middle-class, heterosexist assumptions. The experiences of women, people of color, people with disabilities, gay men, lesbians, and bisexual individuals have been traditionally ignored or discounted, which effectively constructs them as the ‘Other’
According to Das (1995) the vast majority of counselor education programs include coursework in multicultural counseling, however, the "depth of the training provided is not deemed sufficient to meet the growing mental health needs of a culturally diverse population" (p. 74). This thought is mirrored by Sue & Sue (1999), who report that although multicultural training is increasing, "most graduate programs continue to give [it] inadequate treatment" (p. 12). This is because when issues relevant to counseling minority groups are presented in class they are usually from the "White Euro-American, middle-class perspective" (p. 12).

Professional counseling is basically a product of European-American culture and most counselor education programs do not integrate multicultural counseling into the overall curriculum (Das, 1995). Rather the "most common approach is the addition of a single course (frequently titled Cross-Cultural counseling or Multicultural counseling) to the existing curriculum while leaving all other courses untouched" (Das, 1995, p. 74). By relegating the concepts of multicultural counseling to one course not only is the true importance of multicultural issues negated, but the images and stereotypes of the larger society are propagated (Sue & Sue, 1999).

Another shortcoming of the single-course approach is that it tends to marginalize multicultural concerns. It neglects to recognize that minority subcultures exist within the dominate culture and that membership in these subcultures is often experienced as oppressive by the minority groups (Das, 1995). This approach also fails to take into account the counselor’s cultural upbringing and how this shapes his or her outlook on working with clients from different cultural backgrounds. Without fostering an environment that allows for the exploration of both the counselor’s and
the client's cultural background a disservice may be done to the client because traditional counseling approaches tend to focus on the value system of the dominate culture (Hayes, n.d.). Additionally, because the counseling session is typically a meeting of different and often opposing worldviews, there are serious ethical implications that mandate the counselor fully understands the client's worldview in order to ensure the most effective and therapeutic relationship (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992).

**Challenges for Counselor Educators**

Providing affirmative education about sexual minorities often presents a challenge to counselor educators, specifically those who hold traditional, conservative values, or have had little exposure to gay men and lesbians. Even those who intellectually accept homosexuality may emotionally reject same-sex relationships or individuals who do not conform to established gender norms (Corey, Corey, & Callahan, 1998). Unless counselor educators become aware of their faulty assumptions and homophobia, they may project their misconceptions and fears onto their students. Educators must confront their personal prejudice, myths, fears, and stereotypes regarding sexual orientation as part of the process of expanding their self-awareness about gay people in general and about the meaning of gay identity to particular individuals (Sobocinski, 1990). They also need to find ways to continue to educate themselves about affirmative counseling models (Shannon & Woods, 1991).
Theoretical Rationale

*Queer Theory*

"Theories are models or paradigms constructed to describe, explain, and predict a particular phenomenon" (Aradi & Kaslow, 1987, p. 595). Theories that attempt to homogenize, normalize, categorize, and hierarchize are pervasive across the social sciences, however, queer theories work to challenge and undercut all attempts at portraying identity as singular, fixed or normal. "There is no queer theory in the singular, it is a body of abstract theories made up of many different voices which may at times overlap and at others may seem contradictory" (Hall, 2003 p. 5). From a global perspective, queer theory is an attempt to move away from psychological explanations like homophobia, which individualizes heterosexual fear of and loathing toward gay men and lesbians at the expense of examining how heterosexuality becomes normalized as the natural.

"Queer theory does in fact indicate the emergence of new forms of thought, or at least new ways of working with existing categories and concepts…and consists primarily of elaborating the problems with existing intellectual and political modes, especially by studying how these modes function" (Turner, 2000, p. 9-10). Queer theorists attempt to disrupt and to assert voice and power by breaking down what is considered to be traditional ideas of what is normal and what is deviant. Queer theory transforms actions into analytical operations, by utilizing tactics that may be viewed as confrontational to conceptualize new ways of knowing and understanding what it means to be ‘normal’ and/or ‘other’. It involves a “rethinking of the concepts of meaning, truth, subjectivity, freedom, power and so on” (Sullivan, 2004, p. 39).
“Queer theory, then, is about questioning what (and why) we know and do not know about things both normal and queer” (Tierney & Dilley, 1998, p. 60).

Queer theory seeks to break the disciplinary boundaries, rather than work from within them. Queer theorists argue that proponents of normalcy and deviance have accepted this sexual binarism – heterosexual/homosexual – that privileges some and silences others. Rather than highlighting specific institutional practices, such as faculty appointments, queer theorists focus on the fundamental discursive structures that need to be disrupted, structures that make oppressive institutional practices possible. If presently institutional and programmatic structures of knowledge have functioned to define normalized relations that excluded or diminished homosexuality, then these structures must be destroyed (Tierney & Dilley, 1998).

For queer theorists, language is an essential component for the production of identity and the relative value that culture has assigned to the different identity categories (Turner, 2000). Queer theorists investigate the historical and cultural underpinnings of these categories and examine the meanings attached to pairs of categories: man/woman, heterosexual/homosexual, young/old, white/black, rich/poor, etc. Rather than accepting this as a simple reflection of societal distinctions, queer theorists argue that people do not fit neatly into these binary categories. Queer theorists also maintain that existing identity categories are exclusionary and have been developed in relation to the dominant group norms (Tierney, 1997).

Summary

Queer theorization requires a broad acknowledgement of the need for continued discussion, for diversity in perspective and articulation, and for challenging
disruptive speech even if this challenge disrupts queer arguments themselves. The term queer incorporates and promotes a multiplicity of styles, forms, perspectives and insights, of which none can be claimed to be true, real, or definitive (Hall, 2003). Queer theory does attempt to expose social norms as the product of power relations that often oppress those that do not conform.

Queer Theory and Multicultural Education

Pinar (1998) made a case that the current methods and content of multicultural education are based on an assimilation model. This approach is based on the principle that homophobia is the result on misrepresentation and under representation of sexual minorities and that this can be corrected through the inclusion of positive images and truthful depictions gay and lesbian individuals. However, he argued that the core logic of binary categories (homosexual – heterosexual, male – female, etc.) determines how we organize identity in our society. Carlson (1998) contended that the multicultural education must transcend this perspective and combat the belief that individuals can be divided into orderly, cohesive categories. Rather than confirming identity categories as desirable, they need to be viewed as a way of restricting the potential of the self (Carroll & Gilroy, 2001).

Queer Theory and Pedagogy

Pedagogy has often been understood as referring to teaching and instruction methods, or specifically the how-to of teaching. However, rather than focusing on the common concerns of teaching, such as what should be learned and how to teach this knowledge, queer theory begins with the question of how this knowledge came to be
known and produced (Luhmann, 1998). This orientation to pedagogy exceeds education's traditional fixation on the transmission of knowledge and its belief in the teacher as the master of knowledge (Felman, 1987).

Queer theorists concerned with pedagogy are interested in interrupting heteronormative language, thinking, and teaching (Warner, 1993). While in part this concern stems from the desire to eliminate the detrimental homophobia and heterosexism that permeates all social systems, it is also spurred to "broaden perception, complexify cognition, and to amplify the imagination" (Sumara & Davis, 1999, p. 202) of not only the learners but of the teachers as well. Going further, Sumara & Davis (1999) continue by asserting that the point is not to promote queer theory as a theory about queers, but rather the point is to show how all educators ought to become interested in the complex relationships in which sexualities are organized and identified and how this influences the manner that knowledge is produced and represented.

Conceptualizing Queer Theory in Counselor Education

In order to begin to help counseling trainees to explore their attitudes about sexuality and gender it becomes necessary for the educators and supervisors to begin to rethink the traditional definitions of identity, psychopathology, gender, and sexuality (Carroll & Gilroy, 2001). Martin (1998) disagrees with the current narrow practice of including diversity into a single course dealing with multicultural content. He believed that the narrowness in many counselor training programs is reflective of the "belief that recent, purported advances in psychological science make counseling more akin to a technical professional practice than to an area for liberal, humanistic
reflection and interaction” (Martin, 1998, p. 7). By opening counseling classes and programs up to diverse disciplines such as philosophy, psychology, English, and sexuality studies counselors become scholar-practitioners who are comfortable thinking outside the box (Carroll & Gilroy, 2001).

Review of the relevant literature highlighted two factors that may perpetuate the exclusion of frank discussions about sexual orientation from counselor education programs. Specifically, these two are: 1) the organizational climate within the graduate mental health training program may not support it (Pilkington & Cantor, 1996); and 2) counselor educators themselves may have a limited knowledge of issues related to sexual orientation (Eliason, 2000). These two factors appear to contribute heavily to whether or not sexual orientation is infused into the overall training component of counselor trainees. This was the foundation of this study and the research questions that will be discussed below. From this base, queer theory was chosen as the theoretical model from which to view the findings. Queer theory offered a platform from which to examine the multicultural environment, sexual orientation competency and how pedagogy and curriculum are used to incorporate or exclude sexual orientation and related issues in counselor education training programs.

Definition of terms

For the purpose of this study, terms were operationally defined as follows:

**Bisexual** – people who relate affectionately and/or sexually to both men and women. Bisexual refers to both an identity and a behavior (Committee on Lesbian and Gay Concerns, 1991).
CACREP – The Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs.

Counselor Educator - a person who has completed a master’s degree (MA or MS), or a doctorate degree (PhD, EdD, or PsyD) in counselor education, counseling, counseling psychology, or related area, and are currently employed by a college or university counselor education preparation program that has been accredited by CACREP.

Culture – the internalized values, beliefs, attitudes, knowledge, and rituals that, among other things, define any group or collective

Gay Man – a man who relates affectionately, erotically, and/or sexually to other men. Gay implies a sense of identity, not just sexual behavior (Committee on Lesbian and Gay Concerns, 1991).

Gender – refers to whether a person is genetically male or female.

Gender identity – refers to the gender that a person self-identifies as, this may be the same or different than their genetic gender.

Heteronormative – The belief that heterosexuality is the elemental form of human association, the model of intergender relations, the indivisible basis of community, and the means of reproduction that society depends on for its existence (Warner, 1993).

Heterosexual and heterosexuality – people who relate affectionately, erotically, and/or sexually to members of the opposite sex and do not have sex with people of the same gender (Committee on Lesbian and Gay Concerns, 1991).
Heterosexism and heterosexual bias – the belief that heterosexuality is better and more natural than homosexuality or bisexuality. All people are susceptible to the effects of heterosexism in society (Hunt, 1992).

Homophobia and homoprejudice – Feelings of fear, disgust, and discomfort that some people report experiencing when dealing with gay men or lesbians (Hudson & Ricketts, 1980). This is often perpetuated by religions, legal systems, and the media.

Homosexual and homosexuality – people who relate affectionately, erotically, and/or sexually to members of the same gender and do not have sex with members of the opposite gender (Committee on Lesbian and Gay Concerns, 1991).

Lesbian – a woman who relates affectionately, erotically, and/or sexually to other women. Lesbian implies a sense of identity, not just sexual behavior (Committee on Lesbian and Gay Concerns, 1991).

Sexism – a belief or practice that the sex or sexual orientation of human beings gives to some the right to certain privileges, powers, or roles, while denying to others their full potential. Sexism is primarily manifested through male supremacy and heterosexual chauvinism (Warner, 1993).

Sexual orientation – is a complex set of behaviors, emotions, fantasies, and attitudes with regard to intimate partners. Sexual orientation is preferable to sexual preference because preference implies a degree of choice that has not been established through research (Committee on Lesbian and Gay Concerns, 1991).

Queer theory – a body of abstract theories that is made up of many different voices that may at times overlap and at others seem contradictory (Hall, 2003).
Sample Description and Data Gathering Procedures

The population of inference is Counselor Education faculty members in CACRP accredited counselor training programs, 180 programs located in forty-five states, the District of Columbia, and British Columbia, Canada will be used. Target populations from organizations that maintain a list of their membership are considered to be closed populations (Schonlau, Fricker, & Elliot, 2001). CACREP maintains a list of the World Wide Web (www) addresses for each counselor education program that has been granted accreditation. By using these Internet addresses it was possible to systemically gather the email addresses for the faculty members who teach in each of these programs by following the link directly to the program’s webpage and then searching for a faculty listing in each program. This process identified 1379 adjunct, assistant, associate, and full faculty members and instructors that have listed email addresses through the educational institution in which they teach.

In order to ensure the highest population validity possible, this survey was conducted as a census, and all identified Counselor Education faculty members were solicited for participation in the research. This was done by sending the identified faculty members an email that contained a brief overview of the purpose of the study and a request to participate in it. Those that chose to participate were directed to a hyperlink listed at the bottom of the email (http://web.wm.edu/education/research/dfrank/). This link took the participants directly to a secure webpage designed specifically for this study. The webpage is located on the College of William & Mary’s School of Education website. The initial webpage that opened by following the hyperlink contained the consent and
confidentiality information. Faculty members had the opportunity to accept or decline consent for participation prior to being directed to the research instruments which included the Multicultural Environmental Inventory-Revised (MEI-R), the Sexual Orientation Counselor Survey (SOCS), and a researcher developed Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale which was attached to the researcher developed demographic survey.

Research Questions

1. Does a counselor education program’s multicultural environment, as measured by the MEI-R, have a relationship to the use of queer theory inspired pedagogy?

2. Does a counselor education faculty member’s knowledge, skills, and awareness of sexual orientation issues, as measured by the SOCS, have a relationship to the use of queer theory inspired pedagogy?

3. Is their a relationship between counselor education faculty member’s score on the SOCS and the score on the MEI-R?

Directional Hypotheses

1. Counselor education faculty members who perceive the environment of their program to be more multiculturally inclusive (as measured by the MEI-R) will be more likely to use queer theory inspired pedagogy (as measured by the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale) than those who perceive the environment to be less inclusive.
2. Counselor education faculty members who have greater knowledge, awareness, and skills related to gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals is greater (as measured by the SOCS) are more likely to use queer theory pedagogical practices (as measured by the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale) than those who have less knowledge, awareness and skills related to gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals.

3. Counselor education faculty member’s scores on a measure of self-perceived sexual orientation competency (the SOCS) will be positively correlated to their scores on a measure of perceived multicultural environment (the MEI-R).

Limitations of Study

In an attempt to control sampling error to the degree possible, this research was conducted as a census of the entire population rather than a survey of a subsample. The intent of conducting a census was to limit threats to generalizability that may be seen when using convenience, random, non-random, systemic, or cluster sampling. However, this is not necessarily to say that this method is without sources of error. Regardless of whether this study is conducted through a census or a survey of a subsample, both rely on individuals volunteering to participate, which limits generalizability because the characteristics of those that volunteer may not be representative of the target population as a whole (Borg, Gall, & Borg, 1996). Another limitation of this survey method is the fluidity of the population. Faculty members retire, leave the profession, or relocate to different programs, and new faculty members are regularly brought into to fill these voids. Unfortunately, web pages may
not be updated regularly enough to capture these changes. Because of this it is conceivable that a portion of the population was unable to be accounted for. It is also not possible to control for all the extraneous variables, so the results may be influenced by factors that are unrelated to those that are being measured.

Emailed and web surveys are subject to many of the same limitations inherent to mailed measures. This may include participants failing to understand the directions, participant’s dishonesty or desire to give socially acceptable answers. Additionally, both the MEI-R and the SOCS are both fairly new measures that have not been widely used aside from initial validation by the authors. Also the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale was constructed by this researcher, so there are no findings concerning the validity of the measure.
CHAPTER 2

Review of the Related Literature

Sexuality Continuum

Defining sexuality is not as clear-cut as it may initially appear. As binary terms, no agreement has ever been reached on what constitutes homosexuality or heterosexuality (Bullogh, 1990). Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin (1948) and Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, and Gebhard (1953) attempted to answer this question in their pioneering research into male and female (respectively) sexual behavior. Through their research, Kinsey et al. (1948, 1953) found that sexual orientation fell into a distribution along a seven-point continuum between absolute heterosexuality (0) and absolute homosexuality (6) rather than falling into a hetero/homo binary (Savage, 2000). It was also determined that rather than being a static placement upon the continuum sexuality, sexual orientation, and sexual behavior were most often fluid and that an individual’s position on the continuum could change at various times throughout his or her lifespan. Therefore, Kinsey et al.’s paradigm of sexuality shows that the classification of “heterosexual” and “homosexual” are inadequate and possibly misleading when trying to define the human sexual experience (McFarland, 1993).

Previous attempts at defining sexuality over the past twenty-five years have focused more on the broader concept of sexual orientation (Savage, 2002). Sexual orientation encompasses an innate set of behaviors, emotions, fantasies, and attitudes that indicate ones predominate, innate inclination for the gender of his or her sexual partner (Hollander, 2000, Hunt, 1992). Sexual orientation, as opposed to sexual preference, is the preferred term when referencing gay men and lesbians. Sexual
preference is a political and moral term that implies a degree of voluntary choice regarding one’s sexuality that has not been verified by psychological research (Committee on Lesbian and Gay Concerns, 1991; Harley, Hall & Savage, 2000).

Homosexuality and heterosexuality refer to categories of sexual orientation. Respectively these refer to an erotic, affectional, and/or sexual attraction toward the same (homosexual) or opposite (heterosexual) gender. The Committee on Lesbian and Gay Concerns (1991) has recommended that the term homosexuality should be avoided when referring to gay men or lesbians because it is associated with a medical model of mental illness and a variety of negative stereotypes. These stereotypes perpetuate heterosexism and homophobia. The terms gay and lesbian are preferred, as they imply a sense of identity not just sexual behavior.

_Gay Men and Lesbians in Society_

While it may be difficult to establish accurate definitions of heterosexual and homosexual it is even more difficult to ascertain the exact number of gay men and lesbians in the United States. Estimates range from 4% to 17%, depending on the sampling methods and sources used, with 10% being the most frequently reported figure (Gonsiork & Weinrich, 1991). This is a very significant minority within American society, particularly when compared with the fact that Hispanics and Latinos make up 12.5%, African Americans and Blacks account for 12.3%, and Asians represent 3.6% of the population in the United States (US Census Bureau, 2000). However, unlike these ethnic and racial minorities, gay men and lesbians do not have physical characteristics that identify them as gay or lesbian. They must identify by self-report, that is gays and lesbians are only considered to be gay or
lesbian if they define themselves as such (Greene, 1994). It is important to note, however, that it is truly irrelevant if gay people account for one percent, ten percent, or even fifty percent of the population. In a democracy, everyone is afforded a place at the table of human rights and social justice, not only those who are statistically significant (Tierney, 1997).

**Heterosexism and Homophobia**

The term homophobia is widely used to describe many varying actions and beliefs ranging from a multitude of anti-homosexual responses to intolerance and hatred of those who are gay or lesbian, however it is actually a misnomer (Logan, 1996). Phobias are considered to be a clinical condition that has well established diagnostic criteria. Simply adding the prefix of homo to the word should not change the meaning, criteria, or its clinical treatment. Behaviors, beliefs, and feelings that have previously all fallen under that umbrella of homophobia are actually more similar to the expression of prejudice, and not fear as the term “phobia” may imply. Prejudice, on the other hand, has been defined as a hostile or an unjustified negative attitude toward an individual or a distinguishable group based solely on generalizations derived from faulty or incomplete information (Aronson, 1980; Worchel, Cooper, & Goethals, 1988). Prejudice also signifies a behavioral aspect such as active discrimination or verbal and/or physical harassment and is maintained by overgeneralizations and stereotypes (Logan, 1996).

Instead of perpetuating the use of an incorrect term, a more accurate descriptive term, homoprejudice, may be appropriate. Haaga (1991) illuminated the difference between homophobia and homoprejudice by comparing the terms on
several levels. First, the emotions associated with a phobia are fear and anxiety; conversely the emotions that correlate with prejudice are hate and anger. Second, people who are phobic recognize their fear as irrational, while those who are prejudice justify their hate and anger. Third those with phobias avoid the dreaded object or situation, but those who are prejudice aggressively engage in discrimination against the hated entity. Fourth, phobic individuals usually do not have a political agenda, though prejudice individuals actively advocate for legislative and judicial changes to criminalize the behavior or freedoms of the identified group. Finally, those suffering from phobias usually are self-motivated to change and therefore seek out professional assistance. However, the motivation to eliminate prejudice comes from those targeted by the oppressors rather than the oppressors themselves.

The continued usage of incorrect terminology is essentially dangerous because language structures thoughts, social reality, and both the purposeful and unintentional articulation that provides the basis of identity and the parameters and limitations of our ability to know and act, it is also the only material that we have to work from to improve the lives of ourselves and others (Hall, 2003; Lyddon, 1995). This is taken a step further by Blumenfield (1992), who states that “[i]n language lies the assumption of a culture, its rules of conduct, what it will acknowledge as permissible...it tells us what to think because it is impossible to think outside of language” (p. 43). Consequently, continuing to use the term homophobia to describe anti-gay behavior may imply permission to continue to oppress gay men and lesbians and to excuse this oppression as an inevitable fear (Logan, 1996).
Heterosexist Bias

"Homophobia, not to mention heterosexism, is especially intense in the field of education; a highly conservative and often reactionary field" (Pinar, 1998, p. 2).

Heterosexism and heterosexual bias refer to the belief that heterosexuality is better and more natural than homosexuality (Committee on Lesbian and Gay Concerns, 1991).

Educational institutions are not exempt from the pervasive heterosexist bias in Western culture; in fact according to queer theorists, these institutions are often the instruments of communicating bias and of lending it legitimacy (Greene, 1994).

Education as an institution reflects the values, beliefs, attitudes, and definitions of knowledge esteemed and propagated by the culture in power in a society (Howard, 1999). Institutions that train mental health professionals are no exception.

Consequently, counselor educators are not immune to the pervasive effects of the heterosexism and homoprejudice found in dominate American culture. Unfortunately, this bias has insidiously pervaded much of the theoretical and research paradigms of the counseling profession. Just as ethnic minorities can be harmed by unexamined racism in education, therapy, or research, sexual minorities can similarly be harmed by unexamined heterosexist bias and prejudice (Greene, 1994).

Societal Acceptance

Whether or not sexual minorities are easily identified, societal acceptance of gay men and lesbians has steadily improved over the past thirty years. A survey conducted by the National Opinion Research Center in 1974 found that 72% of the respondents believed that homosexuality was wrong (Nyberg & Alston, 1976-77, p.
In 2000 the Kaiser Family Foundation conducted a similar survey to gauge the current attitudes towards gay and lesbian individuals, these results were slightly more positive; with only 51% of respondents reporting that homosexuality is wrong (p. 6).

The general public's increased acceptance of gay and lesbian people has been noted by the gay community as well. The Kaiser study found that 76% of gay men and lesbians believe that there is more acceptance of gay people than in the past. Despite this acknowledgment, 80% of gays and lesbians from this study believe that there is "a lot" of discrimination and prejudice against sexual minority individuals. The study found that 82% of gay men, and 79% of lesbian women reported being the target of verbal abuse, while 32% have been the victims of physical violence because someone believed them to be gay (p. 3). The difficulties associated with this are compounded, because unlike ethnic minority groups, gay men and lesbians' identity often develops outside of, and often in opposition to, one's family and community of origin. These individuals do not automatically receive family and community support when they are victimized, nor are they likely to have been taught strategies for coping with this type of discrimination (Herek, Gillis, & Cogan, 1999). In fact, 34% of gays and lesbians have been rejected by one or more family members because of their sexual orientation (Kaiser, 2000, p. 3).

**Hate Crime Victimization**

Approximately one-fifth of lesbians and one-fourth of gay men have been the victim of a bias-related crime since the age of 16 (Herek, *et al.*, 1999). A bias-related crime, also known as a hate crime, is a criminal action intended to harm or intimidate people because of their race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, or ethnicity (FBI,
1999). Hate crime victims have shown significantly more symptoms of depression, anger, anxiety, and post-traumatic stress than victims of non-bias crimes (Herek, et al., 1999). The US Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Statistics compiles data on all incidents of bias crimes. The Bureau reported that between 1997 and 1999 13% of all identified hate crimes were motivated by sexual orientation (Strom, 2001). However, because the majority of states do not acknowledge or report sexual orientation bias crimes and victims of sexual orientation hate crimes are less likely to report the crime to the police, the actual numbers may not be representative of the issue at hand (Berrill, 1992).

Substance Use and Abuse

The stress related to antigay victimization and the “coming out” process (e.g., loss of friends and family, stigmatization, victimization, pervasive anti-gay hostility) can be seen as having both a proximal and distal relationship to the mental and physical well-being of gay men and lesbians. Gay individuals are at significantly higher risk for substance abuse problems than nongays (Cabaj, 1995). Most studies of substance abuse with gay men and lesbians estimate that the incidence of all types of chemical abuse is between 28-35% as opposed to 10-12% for the general population (Cabaj, 1995; Lesbian & Gay Substance Abuse Planning Group [LAGSAP], 1991; Skinner, 1994). Gay individuals have higher lifetime rates of marijuana use (70% vs. 49% hetero-oriented people), cocaine (29% vs. 9%), methamphetamine (30% vs. 7%), and injected drugs (18% vs. 2%). Homo-oriented people are also more likely than their nongay counterparts to consume alcohol every day (10.9% vs. 1.2%) and to smoke cigarettes daily (43.7 vs. 28.6) (Bradford, Ryan, & Rothblum, 1994; Massachusetts
Department of Education, 1999, Skinner, 1994). Clearly illicit and licit drug use among gay men and lesbians is a serious concern that requires attention from affirmative therapists familiar with the gay and lesbian community.

*Suicide*

As noted previously the stress associated with homoprejudice, antigay victimization, and the "coming out" process negatively impacts the mental health of gay men and lesbians. While one of the consequences of this may be an increase in substance use and abuse, what is more worrisome is the relation that it has to the prevalence of suicide ideation, suicide attempts, and to suicide itself. The lifetime prevalence rates of suicide ideation have been reported from 21.3% (Paul, et. al., 2002) to 42% (Hershberger, Pilkington, & D’Augelli, 1997). Additionally, Paul et al. (2002) found that 11.3% of gay men have attempted suicide at least once as compared to 3.6% of nongay men.

The US Department of Health and Human Services published a controversial report in 1989 on the prevalence of suicide among gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth. The Report of the Secretary's Task Force on Youth Suicide announced that suicide is the leading cause of death for gay, lesbian, and bisexual youth under the age of 25, primarily because of the debilitating effects of growing up in a homoprejudice society. The report also stated that gay youth are 2-3 times more likely to kill themselves than heterosexual youth, and in fact constitute 30% of all adolescent suicides (Gibson, 1989). Although the prevalence rates of suicidal ideation and behavior vary greatly from study to study it is clear that there is a much greater risk for homosexuals than there is for heterosexuals.
Satisfaction with the Mental Health Profession

Whether it is for reasons of substance abuse, depression, issues of discrimination, anxiety, suicidal ideation, or any of the other factors that contribute any individual seeking out counseling, between 25% and 65% of gays and lesbians will seek counseling or therapy services at some point in their lives. This is approximately two to four times greater than for their nongay counterparts (Green, 2000; Liddle, 1996; Rudolph, 1988). Regardless of their own sexual orientation, the vast majority of mental health practitioners will work with gay and lesbian clients during their career (Bidell, 2003; Doherty & Simmons, 1996; Garnets, Hancock, Cochran, & Goodchilds, 1991). Despite the high rates of gays and lesbians who seek professional counseling services, approximately 50% report dissatisfaction with the services they received due to the counselor’s professional conduct (Liddle, 1996; Rudolph, 1990). Specifically noted are the negative, prejudicial attitudes toward and lack of understanding of gay and lesbian issues, lifestyles, and resources demonstrated by the counselor (Phillips & Fischer, 1998; Rudolph, 1988). Although the exact number of gay men and lesbians receiving counseling services is unknown, mental health counselors have a responsibility, both ethically and morally, to address gay and lesbian issues affirmatively and to facilitate the elimination of any form of oppression (Sassman, 1996)

Counseling Professionals Attitudes towards Sexual Minority Individuals

People who identify themselves as gay or lesbian use therapy at a higher rate than those that self identify as heterosexual (Bradford, Ryan, & Rothblum, 1994;
Liddle, 1996; Morgan, 1992). However, mental health professionals lack the
knowledge and/or expertise that are necessary to provide appropriate services to their
gay male and lesbian clients (Garnets, et al., 1991; Phillips & Fischer, 1998). The
problem, however, is not that gay men and lesbians are more likely to seek out mental
health services, the problem is that counselor training programs do not effectively train
counselors to appropriately deal with issues relevant to working with gay men, and
lesbians (Bieschke, Eberz, Bard, & Crouteau, 1998; Flores, O’Brien, & McDermott,
1995).

Research has shown that “graduate counselor trainees lack sufficient levels of
self-awareness and knowledge regarding ...gays and lesbians” and that “the majority
of counseling trainees and professionals have received little or no training about gay
and lesbian issues” (Bieschke, Eberz, Bard, & Crouteau, 1998, p. 735-6). Additionally,
it has been found that educational training programs have failed to train students in the
area of gay and lesbian issues, and that graduates in counseling programs reported
feeling incompetent to work sexual minorities (Flores, O’Brien, & McDermott, 1995;

Research on practicing counselors and therapists attitudes and behaviors
toward gay male, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered (GLBT) clients mirrors the
research that has been done with graduate student counselors. Rudolph (1990) found
that 49% of the practicing counselors in his study were negative to the concept of gay
men and lesbians as sexual beings and 30% were against them holding sensitive
professional positions (e.g. teachers, clergy). Eliason (2000) examined the attitudes
and knowledge that substance abuse counselors have regarding gay male, lesbian,
bisexual, and transgendered clients. She found that 44% of the respondents reported ambivalent or negative attitudes toward GLBT clients. Beischke & Matthews (1996) found no evidence that career counselors engage in behaviors that are affirmative to GLBT clients and that 30% of the career counselors in their study reported no awareness having of any GLBT clients. Doherty & Simmons (1996) study on marriage and family therapists found that only slightly more than 50% of their respondents believed that they were competent to counsel gay men or lesbians. These findings, while reflective of only a minority of counselors, may underestimate the bias and prejudice present in counselors and should be viewed in a social context (Palma, 1996). Respondents in studies that use self-report measures to assess sensitive social issues often are naturally inclined to inflate answers in a deliberate attempt to present themselves in a favorable light (Borg, Gall, & Borg, 1996; Schmitt, Oswald, Kim, Gillespie, Ramsay, & Yoo, 2003).

Counselors hold considerable power and influence over their clients, and their attitudes may significantly impact the client’s counseling experience. It is understood that the role of the counselor is to provide an interactive process in which clients may express their unique experiences in an environment of genuineness, empathy, and unconditional positive regard (Corey, 1991). While this is definitely true, it is also essential that counselors “understand aspects of diversity or difference in their clients and to accept each client as a unique human being rather than as stereotypes of some group” (Ellisason, 2000, p. 311).
Counselor Education and Homosexuality

While providing affirmative education to counselor trainees about diverse clients is necessary, recognition of the issues that impact gay, lesbian, and bisexual clients must begin to be incorporated as well (Eliason, 2000). There are some possible explanations for why sexual minorities are missing from counseling curriculum: 1) educators may have limited knowledge of these issues themselves, and they may be reluctant to present potentially controversial information; 2) they may not view gay and lesbian individuals to be members of a cultural (or nonethnic) minority group; and/or 3) they may be uncomfortable dealing with issues of sexuality (Bieschke & Matthews, 1996; Eliason, 2000).

One way to address these possible explanations is to tackle each of them separately. First, it is misguided at best to expect counselor educator’s to integrate information into their curriculum that they have limited knowledge of. It has already been established that many counselor educators have never been trained to work with populations of diversity and that there is a strong need for them to receive multicultural training (Evans & Larrabee, 2002). However, it appears that the responsibility for obtaining this information has fallen on each person individually. While, some have, and will, take it upon themselves to gain this knowledge, there are others who due to “strong egos, stubbornness, and privilege” never will (Evans & Larrabee, 2002, p. 31). Taking this into account, there must be a more effective way to accomplish this goal than hoping that individuals will become competent on their own.

The major professional organizations (American Counseling Association, American Psychological Association, American School Counseling Association, etc.)
within the counseling field have all published policy statements addressing sexual orientation, and charge their members to challenge heterosexual bias wherever it is found. However, many of these organizations have done little to assist their members in making the shifts in practice as well as in attitude. If these organizations are serious about supporting the "dissemination of accurate information about sexual orientation, mental health, and appropriate interventions in order to counteract bias that is based in ignorance or unfounded beliefs about same-gender orientation" (ACA, 2003) they must begin to actively incorporate this into their conferences, professional journals, and training requirements.

For example, within the counseling field as a whole we find that gay men and lesbians are still effectively invisible within the profession. Published research on issues relevant to sexual minority individuals is noticeably lacking in the professional counseling journals. Buhrke, Ben-Ezra, Hurley, & Rupercht (1992) reviewed six major counseling and counseling psychology refereed journals from 1978 through 1989 and found that out of 6,661 articles only 43 (.65%) focused on variables related to lesbian or gay male sexual orientation. In 1998 Bieschke, Eberz, Bard, & Croteau reviewed the same journals using the same criteria as Buhrke et al. for the years of 1990 through 1997 and found that of the 3,009 published articles only 49 (1.6%) focused on gays or lesbians. Clearly professional writing on issues concerning lesbian and gay men is underrepresented in counseling literature. This raises some serious concerns, by most estimates lesbians and gay men represent 10% of the population, yet less than 1% of the articles in the major counseling and counseling psychology-related journals have focused specifically on sexual-minority variables.
Newman (1989) believes that the lack of professional gay and lesbian literature is a reflection of society and that “part of the way our society has maintained stereotypes and negative attitudes about homosexuality is by refusing to consider it as a legitimate topic for discussion in our homes or education institutions” (p. 203). Newman continued by saying that both overt and covert discrimination is the result of negative societal attitudes, heterosexism, and the unprotected legal status of sexual orientation. In order to reduce this discrimination, gay and lesbian issues need to be incorporated into current training curriculums.

Secondly, is the belief by some that gay and lesbian individuals are not members of a cultural minority group. There is a large debate going on in the multicultural counseling community as to the scope and definition of multiculturalism (Israel & Selvidge, 2003; Pope, 1995). The issue that is dividing the two sides is whether or not to include sexual minority individuals under the umbrella of multiculturalism. Regardless of which side of the argument an individual stands on, preparing counselors to work with real people regardless of what identity category they fit in is imperative.

According to Pope (1995), gay men and lesbians are a distinct cultural minority, as well as being a sexual minority. He argues that cultural minority status is given to any group that is a minority within a majority culture that “have their own geographical living areas, economic and social organizations, cultural traditions, and rituals” (p. 73). Since each of these criteria can be applied to the gay community as equally as they are to any ethnic community, gays and lesbians should be covered by the overarching branches of multiculturalism. This line of reasoning effectively
reduces the argument from one of inclusion to one that is essentially a difference of values, which should not be the basis of making policy (Pope, 1995).

Pederson (1991a) addressed the value judgment call in the special issue of the Journal of Counseling & Development’s special issues on multiculturalism as a fourth force in counseling, by saying “one advantage to the term multiculturalism is that implies a wide range of multiple groups without grading, comparing, or making them as better or worse than one another and without denying the very distinct and complementary or even contradictory perspectives that each group brings with it (p. 4). In the same issue he continued by saying that “the broad definition of culture is particularly important in preparing counselors to deal with the complex differences among clients from or between every cultural group” (Pederson, 1991b, p. 7). As members of the counseling profession we need to work toward an inclusive definition of multiculturalism as opposed to an exclusive one.

Finally, is the lack of comfort that some people have when dealing with sexuality. This explanation can be looked at from two perspectives. On one hand is the concept that sexual orientation encompass much more than what sexual acts or behaviors that people perform, it is actually a sense of identity, which is given legitimacy by including sexual orientation under multiculturalism. The other side is that all human beings are sexual beings and that as counselor educators we need to acknowledge that human sexuality incorporates the multifaceted mélange of biological, psychological, social, academic, and interpersonal domains and therefore cannot be extricated out of someone.
Traditionally, multicultural counseling has been broadly defined as any counseling relationship in which the counselor and the client belong to different cultural groups, hold different assumptions about social reality, and/or subscribe to different world views (Das, 1995). However, given the demographics of the profession in the United States, multicultural counseling primarily means “White, middle-class [heterosexual] counselors working with minority group clients” (Das, 1995, p. 45). For a counselor to effectively work with clients belonging to a different ethnic or nonethnic cultural group, it is necessary for him or her to acquire specific knowledge about the particular group. The counselor also must have a general understanding of the sociopolitical systems and institutional barriers that affect the minority groups within the United States (Sue, et al., 1992).

Multicultural counseling and gay and lesbian counseling have developed fairly independently of each other and are at times often pitted against each other in a battle for infusion in counselor education curriculum (Israel & Selvidge, 2003, p. 84). Instead of being in competition with each other multicultural counseling and sexual minority counseling can work together and strengthen each field while “building a more comprehensive vision of counselor competence with diverse clients” (Israel & Selvidge, 2003, p. 84). While the similarities exist between ethnic and racial minorities and sexual minorities, there are some important differences. Unlike dealing with ethnicity or race, it is essential to focus on sexuality when addressing sexual orientation. This is a particularly difficult topic for many people, and in many cases automatically relegates the topic away from counseling skills or techniques and into human sexuality. This difficulty aside, the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary
for competent counseling with ethnic, racial, and sexual minority individuals have a
great deal in common (Israel & Selvidge, 2003).

Summary

Providing affirmative education about sexual minorities has presented a
challenge for many counselor educators, specifically those who hold traditional,
conservative values, or have had little exposure to gay men and lesbians. Even those
who intellectually accept homosexuality may emotionally reject same-sex
relationships or individuals who do not conform to established gender norms (Corey,
Corey, & Callahan, 1998). Unless counselor educators become aware of and challenge
their faulty assumptions and homoprejudice, they risk projecting their misconceptions
and fears onto their students. Educators must confront their personal prejudice, myths,
fears, and stereotypes regarding sexual orientation as part of the process of expanding
their self-awareness about gay people in general and about the meaning of gay identity
to particular individuals (Sobocinski, 1990). They also need continue to educate
themselves and increase their own competence with the many different culturally
affirmative counseling models that are available (Shannon & Woods, 1991).

Pedagogical Practices

Currently the majority of counselor education programs do not integrate
multicultural counseling into the overall curriculum (Das, 1995; Leach & Carlton,
1997; Gloria & Pope-Davis, 1997). The most common approach is to “add-on” a
single Cross-Cultural counseling or Multicultural counseling course to the existing
curriculum while leaving all other courses untouched (Das, 1995). By relegating the
concepts of multicultural counseling to one course not only is the true importance of multicultural issues negated, but the images and stereotypes of the larger society are propagated (Sue & Sue, 1999).

Generally, the Multicultural or Cross-Cultural counseling course is taught by “a junior adjunct faculty member and often without a strong conceptual framework to specific competencies” (Das, 1995, p. 74). The most common approach to teaching a multicultural class is to rely on speaker panels. Speaker panels are composed of representatives of groups identified by the faculty as being marginalized who agree to come in and speak to the class about their experiences as a member of said group. de Castell (1991) describes this practice as similar to that of a performing parrot at a sideshow. “Step right up folks, see a real live Lesbian. She walks, she talks, and you can ask her anything you want!” (as quoted in Eyre, 1993, p. 274). This process is a double-edged sword, it is much more powerful for the members of a class to hear first-hand about the experiences of real people and be able to ask them questions, than it is to read about it third-hand in a text. However, doing this opens up the possibility of the individual being exposed to additional ignorance and abuse while perpetuating their identification as the Other (Eyre, 1993). Because of the risk of reinforcing stereotypes through cultural generalizations, knowledge-based training should be provided in such a way that counselors use the information as guidelines rather than as rigid rules (Israel & Selvidge, 2003).

Midgett & Meggart (1991) asserted that multiculturalism must not be limited to one course, but should permeate all curriculum and social aspects of counselor training. They advocated for an inclusive approach to multicultural training that must
include academic, therapeutic, and day to day experiences with culturally different populations. Inherent in this approach is the belief that these experiences would afford the future counselor a greater understanding of the elements of prejudice and its impact on the lives of minority individuals (Palma, 1996).

While it is necessary to evaluate counselor education in terms of multiculturalism, it is vital that we specifically address gay and lesbian issues. The reason that this specialized training is imperative is that generalist training will not result in gay-affirmative therapists as it is usually provided from a heterosexist worldview. Therapists trained in a generalist model are more likely to be harmful to queer clients because of their own unchallenged conscious and/or unconscious heterosexist biases, the heterosexist biases of traditional psychological therapies in which they have been trained, and/or their lack of familiarity with gay issues, lifestyles and resources (Phillips & Fischer, 1998).

Norton (1982) said that educators, counselors and counseling students need help and direction to develop their ability to be comfortable when working and interacting with the 10% of the population that is gay and lesbian. Current knowledge and facts about homosexuality need to be directly addressed in order to dispel the myths and misinformation that are so widely held. However, just having information on gay men and lesbians is not enough. Since homosexuality has been perceived so negatively throughout history there is a need to combat this by incorporating gay and lesbian affirmative practices into academics, research and practice (Dworkin & Guitierez, 1989). Counselor educators are in a key position to design, employ, and monitor these affirmative interventions (Savage, 2002; Strong & Callahan, 2001).
However to do so, counselor educators, themselves, must possess a general understanding of sexual orientation, an awareness of their own attitudes and beliefs toward persons who identify as gay, lesbian or bisexual and how this impacts their ability to engage effectively and competently with their sexual minority clients (Israel & Selvidge, 2003).

Summary

The field of education has typically been grounded in Western, patriarchal, able-bodied, middle-class, heterosexist assumptions. The experiences of women, people of color, people with disabilities, gay men, lesbians, and bisexual individuals have habitually been ignored or discounted, which effectively constructs them as the ‘Other’ (Eyre, 1993). This is as true for counselor education as it has been in all other education fields. According to Das (1995) counselor education programs regularly include coursework in multicultural counseling, however, the “depth of the training provided is not deemed sufficient to meet the growing mental health needs of a culturally diverse population” (p. 74). This thought is mirrored by Sue & Sue (1999), who report that although multicultural training is increasing, “most graduate programs continue to give [it] inadequate treatment” (p. 12). This is because when issues relevant to counseling minority groups are presented in class they are usually from the “White Euro-American, middle-class perspective” (p. 12). Current pedagogical practices must be evaluated and adapted as necessary to incorporate the views and experiences of the vast majority of people who do not this Western, patriarchal, able-bodied, middle-class, heterosexist model.
Challenges for Counselor Educators

The need for multiculturally competent counselors has never been more compelling, it is crucial that counselors are trained to think complexly, rather than categorically, about the many manifestations of culture that they will experience with their clients (Fassinger & Richie, 1996). This is particularly vital since research has shown that a client’s perception of satisfaction with counseling services is significantly influenced by the counselors’ level of multicultural counseling competency (Constantine, 2002). Therefore, a counselor’s ability to work effectively with clients from diverse backgrounds necessitates training in areas of difference. However, because mental health professionals are predominately Caucasian and are trained by predominately Caucasian faculty members, it is imperative that training programs be revamped to include accurate and realistic multicultural content and experiences that generate sensitivity and appreciation of the history, current needs, strengths, and resources of minority communities (Sue & Sue, 1999).

Multicultural Environments

While the manner in which multiculturalism is incorporated into counselor education programs and the degree to which all cultural groups are addressed is important, it is as equally important that the environment be affirmative and inclusive of minority-status individuals. According to Gloria & Pope-Davis (1997) the training and learning environment needs to address, model, and reinforce a cultural environment that honors and includes both diversity and multiculturalism. Without institutional support, the
student-in-training is in essence being educated about diversity in an environment in which there is little personal and professional commitment to diversity. Choosing to ignore attitudes, behaviors, and experiences that do not honor or support diversity is to assume that they do not affect the learning environment. Furthermore, it also communicates hidden messages that different groups of people are not valued or respected. (p. 244)

The multicultural environment of a program goes well beyond the manner in which difference is defined or taught. It must also include an accurate assessment of the more subtle aspects of the culture and atmosphere of the learning environment both inside and outside of the classroom. The culture that has shaped academic institutions is relatively homogenous by class, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and gender. This milieu can create a ‘defensive learning environment’ that is not welcoming to a cultural ambience that is different from the academic status quo (Gloria & Pope-Davis, 1997). This ‘defensive learning environment’ creates a situation of “nonentitlement” where students outside of the majority feel as if they are not welcomed in higher education due to their cultural or ethnic differences (DeFreece, 1987).

Along with the general atmosphere of the counseling program, the manner in which issues of diversity are handled in the classroom and/or curriculum holds tremendous sway over the general environment. How diversity is (or is not) incorporated into the curricula sends both an overt and a covert message to students about the commitment and importance of diversity to the program. While it may not
be the main focus of a course, is the ethical responsibility of faculty member to prepare their students to competently address multicultural issues (APA, 1992). Not only is it necessary to teach about multiculturalism, it is also necessary to teach from a multicultural perspective so that cultural differences that may be present in different ethnic and cultural groups receive the same acknowledgement that is received by students from the majority.

Counselor educators who want to ensure that the teaching environment is affirmative to gay and lesbian issues and training need to be able to evaluate the manner in which the department and university are affirmative to the inclusion of lesbians and gay men (Bieschke, Eberz, Bard, & Croteau, 1998). Furthermore, counselor educators need to recognize that the profession often reflects the values of the dominate culture, and has been referred to as “the handmaiden of the status quo” (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992, p. 479). This means that the larger current political and social culture of our society is represented within the program and needs to be acknowledged and addressed if an affirmative environment is to be fostered.

Bieschke, Eberz, Bard, & Croteau (1989) suggest that faculty members in counselor training programs engage in an ongoing evaluation to assess the degree that the environment is safe and supportive for the study of sexual orientation issues. Iasenza (1989) stated that while it is no longer acceptable to openly express disdain for sexual minority individuals, prejudice and discrimination continues toward those interested in the topic of sexual orientation. Some people in positions of greater power (advisors, faculty members, human subjects committees) may directly or indirectly discouraged students from pursuing studies related to gay and lesbian topics.
(Pilkington & Cantor, 1996). Counselor education faculty must be particularly conscious of their own heterosexist bias and homoprejudice, and specifically in the nature and extent of changes that are necessary to create an affirmative training environment (Bieschke, Eberz, Bard, & Croteau, 1998).

The more multiculturally aware and sensitive that counselor training programs and departments become, the more effective that they become in providing a diversified environment that is welcoming to all (Katz, 1989). In order for this to happen, evaluation of the cultural atmosphere needs to be ongoing. There occasionally seems to be the attitude that if faculty members or students are not questioning the programs commitment to diversity everything must be satisfactory. However, if the environment is not welcoming and inclusive, individuals will be reluctant to step forward due to the lack of comfort that they feel. In this case the exclusive environment perpetuates itself.

There are several theoretical models that provide for the issues described above; however, because the overall focus of this study is directly related to sexual orientation and the manner in which it is infused into counselor education training programs, the theoretical model of choice is Queer Theory. Queer theory requires rethinking traditional concepts and definitions such as identity, psychopathology, gender, and sexuality. Queer theory challenges the status quo, which is responsible for perpetuating the homoprejudice and heterosexism that is found in all social systems. This next section will provide a brief history of the foundations of queer theory, an overview of modern queer theory and an examination of how queer theory is manifested in education generally and counselor education specifically.
Theoretical Rationale

Queer Theory

Genealogy of Queer Theory

Queer theory is a field of study that remains conceptually slippery, which makes it difficult to summarize briefly (Turner, 2000). The term “Queer Theory” refers to writing that has taken sexuality as its subject and specifically addresses the ways in which gay men, lesbians, bisexual men and women, and transgendered individuals are impacted by traditional definitions of sex, sexuality and gender. Queer theory excites controversy and may be seen as “repugnant or threatening” (Dawidoff, 2000, p. x) by some academics and writers because it is counterintuitive to the current sexphobic and homoprejudice public culture.

The body of abstract theory that came to be known as queer theory during the 1990’s is dauntingly complex and diverse and demands recognition of tendentiousness and epistemological limitations. Also it is worth noting that “there is no queer theory in the singular, only many different voices and sometimes overlapping, sometime divergent perspectives that can be loosely called queer theories” (Hall, 2004, p. 5). These different perspectives and fields of thought encompassed by the umbrella of queer theory all have much the same origins and claim many of the same original theorists as their founders.

French philosopher and activist, Michael Foucault, is frequently identified as one of the most influential thinkers and founder of modern queer theory. In his book *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction, Volume 1* (1978), Foucault analyses the
interrelationships of knowledge, power and sexuality which became the intellectual
catalyst of queer theory (Spargo, 1999). This being said, Foucault is not the originator
of queer theory, nor was queer theory the intention of Foucault’s philosophy.

The central feature of Foucault’s work was that sexuality is not a natural
feature or fact of human life, but instead is a constructed category of experience that
has historical, social, and cultural, rather than biological, origins. This does not mean
that Foucault ruled out the biological dimension, but rather he prioritized the crucial
role that society and its institutions have on the formation of sexuality. His focus was
to examine the production of sexuality categories in society not what sexuality is.

During the 1980’s gay male scholars and writers positioned themselves with
regard to their differences with Foucault. Much the writing from this period
predominately focused on the debate between essentialist and social constructionist
accounts of sexual identity. Foucault took neither position nor did he attempt to
explain sexuality as a discrete, persistent phenomenon that could be discovered.
Instead Foucault believed that sexuality was inescapably intertwined with knowledge
and power. He studied sexuality in order to understand the various operations of
institutions and discourses in which authoritative individuals used the specifics of
sexual thoughts and practices for control over behavior (Turner, 2000). Foucault
(1978) believed that the search for truth about an individual’s sexual identity was more
a political than a positivist endeavor.

One of Foucault’s most controversial assertions, and certainly one that was a
catalyst for the development of queer theory, was that the category of homosexuality
is relatively recent in origin. He insisted that the “psychological, psychiatric, medical
category of homosexuality” did not exist prior to Carl Westphal’s 1870 article on contrary sexual sensations (Foucault, 1978). He was not suggesting that same-sex relations did not exist prior to the 19th century, just that the homosexual was not a distinct “species” before that time. Homosexuals became a type of human being defined by their sexual practices and were seen as being totally infused with sexuality: “It was everywhere present in him; at the root of all his actions” (Foucault, 1978, p. 43). The category ‘homosexual’ referred solely to the male homosexual as women were widely believed not to be sexual beings outside of their relationships with men. This distinction is particularly interesting because it was three feminist scholars who took up Foucault’s work and expanded it further to what has become modern queer theory.

One feminist author in particular, Judith Butler, has had more influence on queer theory than any other (Hennessey, 1994; Sedgwick, 1993). Butler found that Foucault’s exploration of sexuality without mention of gender to be problematic, however, she believed that his analysis of sexuality as a function of power to be inline with feminist teachings. By 1990 Butler had begun to expand upon Foucault’s writings by incorporating discussions of the nature of gender, sexuality, and identity that would become imperative to the development of queer theory (Turner, 2000). In her 1990 book Gender Trouble, Butler controversially argued that feminism worked against itself by using the term ‘woman’ as its fundamental category (Jaggose, 1996). Butler’s rationale for this was that the “cultural matrix through which gender has become intelligible requires that certain kinds of identities cannot exist” and “the term ‘woman’ [does] nothing more that perpetuate a regulatory fiction which inadvertently
reproduced the normative relation between sex and gender that naturalized heterosexuality (p. 17).

Eve Sedgwick is another feminist who has had an immense impact on development of queer theory. Sedgwick took up essentialist/social constructionist debate about the causes of homosexuality in her 1990 book *Epistemology of the Closet*. Sedgwick argued that either position focused on etiology and believed that this debate was dangerous as it presented both sides in terms of blame. If it were biological as the essentialists claimed, the cause is “couched in terms of ‘excess’, ‘deficiency’, or ‘imbalance’ – whether in the hormones, in the genetic material, or … in the fetal endocrine environment” (p. 43). On the flip side are cultural or nurturing influences as the social constructionists’ claim, from this approach Sedgwick believed the blame would be placed on the parents or familial networks. Either way she believed that this would have disastrous consequences for lesbians and gay men. Rather than address the causes of homosexuality (or heterosexuality for that matter) Sedgwick addressed the power structures that were behind the creation of the binary.

The third feminist who was instrumental in the creation of queer theory is Theresa de Lauretis, who actually coined the term “queer theory” as the editor of a special issue of the feminist journal *differences* in the summer of 1991. The issue, titled “Queer Theory: Lesbian and Gay Sexualities,” contained essays on a diverse array of cultural representations and manifestations of same-sex desire (Hall, 2003). In the introduction to this issue de Lauretis wrote that the term ‘queer theory’ was arrived at in an effort to avoid the fine distinctions found in lesbian theory and gay theory because it is not gender specific (p. iii). de Lauretis clearly intended to “mark
significant difference between queer theory and lesbian and gay studies” (p. iv). She saw at least two problems with the term ‘lesbian and gay studies’. First was the automatic connection that it had to homosexuality which she believed limited the usefulness of the term. The second problem was that it served to create another discrete set of identity categories which only would serve gay men and lesbians. For de Lauretis the term queer allowed for the possibility of keeping open the question and contest of the element of race – or class, age or anything else – and its often complicate, unpredictable relationship to sexuality (Turner, 2000).

Modern day queer theory was influenced by the social reform movement. The social reform movement sought to break down traditional ideas of what is normal and what is deviant, by showing the queer in what is thought of as normal and the normal in what is seen as the queer (Tierney, 1997). Queer theory, then, is about inquiring why we know and don’t know about things both normal and queer. The central struggle from this perspective is deconstructing the meaning of deviance in relation to the norm and “how institutions control and legitimize certain discourses” (Pinar, 1998, p. 62).

Queer theory itself is derived from critical postmodernism. According to Peter McLaren, (1995), “critical postmodernism takes into account both the macropolitical level of structural organization and the micropolitical level of different and contradictory manifestations of oppression as a means of analyzing global relations of oppression” (p. 209). Critical postmodernism also concerns itself with praxis. Praxis is a strategic approach to academic life that seeks to disrupt norms that silence individuals and groups so that the conditions for enablement and voice are created.
Critical postmodernism seeks to blend critical theory and postmodern analysis of social life. Critical theory's advocacy for empowerment and the development of voice is combined with the postmodern notion of difference and the deconstruction of norms (Tierney, 1997).

Broadly stated, critical theory is an attempt to understand the oppressive aspects of society in order to produce the environment for change and empowerment of those who have been silenced and invisible. Critical theory is not simply the quest to understand life but to change it (Tierney, 1997). Postmodernism also attempts to critique and to understand how the concepts of truth and deviance have been constructed and defined. Specifically, the struggle from the postmodern stance is to analyze how norms come into being and what it means for the people and groups that have been placed on the margins (Tierney, 1997). Critical postmodernism, from this perspective, challenges modernist notions of rationality, norms, and identity.

Not only do queer theorists use critical theory to investigate how norms come into being, but by incorporating the postmodern perspective they help emancipate its members from the many forms of oppression that are perceived to operate in the culture (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). It is contended that all knowledge is socially and historically determined and the consequence of power. Given such assertions about knowledge, the concept of power becomes infused with a concern for empowerment. The basic approach, central to queer theory, is the exploration of societal connectedness while maintaining individual differences. In particular how marginality is constructed and maintained becomes a pivotal point of the investigation for queer theorists (Tierney, 1997).
Queer theory emphasizes that the point is not simply to study the world but to change it. The "aim is to assemble new practices, languages, and ways of seeing and hence acting in the world so that individuals and groups will not of necessity need to subsume their identities into a homogeneous mass" (Pinar, 1998, p. 24). However, this must not unthinkingly be undertaken within the same framework that has supported and sustained heterosexism. Audre Lorde's (1984) comment that "the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house" (p. 112) is apt counsel.

Queer Theory and Multicultural Education

Queer theory believes that the current manifestations of multicultural education are doing little more than perpetuating the historical productions of heterosexuality and homosexuality that have served to regulate the power relationships of inequality. The basis of this belief is that since multicultural education has been heavily influenced by identity politics, and has tended to unproblematically incorporate the affirmation of identity categories it is having the ironic effect of perpetuating stereotypes and reinforcing inequities by making the 'Other' more visible as the 'Other'" (Carlson, 1998, p. 114). Taking this a step further, by acknowledging that the other major identity categories (e.g., gender, race, and class) are serving the same role of perpetuating stereotypes, one can no longer unproblematically embrace multiculturalism and the current manifestations of multicultural education.

Counselor educators have the task of assisting students become aware of the issues behind the identity categories of race, class, gender, and sexual orientation in order for them to become effective practitioners. However, it will take more than simple information acquisition for this to be accomplished because simply gaining
knowledge does not automatically translate into increased counselor competency (Kocarek & Pelling, 2003). Information on these topics is not enough, specifically in relation to sexual orientation. Homosexuality has been perceived so negatively throughout history not only by the general public, but also from within the mental health communities that there is a need to not only teach about it but also to provide models of practice and research that are affirmative (Dworkin & Guitierrez, 1989). Teaching for social change is only possible when we teach for subject change, which necessitates that every educator must critique his or her own role in enforcing or challenging current identity categories (Eyre, 1993).

The aim of queer theory is to deconstruct the binary distinctions that govern identity formations and to reveal the power relations that arrange them. According to Foucault (1985) multicultural education needs to be about promoting a formation of the self that is less fixed and more open, without rigid identity boundaries. Rather than positioning the other as the Other, individuals can be taught how to negotiate relations in ways the protect the freedom and address the interests of all, with the goal being to achieve balance in one’s life and in one’s everyday relations with others. To promote this type of learning, Foucault (1985) identified what he called “technologies of the self” that involve self-reflection so one may “turn its gaze on itself - with the purpose of recognizing itself”; and in this recognition act “to improve one’s self, to surpass one’s self” (p. 5). The technologies that Foucault identified for this process, which may be incorporated into modern multicultural education, include dialogue, listening, meditation, memory, self-examination, diary and journal keeping, and letter writing (Carlson, 1998).
Foucault believed that it is by turning inward that ultimately leads outward again so that we may refocus our attentions on the politics of everyday life and learn how to negotiate our relations with others, including those who differ by class, race, gender, sexuality, and other identity categories, in ways that are non-oppressive and allow for the building of alliances across differences. Carlson (1998) cautions that without this multicultural education risks becoming a fragmented field of study that treats various marginalized groups separately, each given a week in the curriculum. “If the promise of multicultural education is to be realized, it must be committed to helping young people learn the technologies of the self that will allow them to work together strategically across, as well as within, various identity boundaries to advance common democratic projects” (p. 118).

*Queer Theory and Pedagogy*

Queer theory offers methods of critiques to identify the repetitions of normalcy as structure and as pedagogy (Britzman, 1995). This critique works from the premise that curriculum and pedagogy are not only sexualized, but heterosexualized. Taken further is the belief that curriculum and pedagogy have the obligation to interrupt heteronormative thinking – not only for the purposes of promoting social justice, but to also broaden the possibilities for perceiving, interpreting, and representing the true nature of the human experience (Sumara & Davis, 1999).

Warner (1993) uses the term “heteronormativity” to refer to the complex ways in which “het[ero]sexual culture thinks of itself as the elemental form of human association, as the very model of intergender relations, as the indivisible basis of all community, and as the means of reproduction without which society wouldn’t exist”
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(p. xxi). This means that all social relations and all forms of thinking that exist with these relations are heteronormative. In other words, heteronormativity creates a language that is "straight", and "living within a heteronormative culture means learning to 'see' straight, to 'read' straight, [and] to 'think' straight" (Sumara & Davis, 1999, p. 202). Heteronormativity can be disrupted, or as Britzman (1995) states, we can learn to "stop reading straight" (p. 151). Queer theorists are interested in interrupting heteronormative thinking and compelled to eliminate the homoprejudice and heterosexism that permeates society.

Queer theory proposes that curriculum and pedagogy can be used as an avenue to interpret the particularities of the alleged differences among individuals, not merely among categories of people. Queer is not a signifier that represents gay, lesbian, bisexual, and/or transgendered identities, rather it functions as a marker that refuses the cultural rewards afforded to those whose public behaviors are consistent with "proper" heterosexual identity (Sumara & Davis, 1999). Queer theorists are not only concerned with sexuality, but how sexuality intersects with race, class, nationality, gender, age, able-ness, and other identity categories that have long been the basis for the closure of, rather than the pursuit of, understanding about the lives of marginalized people (Turner, 2000).

**Challenges to Integrating Queer Theory in Counselor Education**

Queer theory offers a new approach to counselor education that will assist counselor educators and trainees to challenge traditional definitions of identity, gender, and sexuality (Carroll & Gilroy, 2001). Unlike current counselor education approaches to diversity which have been influenced by professional associations’ call
for more specialized course offerings and focused content, queer theory challenges counselor educators to transcend this narrowness so that students learn to be “reflective scholar-practitioners in continuous interaction with ideas and with others holding similar and dissimilar views” (Martin, 1998, p. 7). One way that this may be accomplished is for counselor educators to emphasize counseling models that lend themselves to the basic suppositions of queer theory, specifically nontraditional approaches to therapy that promote an adherence to an “ethics and practice of freedom” (Foucault, 1985, p. 5), which means that human behavior is not dictated by a set of universal laws and rules. It is also important to encourage students to think carefully about how power operates not only in the lives of counselors and clients but also in society as a whole and how it can be used either malevolently or with integrity.

According to Winslade, Monk, and Drewery (1997) there are three concepts that are central to incorporating queer theory into counselor education: discourse, positioning, and deconstruction. Discourse refers to the “use of language as a form of social practice” (p. 229). The use of discourse involves giving consideration to the power dynamics in language and to help to sensitize students to who is and is not speaking and who is being objectified and/or marginalized. Discursive practices occur at personal, political, and cultural levels and can offer different and often contradictory versions of reality.

Positioning is the concept that the subjects within any discourse occupy positions. This means that the function of a discourse is to “offer a particular set of relationships that locate or situate the person in relation to the other phenomena inscribed by the discourse” (p. 230). An example of this would be the terms masculine
and feminine, both refer to the ways in which society prescribes that male and female
genders are expected to act and behave. However, the subject may have different and
contradictory positions depending on the social situation.

The third concept set forth by Winslade, Monk, and Drewery related to the
incorporation of queer theory into counselor education is deconstruction.
Deconstruction is the belief that the customary privilege given to the prevailing
knowledge of society must be evaluated and challenged. This is particularly necessary
when this knowledge is used to constitute everyday social practices. From a queer
theory perspective this is similar to disrupting power structures by breaking down
traditional ideas of what is normal and what is queer.

Morris (1998) identifies four characteristics of individuals who work from a
queer curriculum perspective, they: (a) digress from mainstream “official” discourse;
(b) challenge the status quo by queerly reading texts (uncovering potentially radical
politics), or queer texts (pointing out silences or absences of marginalized group and
adding them to the text); (c) understand that curriculum is gendered, political,
historical, racial, classed, and aesthetic; and (d) see themselves as a co-learner with
students (p. 284). Overall, the queer curriculum individual turns academic life “inside
out, upside down, [and] backwards” (p. 285) by radically digressing from previously
accepted practices by altering the ways that educators think about curriculum (Pinar, et
at., 1995).

Queer Theory’s Potential Effect on Counselor Education

The incorporation of Queer Theory into Counselor Education has the potential
to change the current training provided to counselor trainees. A Counselor Education
faculty member who teaches from a Queer Theory perspective will create an environment that allows for the discourse, positioning, and deconstruction that Winslade, Monk, and Drewery (1997) discuss and to incorporate the characteristics identified by Morris (1998) into their curriculum. Teaching from a Queer Theory perspective would also mean providing the students with authentic experiences that replicate the phenomena under consideration as closely as possible while nonjudgmentally eliciting the student’s thoughts about the experience. This helps the student to begin constructing their own knowledge base rather than unquestionably accepting the repetitions of knowledge that has provided by traditional education. (Lovell & McAuliffe, 1997).

Duckworth (1986) explained this concept by stating that a key aspect to learning is to experience the phenomena first hand – the real thing, not books or lectures about it – simply telling students what you want to impart on them leaves them cold and disinterested. In other words, it becomes very easy for students to sit back, stop thinking, and assume that what is being taught right without critically understanding it. However, by engaging them in the subject and following up by eliciting discussions about what it is that they noticed and what they make of it places them in the situation of becoming active learners. Encouraging students to explain their thoughts and make them clear to other people allows the individual to achieve greater clarity and understanding for themselves because much of the learning comes from personal understanding.

The development of this type of environment has been found to have several desirable outcomes. Specifically the counseling trainees will learn to think more
clearly, the students themselves determine what is important, and they come to depend on themselves. The end result is for students to begin to understand that all knowledge is constructed so that they can broaden their perspectives, complexify their cognition, and to amplify their imagination (Lovell & McAuliffe, 1997; Sumara & Davis, 1999). This is an important factor in helping trainees to understand the constructed nature of identity categories and binary distinctions and how these categories have been developed in relation to the dominant group norms.

Critique of Queer Theory

The construction of one universal theory is a major mistake that negates reality of the lived experience of all people (Haraway, 1991). Any form of queer theory that is presented definitely is hypocritical at best, and completely at odds with what it seeks to accomplish (Hall, 2003). Queer theory begins with the premise that the predominate modes of intellectual and political systems in the western culture do not serve the needs of queers and that they can not be made to do so. Queer theorists have not yet arrived at a scheme for what should replace these existing models, instead they focus their attentions primarily on elaborating the problems with the current paradigms while leaving open the question what should replace them (Turner, 2000).

Queer theories, even in their wide claims of diversity, seem to be struggling with the limitations of basic terminology and language. This is particularly indicative in the use or lack of use of the term bisexuality. The ability of sexual desire to be morphic and multidirectional rather than being fixed creates some very interesting and complex challenges to queer theory (Hall 2003). The implications that bisexuality present in regards to sexual identity are frequently ignored in discussions of queer
theory. Bisexuality challenges queer identity and queer theorization in ways that are far more complex than could possibly be addressed simply by adding self-identified bisexuals to the list of those subsumed by the queer rubric (Storr, 1999).

Hall (2003) suggested that queer theory needs to vigorously explore the manner in which “homosexual and heterosexual are terms that do not capture the true complexity of most human lives when viewed as a continuum of past behaviors and the always inherent future possibilities” (p. 101). Queer theory currently does not look at how sexual desire, behavior, and expression wax and wane over time. Allowing for the fact that desire outside of the binary exists at points in time in most peoples lives requires that we need to consider the possibility that the manner in which we conceptualize sexuality may need to be changed (D’Emilio, 1979).

Along with issues of bisexuality, transgenderism has a very touchy relationship with queer theory as well. Namaste (2000) criticizes queer theory for its “absolute neglect of every day life for transgendered people” (p. 9). She believes that gay men and lesbians have often oppressed gender nonconformists and that queer theory “robs transgendered people of dignity and integrity” (p. 23) while pathologizing them much in the same way that traditional science has done.

Another area that may be problematic is the manner in which queer theory views the intersection of class and sexuality. To a certain degree American queer theory has followed the broader norms of the American middle- and upper-class, academic, gay and lesbian culture (Hall, 2003). The nature of the problem here is better understood when viewed through the lens of who has access to a university education. The academic queer pool of Ph.Ds and publishing professors at research
universities is certainly not very diverse or large. Queer theory is a “theory that is available primarily to those who have a university education and that reference previous intellectual work, which itself is class inflicted” (Hall, 2003, p. 80).

Gaps in Research

Past research on the lack of education and knowledge that mental health professionals have regarding the needs of their lesbian and gay male clients are truly interconnected. The connection is that this previous research does not seem to have investigated is how mental health professionals are able to move through the higher education system in general and graduate counseling programs specifically without receiving accurate and unbiased knowledge that is needed to provide affirmative services to all clients, regardless of sexual orientation. If counselors are leaving their training programs only having the necessary skills to counsel others like themselves then the profession is being done a great disservice and it is the general public that will suffer.

In order to determine why graduate level counselors are completing their training programs without having sufficient levels of self-awareness, knowledge, and skills regarding gay and lesbian clients it seems prudent to investigate the factors that influence this. Queer theory provides a platform to look into this: pedagogy and curriculum. However, to be able to do this investigation justice it would seem prudent to begin by attempting to understand the place that the counselor educators are working from. Because much of the history of the mental health profession “has a legacy of homophobia, heterosexism, silence, and destructive mythology” (Laird & Green, 1996, p. 2) and many counselor educators are a product of training programs.
that taught about homosexuality only in the context of pathology (McGoldrick, 1996) it is necessary to investigate the knowledge, skills, and awareness that counselor educators have about sexual minority individuals and how this influences the manner in which the subject of sexual orientation is incorporated into their pedagogical approach and their choice of curriculum.

Overall, the review of the current literature identified two factors that may perpetuate the exclusion of frank discussions about sexual orientation from counselor education programs. Specifically, these two are: 1) the organizational climate within the graduate mental health training program may not support it (Pilkington & Cantor, 1996); and 2) counselor educators themselves may have a limited knowledge of issues related to sexual orientation (Eliason, 2000). These two factors appear to contribute heavily to whether or not sexual orientation is infused into the overall training component of counselor trainees. However, there have been no research studies that have looked at the manner or degree that these factors actually impact the inclusion of sexual orientation competency into counselor education training programs. Also, neither the influence that queer theory has in counselor education nor how queer theory relates to the multicultural environment, sexual orientation competency or pedagogy and curriculum in counselor education training programs has ever been quantitatively investigated.

Conclusion

The very recent history of pathologizing homosexuality still has a strong impact on the public in general and mental health professionals in particular (Rothblum, 1994). Empirical evidence suggests that counseling professionals continue
to exhibit heterosexist attitudes and beliefs in their work with and their attitudes toward gay men and lesbians (Bieschke & Matthews, 1996; Eliason, 2000; Flores, et al., 1995; Jones, 2000; Phillips & Fischer, 1998; Rudolph, 1988, 1990; Savage, 2002; Sussman, 1996; Thomas & Fishburn, 1988). The data has also identified the lack of satisfaction that lesbians and gay men have with the mental health profession (Liddle, 1996; Rudolph, 1990) because of the perceived heterosexism that still pervades the vocation that initiated it and perpetuated it for years.

It is not unreasonable to believe that clinician’s of all sexual orientations can work successfully and affirmatively with gay men and lesbians as long as they are accepting of their client’s sexual orientation, free of homoprejudice and aware of the heterosexist bias that society has maintained (Ritter & Turndrup, 2002). It is necessary for counselors to understand the heterosexist bias that has shaped the context of the gay and lesbian experience (Phillips & Fischer, 1998) and the societal constraints that influence them daily. However, for this to happen, counselor educators will need to begin the process of evaluating their personal beliefs and biases and how these impact their ability to incorporate related issues into their teaching repertoire.

Using Electronic Surveys & the Internet

With the growth of the World Wide Web and the expanded use of e-mail for business and personal communication, the Internet has provided a new way of conducting research. When compared with other methods of collecting data, the Internet can make research less expensive, easier to conduct, and much more rapid than traditional surveying methods (Kraut, Olson, Banaji, Bruckman, Cohen & Couper, 2004). While it is easier, faster, and less expensive to conduct, researchers
still need to be aware of some of the potential downfalls of conducting research electronically.

One of the biggest concerns for researchers using Internet surveys is coverage bias or bias due to sampled people not having or not choosing to access the Internet (Crawford, Couper & Llamas, 2001; Kay & Johnson, 1999; Solomon, 2001). Despite the continued growth of the Internet there are considerable numbers of people who do not have access or choose not to use the Internet. There is also a large divide in Internet use among racial and socioeconomic groups. There are, however, specific populations where Internet access is extremely high and coverage bias is less likely a concern. College students and faculty members in the United States, Canada, and Western Europe are examples of these populations (Solomon, 2001). Although coverage bias may be less of an issue for these groups, comfort with the Internet and computer literacy are potential sources of bias in response rate, though these concerns have been lessening in recent years as experience with the Internet grows (Dillman, Tortora, & Bowker, 2001). Sampling error issues with Internet surveys a normally considered to be similar to conventional surveys, however it is more feasible to collect a much larger number of respondents than otherwise could have been gathered using traditional surveying methods, which increases the statistical accuracy and decreases standard error (Schonlau, Fricke, & Elliott, 2001).

While research on Internet-based surveys is limited when compared to other types of surveying (mail, phone, etc), the research reports have been mixed when discussing return rates. Some of the current literature has begun to show that Internet surveys have a lower return rate (Copper, Blair, & Triplett, 1999; Solomon, 2001).
Several studies have been focused on the difference in response rates between email and postal mail. In most of these studies the postal mail response was higher by as much as twenty-one percent (Schonlau, Fricker, & Elliott, 2001) and when respondents are given the choice between Internet and paper questionnaires, they overwhelmingly choose paper (Couper, 2001; Fricker & Schonlau, 2002). This choice is thought to be due to the lack of comfort that the general public feels with the Internet. It is believed that as personal comfort with the Internet increases this trend will reverse. However, according to Mathy, Kerr, & Haydin (2003) many researchers have found exactly the opposite – that Internet returns were comparable or higher than postal mail returns. These conflicting findings confirm that the variables related to whether or not someone completes and returns a survey are as varied as the reasons the research is being conducted.

Research has shown that people often experience a greater sense of privacy and anonymity while communicating through the Internet. This increased sense of anonymity that some people feel by using the Internet has been shown to reduce social desirability distortion and to increase self-disclosure (Richman, Kiesler, Weisband, & Drasgow, 1999). Social desirability distortion refers to the tendency of some respondents to answer questions in a more socially desirable direction than may actually be true for them. This trend may be incredibly useful when conducting research that involves gathering information about socially controversial issues (e.g. sexual orientation, abortion, politics, and religion) or private behavior (e.g. sexual acts, drug use).
CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perception of Counselor Education faculty members concerning the multicultural environment in the program in which they teach in. The study examined their attitudes, knowledge, and skills toward gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals, and to what degree queer theory influences their pedagogical approach to counselor education. The study also investigated what, if any, relationship existed between these factors. Chapter three describes the participants in the study, outlines the research design and procedures, describes the instruments used, states the research questions and hypotheses, and defines the statistical procedures that were used to evaluate the data.

Participants and Setting

The target population for this study was counselor educators. For the purpose of this study a “Counselor Educator” was defined as a person who has completed a master’s degree (M.A. or M.S.), or a doctorate degree (PhD, EdD, or PsyD) in counselor education, counseling, counseling psychology, or related area, and is currently employed by a college or university counselor education preparation program that met two qualifications. First the program must have been accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and second the program must have a physical campus or building where
the courses are taught. The second qualification eliminates faculty members from the two CACREP programs (The University of Phoenix, and Capella University) that are taught completely online. Neither of these programs maintains online information about their faculty members.

CACREP does not maintain a listing of Counselor Education faculty members, though a list of the Internet addresses for each program was available. By systemically going to the official website of each of the CACREP accredited programs it was possible to identify the Counselor Education faculty members and to obtain an email address for each of them. Using the qualifications noted above, 1379 faculty members from 180 CACREP accredited programs covering 45 states, the District of Columbia, and British Columbia, Canada were identified.

After sending out the initial and the follow-up email requests for participation this number was adjusted down to 1283 people. The adjustment was due to the removal of email addresses that were not valid and to the removal of individuals who responded to say that they were not faculty members of a Counselor Educator programs, not teaching in CACREP-accredited programs, or retired. There were also a number of automated responses from CACREP-accredited, counselor education faculty members who are currently on sabbatical and would not be checking or responding to emails until after the data collection period had ended. From the 1283 requests for participation that were sent out, 236 people responded by completing all three of the research instruments which represents an 18.4% return rate.
Data Collection Procedures

The purpose of a survey is to gather information about a population group; since the entire population has been identified this survey was conducted as a census. One thousand-three hundred and seventy-nine faculty members were recruited to participate in this study. A descriptive email (Appendix A) was sent to the entire identified population explaining the purpose of the study and requesting that they participate in this research. Those members that agreed to be participants in this study were instructed to click on a hyperlink (http://web.wm.edu/education/research/dfrank/) located at the bottom of the initial email. This link took them to a webpage designed specifically for this study. The webpage is located on College of William & Mary’s School of Education web server.

When the participants clicked on the hyperlink from the initial email they were directed to the consent/confidentiality form (Appendix B). After reading the form, participants had the opportunity to print a copy of the form for their records if they choose. Participants then had the option to click on the “I agree” button if they decided to contribute to this research project or to close out the web page if they decided against participation. Those that choose the “I agree” option were then sent to a page that contained electronic versions of the research instruments.

Approximately two weeks after sending out the initial request for participation a follow-up request (Appendix C) was sent to all identified individuals. Since this study was done anonymously it was not possible to determine who had completed the instruments and who had not which necessitated sending the second request to everyone. This follow-up email did acknowledge the anonymity issues, so those that
had already completed it were thanked, while those who had not had the opportunity to do it were asked a second time to complete the instruments.

Instrumentation

Three instruments will be used to gather the data that is relevant to this study: the Multicultural Environmental Inventory-Revised (MEI-R), the Sexual Orientation Counselor Scale (SOCS), a demographic survey with researcher developed Likert-type questions attached.

Multicultural Environmental Inventory – Revised (MEI-R)

"The MEI-R is an instrument that has been designed to measure an individual's perceptions about the degree to which graduate counseling programs address multicultural issues within curriculum, supervision, climate, and research" (Pope-Davis, Liu, Nevitt, & Toporek, 2000, p. 57). The MEI-R (Appendix D) consists of 27 items that were constructed to assess the multicultural milieu of graduate counseling programs. Each item is a descriptive statement that concerns some facet of the participants counseling program. Contributors were asked to rate the degree to which they believe the statement is representative of their training program on a Likert-type scale (1 = not at all, 3 = moderately, 5 = a lot). Higher scores on the MEI-R indicate a greater degree of focus on multicultural issues within the counseling program (Pope-Davis, Liu, Nevitt, & Toporek, 2000).

There are two methods to scoring the MEI-R. The first provides a total score for the participant's perceptions about the degree to which the training environment focuses on multicultural issues. When scoring using this method the scores range from
27 – 135, with higher scores signifying a perception of a greater degree of focus on multicultural issues within the training program. The second provides four scores for each of the individual subscales (factors) for their perceptions about the various aspects of the multicultural training environments. When using this method, scores will be obtained for each of the following: curriculum & supervision (factor 1, scores range from 11 - 55); climate & comfort (factor 2, scores range from 11 - 55); honesty in recruitment (factor 3, scores range from 3 - 15); and multicultural research (factor 4, scores range from 2 - 10). Researchers should not use both the total score and the subscale scores as they are highly correlated and would therefore be redundant to use both. For the purpose of this study the total score method will be used.

There are no published studies using the MEI-R per se. The MEI-R is the product of the author’s initial investigation and validation of the Multicultural Environmental Inventory (MEI). The original instrument consisted of 53 items and was tested on 208 students and faculty from APA-approved counseling psychology programs across the United States. From this investigation the authors reduced the number of questions to the current 27 found in the MEI-R. These 27 items were based on the items’ effectiveness in measuring the underlying constructs. The final 27 items fell into one of four factors that accounted for 68% of the variance and had item-total correlations ranging from 0.21 to 0.53. Along with determining the factor loading of the MEI-R, the researchers calculated the internal consistency reliability estimates for both the entire scale and for each individual factor. Overall, the estimated reliability for the MEI-R was found to be 0.94, with each of the factors showing a respective reliability of 0.92 (curriculum and supervision), 0.92 (climate and comfort), 0.85
(honesty in recruitment), and 0.83 (research) (Pope-Davis, Liu, Nevitt, & Toporek, 2000). It is worth noting that all of these results stem from the original study that was conducted using the original 53-items. At this time there are no published studies that have used the revised version of the MEI, therefore it is not possible to verify if the instrument’s creators hypothesized correlations, variance, factor loadings, validity, and reliability are indicative of what would be found had the revised version with 27-items been tested under the similar circumstances that were used with the original 53 items.

Sexual Orientation Counselor Scale (SOCS)

The SOCS (Appendix E) consists of 29 Likert-type statements that were constructed to assess the awareness, skills, and knowledge of counselors working with lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) populations (Bidell, 2003). Each item is a declarative statement that addresses the participant’s personal beliefs about gay, lesbian, or bisexual individuals, the participant’s professional experience with gay, lesbian, or bisexual individuals, or the participant’s knowledge of gay, lesbian, or bisexual individuals. Overall, the SOCS is used to measure the awareness, skills, and knowledge of counselors, psychologists, and trainees when working with GLB issues and individuals (Bidell, 2003).

To date there are no published articles related to the SOCS in peer-reviewed journals. However, papers related to the development and validation of the SOCS were presented at the American Psychological Association’s 109th conference in San Francisco, CA (Bidell & Casas, 2001) and at the American Counseling Association’s 2003 annual conference in Anaheim, CA (Bidell, 2003b). An unpublished manuscript was also provided to this writer by the researcher detailing the development and
validation of the SOCS (Bidell, 2003a). It is also worth noting that the Skills subscale appears to measure more experiential activities and perceived competence than it does true skills.

The original version of the SOCS contained 45 items and was administered to 287 undergraduate, master-level students, doctoral-level students, and counseling psychologists who were recruited from universities in California, Nevada, Texas, and Ohio (Bidell & Casas, 2001). Based on the results of this investigation the author reduced the number of questions form the original 45 to the current 27. The rationale for this was that an exploratory factor analysis identified a three-factor solution that accounted for 40% of the total variance. These three factors are (a) Skills, which consists of twelve items relate to a counselors direct clinical experience with GLB clients; (b) Awareness, which includes ten questions that deal with the mental health professionals attitudes and opinions about GLB clients; and (c) Knowledge, which consists of seven items that examine the clinicians understanding of general and mental health issues facing GLB clients (Bidell, 2003). This three factor design is similar to multidimensional multicultural competency models that provide a foundation for conceptualizing counselor competence with ethnic minorities (Arredonodo, et al., 1996; Fassinger & Richie, 1997; Israel & Selvidge, 2003; Kocarek & Pelling, 2003; Sue & Sue, 1999) and is considered to be similar those that are necessary to work with sexual minorities as well (Fassinger & Richie, 1997; Israel & Selvidge, 2003). The overall reliability for the entire scale was found to be 0.91, with each of the subscales showing a respective reliability of 0.88 (awareness), 0.92
(skills), and .73 (knowledge). The overall one-week test-retest reliability correlation coefficient for the SOCS was found to be 0.84 (Bidell, 2003).

**Demographic Survey and Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale**

The demographic survey (Appendix F) was developed by this researcher to gather information about the participants. Information that was collected included: age, gender, race/ethnicity, nationality, sexual orientation, highest degree earned, CACREP accreditation, which accredited CACREP program that they teach in, the number of years they have been a counselor educator, if they are licensed as a counselor (or equivalent) in the state in which they teach and if they currently see clients, if they currently teach a multicultural counseling class, and whether or not the respondent is aware of how their institutions nondiscrimination and benefits policies apply to sexual minority individuals. This information was used to determine faculty characteristics and variables that may share variance with the other constructs being measured.

Fourteen researcher developed Likert-type scale questions (Appendix F) were attached to the demographic survey. The researcher developed questions are related to pedagogical practices that are consistent with Queer Theory and are based on concepts identified in the literature. Queer pedagogy asks the question of how knowledge comes to be known and produced (Luhman, 1998). Sumara & Davis (1999) take this further by saying that the point of queer pedagogy is to show the complex relationships in which sexualities are organized and identified and how this influences the manner in which this information is represented and in turn constructed as knowledge by counselor trainees. Questions 15, 16, 17 and 20 look at the degree to
which counselor educators design their courses to be representative of sexual orientation in the courses subject matter, the syllabi, in the choice of texts and readings, and in relation to other marginalized groups.

Winslade, Monk, and Drewery’s (1997) concept of discourse is the grounding for questions 19 and 23. Discourse involves giving consideration to the power dynamics in language and assisting students to identify who is and is not speaking and who is being objectified and/or marginalized. These questions look at the degree to which the faculty member initiates discussions of the voice of the authors and editors of the texts and the degree that they work at giving the marginalized a voice in their classes.

Eyre (1993) has said that from a queer theory perspective it is vital for each educator to critique his or her role in enforcing and/or challenging current identity categories. This is similar to Winslade, Monk, and Drewary’s (1997) hypothesis of positioning, which says that within discourse the subjects occupy defined positions according to their societally defined identity category. Queer theorists also maintain that existing identity categories are exclusionary and have been developed in relation to the dominant group norms (Tierney, 1997). Questions 22 and 26 have been designed to reflect the degree to which the faculty members address this in their courses.

Current identity categories are believed by queer theorists to serve the role of regulating power relationships (Tierney, 1997). Queer pedagogy follows the belief that it is the role of the faculty member to encourage students to consider the manner in which power operates in society and how it affects the individual both positively and
negatively. Buhrke & Dolce, 1991 have argued that faculty members have an
obligation to acknowledge the power differential between themselves and their
students and that there must be procedures enacted to hear concerns of related to this
power differential. Questions 18, 25, and 27 stem from these discussions.

It has been proposed that issues of power can be addressed by counselor
education faculty members by emphasizing counseling models that lend themselves to
the basic suppositions of queer theory, namely nontraditional approaches to therapy
that promote an adherence to an “ethics and practice of freedom” (Foucault, 1985, p.
5). An example of this would be the constructivist and narrative approaches that
endorse a belief that human behavior is not dictated by a set of universal laws and
rules. This proposal is the source for questions 21 and 24.

Question 28 specifically asks the respondents about their perceived knowledge
of queer theory. The purpose of asking this is that the previous questions are
attempting to determine to what degree the faculty members incorporate queer theory
Techniques in their pedagogical approach to counselor education. It is possible, even
likely, that if they do incorporate aspects of this approach into their pedagogy they
may not be aware that it mirrors the tenets of queer theory. Therefore, the question is
being asked to see if there is a relationship between knowing about queer theory and
teaching from a queer approach. The final question on this survey is optional, open-
ended and asks the respondents to include any thoughts or feelings that they have
about any aspect of this survey. The purpose is to see what, if any, themes may
emerge.
Research Design

A correlational research design was employed to determine the strength and direction of relationships between variables. Because Pearson’s Correlations are bivariate, a stepwise regression analysis will be conducted also. Additionally, a descriptive component of the design allowed for the development of profiles of Counselor Education faculty member’s who teach in CACREP accredited counselor training program, and to determine the perceived multicultural environments in counselor training programs.

Research Questions

1. Does a counselor education program’s multicultural environment, as measured by the MEI-R, have a relationship to the use of queer theory inspired pedagogy?

2. Does a counselor education faculty member’s knowledge, skills, and awareness of gay and lesbian issues, as measured by the SOCS, have a relationship to the use of queer theory inspired pedagogy?

3. Is their a relationship between counselor education faculty member’s score on the SOCS and the score on the MEI-R?

Directional Hypotheses

1. Counselor education faculty members who perceive the environment of their program to be more multiculturally inclusive (as measured by the MEI-R) will be more likely to use queer theory inspired pedagogy (as
measured by the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale) than those who perceive the environment to be less inclusive.

2. Counselor education faculty members whose knowledge, awareness, and skills related to gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals (as measured by the SOCS) are more likely to use queer theory pedagogical practices (as measured by the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale) than those who have less knowledge, awareness and skills related to gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals.

3. Counselor education faculty member’s scores on a measure of self-perceived sexual orientation competency (the SOCS) will be positively correlated to their scores on a measure of perceived multicultural environment (the MEI-R).

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were utilized to profile counselor education faculty members from CACREP-accredited counselor education programs in terms of age, gender, race/ethnicity and nationality, educational level, licensure status, programs accreditation and number of years as a counselor educator, and knowledge of their institutions nondiscrimination and benefits policies. An exploratory factor analysis was run on the researcher developed queer theory inspired pedagogy questions to determine factor structure of the survey. Factor analyses were also conducted on the MEI-R and SOCS to check the factor structure described by the instrument’s authors. Pearson’s Correlations and Stepwise Multiple Regressions were also run using the data gathered from the queer theory pedagogy questions, the MEI-R, and the SOCS to
determine the strength and the direction of the relationships identified in the directional hypotheses. All computations were done using SPSS 12.0.

Ethical Considerations

All participants were informed of the purpose of this study and the ethical safeguards employed. They were assured about the confidentiality of the data; their names will not be revealed and only aggregate data has been reported. They were also informed about the voluntary nature of their participation and that they may have chosen to withdraw at any time without penalty. The guidelines of the Human Subjects Research Committee at The College of William and Mary and of ACA were followed. Permission to carry out this study was obtained from this researcher’s dissertation committee and the Human Subjects Research Committee at The College of William and Mary. It is believed that no harm came to any of the participants as a result of their participation in this study. Participants were offered an opportunity to receive the results of this study via e-mail.

Limitations

In an attempt to control sampling error to the degree possible, this research was conducted as a census of the entire population rather than a survey of a subsample. The intent of conducting a census was to limit threats to generalizability that may be seen when using convenience, random, non-random, systemic, or cluster sampling. However, this is not necessarily to say that this method is without sources of error. Regardless of whether this study is conducted through a census or a survey of a subsample, both rely on individuals volunteering to participate, which limits
generalizability because the characteristics of those that volunteer may not be representative of the target population as a whole (Borg, Gall, & Borg, 1996). It is not possible to control for all the extraneous variables, so the results may be influenced by factors that are unrelated to those that are being measured.

Emailed and web surveys are subject to many of the same limitations inherent to mailed measures. This may include, but is not limited to, participants failing to understand the directions, participant's dishonesty or desire to give socially acceptable answers. Additionally, the MEI-R and the SOCS are both fairly new measures that have not been widely used aside from initial validation studies conducted by the authors. The Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale was constructed by this researcher, so there are currently no findings concerning validity of the measure.
CHAPTER 4

Analysis of Results

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of Counselor Education faculty members concerning the multicultural environment in the program in which they teach. The study examined their attitudes, knowledge, and skills toward gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals, and to what degree queer theory influences their pedagogical approach to counselor education. This chapter presents a brief overview of the sampling procedures that were utilized followed by the results of the statistical and other data analytical procedures used to test the research questions and directional hypotheses. Statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS 12.0 for Windows, with the alpha level set at .05 for all statistical tests.

Sampling Procedures

The target population for this study was counselor educators. For the purpose of this study a “Counselor Educator” was defined as a person who has completed a master’s degree (M.A. or M.S.), or a doctorate degree (PhD, EdD, or PsyD) in counselor education, counseling, counseling psychology, or related area, and was currently employed by a college or university counselor education preparation program that meets two qualifications. First the program had to be accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and second the program had to a physical campus or building where the courses are taught. The second qualification eliminates faculty members from the two
CACREP programs (The University of Phoenix, and Capella University) that are taught completely online.

Based on this criteria, one thousand, three hundred and seventy-nine (1379) email addresses for counselor educators in CACREP accredited programs were identified by systematically reviewing the Internet homepage of 180 counseling programs in 45 states, the District of Columbia, and British Colombia, Canada. This number was adjusted down to one thousand, two hundred and eighty-three (1283) after removing the email addresses that were not valid, and those that belonged to people other than current CACREP accredited counselor education faculty members. Out of the 1283 requests for participation that were sent out, 236 people responded by completing all three of the research instruments which represents an 18.4% return rate.

All of the participants were asked to electronically complete on the Internet the Multicultural Environmental Inventory – Revised (MEI-R, Pope-Davis, et al., 2000), the Sexual Orientation Counselor Scale (SOCS, Bidell, 2003), and a researcher developed demographic questionnaire that had 13 Likert-type questions related to queer theory pedagogy attached to it (instruments are presented in the Appendices). The request for participation emails, which included the hyperlink to the survey, were sent out the week of April 20, 2004. A follow-up request was emailed to all participants on May 4, 2004. The data collection concluded on May 19, 2004.

**Demographic and Descriptive Statistic Results**

There were 236 CACREP-accredited faculty member participants in this study that completed all three of the research instruments. This represents an 18.4% return rate. The demographics are presented in Table 1. The sample consisted of 111 men
(47%), 122 women (51.7%), 2 (0.8%) male to female and 1 (0.4%) female to male transgendered individuals. Of the participants, 192 (81.4%) reported being heterosexual, 28 (11.9%) reported being homosexual, 14 (5.9%) reported being bisexual, and 2 (0.8%) did not report any sexual orientation. The ethnicity of the participants in this study included 16 (6.8%) African Blacks, 2 (0.8%) American Indians, 4 (1.7%) Asians, 189 (80.1%) Caucasian Europeans, 10 (4.2%) Latino(a)/Hispanics, 2 (0.8%) Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders, and 13 (5.5%) indicating “other”. The sample was also broken down into 223 (94.5%) Americans, 6 (2.5%) Canadians, and 7 (3%) indicating other. The mean age of the participants was 48.09 years (SD = 10.57), the range of ages was from 28 – 72 years; there were also 4 participants that did not disclose their age.

Educationally, the participants reported highest degree earned to be 14 (5.9%) MA/MS'; 1 (0.4%) EdS'; 41 (17.4%) EdD.s; 171 (72.5%) PhDs, 3 (1.3) PsyDs; and 6 (2.5%) “others”. The number of years that the participants reported being counselor educators was as follows: 67 (28.4%) with 1 – 5 years, 34 (14.4%) with 6 – 10 years, 59 (25%) with 11-15 years, 31 (13.1%) with 16 – 20 years, 40 (16.9%) with more than 21 years, and 5 (2.1%) that did not respond. There were 154 (65.2%) that are currently licensed as counselors (or equivalent) in their home state, and 111 (47%) that reported currently seeing clients. There are also 69 (29.2%) of the respondents who are currently responsible for teaching their programs multicultural counseling course.

The CACREP-accreditation of the respondents programs were as follows: Career – 16 (6.8%); College – 28 (11.9%); Community – 158 (66.9%); Gerontological – 2 (0.8%); Marriage, Couples, & Family – 54 (22.9%), Mental Health – 70 (29.7%);
School – 185 (78.4%); Student Affairs – 35 (14.8%); and Counselor Education – 109 (46.2%). While the program was CACREP-accredited in these programs, the programs that the respondents primarily taught was as follows: Career – 9 (3.8%); College – 20 (8.5%); Community – 133 (56.4%); Gerontological – 0 (0.0%); Marriage, Couples, & Family – 48 (20.3%), Mental Health – 62 (26.3%); School – 126 (53.4%); Student Affairs – 21 (8.9%); and Counselor Education – 93 (39.4%).

An attempt was made to find comparison data for this population, however there appear to be no demographic summaries for counselor educators in CACREP-accredited programs available.

Table 1*

Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N=236)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male to Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None Reported</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1 continues on the next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African/Black</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/European</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino(a)/Hispanic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdD.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instrumentation

This section provides a review of the instrumentation, including description of the response sets, the factor analysis of each scale, and the reliability information on each scale.

Demographic Questionnaire and Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale

The Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale is a researcher developed instrument that included 13 Likert-style questions that were attached to the end of the demographic questionnaire. From the initial 236 completed research packets there were 4 (1.7%) participants that left more than 33% of the questions unanswered on the queer pedagogy scale therefore their responses were invalidated to ensure the highest reliability and validity, leaving 232 surveys that were scored. The scoring of the instrument is based on the two factors, Concrete and Conceptual (which are discussed in more detail below), the scores from each subsection (factor) are totaled to provide one score for each. The Concrete subscale has a score range of 8.00 – 56.00, the mean score was 40.48 (SD = 9.21) and the median was 43.00. The range of scores for the Concrete scale was 17.00 – 56.00. The Conceptual subscale has a score range of 9.00 – 63.00, the mean score 48.97 (SD = 10.29) and the median was 51.00. The range of scores for the Conceptual scale was 10.00 – 63.00.

Factor Analysis of Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale. An exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the researcher-developed queer theory pedagogy questions to determine the underlying structure of the questionnaire. The fourteen questions
were factor analyzed using SPSS 12.0 and thirteen were found to be grouped into two factors (Table 2), the final question did not load onto either factor.

Table 2

Rotated Factor Matrix(a) for Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QTPS 15</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTPS 16</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTPS 17</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td>.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTPS 18</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTPS 19</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTPS 20</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTPS 21</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTPS 22</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTPS 23</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTPS 24</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTPS 25</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTPS 26</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTPS 27</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTPS 28</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

Because the two factor solution was strong, the two factor scores were used as the indicators for the scale. The two factor solution accounted for 61.18% of the variance. These two factors have been labeled Concrete and Conceptual. The naming of the factors is due to whether the question refers to a concrete action that you can include in a course (e.g. include sexual orientation in a syllabi or in textbook selection) or if it is a conceptual action that directs the manner in which a course is taught (e.g. initiating discussion of the impact that power and control have on knowledge, or
acknowledging the position and voice of a text’s author or editor). The Concrete factor includes questions 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, and 26 from the demographic questionnaire, while the Conceptual questions are 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27. Question 28 did not load onto either of the factors, which was to be expected as the question does not inquire into pedagogical practices, but rather perceived knowledge of queer theory.

The overall reliability estimate for the researcher developed 13-item queer theory pedagogy scale was run using SPSS 12.0 to determine the consistency, stability and precision of the instrument. It was found to have an overall Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.931. Each of the subscales were also checked for reliability, the Concrete factor had a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.897, and the Conceptual factor had a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.915.

*Multicultural Environmental Inventory – Revised*

From the original 236 returned survey packets, one respondent (0.4%) left all answers on the MEI-R blank, therefore that response was invalidated to assure the highest reliability and validity. The MEI-R has two scoring methods, an overall total score, and individual subscale scores. For this study, the method used will be the individual subscale scoring method. Factor analysis of the scale and its subscales will be discussed in the next section. The Curriculum & Supervision subscale has a score range from 11 – 55. The mean was 39.88 (SD = 8.06) and the median was 40.00. The range of scores for this subscale was 19 – 55. The Climate and Comfort subscale gives a possibility of scores ranging from 11 – 55. The mean was 45.07 (SD = 7.30) and the median was 45.00. The scores ranged from 21 – 55. The scores on this subscale
ranged from 21 – 55. The Honesty in Recruitments subscale has a possibility of scores ranging from 3 – 15. In this study the mean was 12.32 (SD = 2.95) and the median was 13.00. The scores ranged from 3 – 15. The final subscale on the MEI-R is Multicultural Research, which has scores ranging from 2 – 10. The mean was 7.31 (SD = 2.00) and the median was 8.00. The range of scores was from 2 – 10. The authors of the MEI-R do not provide means, medians, range of scores, or standard deviations in their published article, so no comparison between this data and theirs may be made at this time.

Factor Analysis of the Multicultural Environmental Inventory – Revised. An exploratory factor analysis was done on the MEI-R using the data that this researcher obtained to determine if the structure that the scale authors have reported is the most appropriate for use with this sample. After conducting the factor analysis using SPSS 12.0 it was determined that the factors found using this data (Table 3) did not match with those found by the authors of the MEI-R in their analysis (Table 4), the only exception would be the author’s factor 3 (research) which matched exactly to these data. Furthermore, the factor loadings from this research do not appear to support logical factors; therefore, since the factor analysis of the current data was not successful, all further calculations will be done using the matrix that has been proposed by Pope-Davis et. al. (2000). The MEI-R author’s factors account for 68% of the variance. The MEI-R has two possible scoring methods, the first is to have a separate score for each of the four factors, which would provide an individual score for the person’s perception about the multicultural nature of various aspects of the multicultural training environment, however, further factor analysis found no support
for the reduction of these four factors into a single factor total score, therefore the individual factor scores will be used for further analyses.

Table 3

Rotated Factor Matrix(a) for the MEI-R

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEI 1</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td><strong>.885</strong></td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 2</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td><strong>.621</strong></td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 3</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td><strong>.677</strong></td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 4</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td><strong>.730</strong></td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 5</td>
<td><strong>.454</strong></td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 6</td>
<td><strong>.476</strong></td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 7</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 8</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 9</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 10</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 11</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 12</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td><strong>.400</strong></td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 13</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td><strong>.484</strong></td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 14</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 15</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td><strong>.471</strong></td>
<td>.158</td>
<td><strong>.686</strong></td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 16</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td><strong>.841</strong></td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>-.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 17</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td><strong>.712</strong></td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 18</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td><strong>.694</strong></td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 19</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td><strong>.880</strong></td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 20</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td><strong>.732</strong></td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 21</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td><strong>.422</strong></td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td><strong>.447</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 22</td>
<td><strong>.405</strong></td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 23</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 24</td>
<td><strong>.429</strong></td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td><strong>.504</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 25</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 26</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 27</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td><strong>.582</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 9 iterations.
Table 4

| MEI items and factor loadings obtained with the pattern matrix of the oblique solutions |
|----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                                  | Factors          |                  |                  |                  |
|                                  | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    |
| MEI 1                            | .70  | -.00 | .12  | .12  |
| MEI 2                            | .75  | -.00 | -.00 | .26  |
| MEI 3                            | .00  | .50  | .00  | .20  |
| MEI 4                            | -.23 | .76  | -.00 | .22  |
| MEI 5                            | .73  | -.00 | -.00 | .22  |
| MEI 6                            | .00  | .00  | .00  | .88  |
| MEI 7                            | .25  | -.00 | .00  | .83  |
| MEI 8                            | .79  | -.00 | .14  | -.00 |
| MEI 9                            | .71  | .22  | -.00 | -.00 |
| MEI 10                           | .81  | .13  | -.00 | -.00 |
| MEI 11                           | .79  | .17  | -.00 | -.00 |
| MEI 12                           | .20  | .59  | -.00 | .16  |
| MEI 13                           | -.00 | .85  | -.00 | -.11 |
| MEI 14                           | .74  | .11  | -.12 | -.00 |
| MEI 15                           | .20  | .76  | -.00 | -.11 |
| MEI 16                           | -.00 | .89  | .12  | -.15 |
| MEI 17                           | -.00 | .86  | -.00 | -.14 |
| MEI 18                           | .00  | -.00 | .87  | -.00 |
| MEI 19                           | .00  | .12  | .88  | .00  |
| MEI 20                           | -.00 | .00  | .85  | .15  |
| MEI 21                           | .22  | .72  | -.00 | -.16 |
| MEI 22                           | .61  | .14  | -.00 | .12  |
| MEI 23                           | .63  | -.11 | -.00 | -.13 |
| MEI 24                           | .77  | .12  | -.00 | -.00 |
| MEI 25                           | .24  | .68  | -.00 | -.00 |
| MEI 26                           | -.00 | .77  | -.00 | -.00 |
| MEI 27                           | .25  | .45  | -.00 | .13  |

(Pope-Davis, et. al., 2000, p. 61)

The overall reliability estimate for the MEI-R was run using SPSS 12.0 to determine the consistency, stability and precision of the instrument. The MEI-R has reported reliability scores of 0.94 for the overall 27 item scale; 0.92 for the Curriculum and Supervision factor; 0.92 for the Climate and Comfort factor; 0.85 for the Honesty
in Recruitment factor; and 0.83 for the Research factor (Pope-Davis, 2000). In this study the reliability of the overall MEI-R was found to have a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.928; for the Curriculum and Supervision factor, 0.875; for the Climate and Comfort factor, 0.855; for the Honesty in Recruitment factor, 0.895; and for the Research factor, 0.695.

*Sexual Orientation Counselor Scale*

Out of the original 236 participants who completed the survey instruments, four (1.6%) of the responses for the SOCS were invalidated due to respondents leaving more than 33% of the 29 questions unanswered. The SOCS has two scoring methods, the first being an overall total score and the second being individual scores on each of the three subscales, for this study the individual subscale scoring method was used. Factor analysis of the scale will be discussed in the next section. The range of scores for each of the subscales is 1.00 - 7.00. The Awareness subscale from this study had a mean of 6.19 (SD = 0.97) and a median of 6.50. The scores ranged from 2.00 to 7.00. The Skills subscale had a mean of 5.04 (SD = 1.42) and a median of 5.33. The range of scores was from 1.17 to 7.00. The third subscale of the SOCS is the Knowledge scale, which had a mean of 4.84, a median of 5.00, and a standard deviation of 1.15. The scores ranged from 1.71 to 7.00. The validation study conducted by the author of the scale using 287 subjects found that the Awareness subscale had a mean of 6.46 (SD = 0.80), the Skills subscale had a mean of 4.80 (SD = 1.47), and the Knowledge subscale had a mean of 4.18 (SD = 1.12) (Biddell, 2003). The means and the standard deviations from the scores in this study are not statistically different than those from the original validation study conducted by Bidell.
These findings lend additional support to the reliability and validity of the SOCS.

*Factor Analysis of the Sexual Orientation Counselor Scale.* The factor analysis that was conducted using the SOCS data collected from this study supported the structure reported by Biddell (2003). The three factor solution found using these data (Table 5) match up with that of the three factors that the instruments author reported (Table 6). The three factor solution found using the data from this study accounts for 48.70%. The SOCS, like the MEI-R, may be scored using one of two methods, either an individual score for each of the three individual factors or one total score. In order to determine if the three individual factors could be reduced down to one a second factor analysis of the three original factors was conducted. There was no evidence that these three factors could be reduced to one overall factor, therefore all additional analyses will be conducted using the three factor solution.

Table 5*

| Rotated Factor Matrix(a) for the Sexual Orientation Counselor Scale |
|------------------|---|---|---|
|                  | 1  | 2  | 3  |
| SOCS 1           | .585| .080| .191 |
| SOCS 2           | .102| .731| .051 |
| SOCS 3           | .611| .151| .225 |
| SOCS 4           | .842| .018| -.056|
| SOCS 5           | .014| .099| .420 |
| SOCS 6           | .658| .212| .139 |
| SOCS 7           | .713| .043| -.092|
| SOCS 8           | .825| .044| -.033|
| SOCS 9           | .335| .089| .414 |
| SOCS 10          | .138| .658| .124 |

*Table 5 is continued on the next page
Table 6

Pattern matrix factor loading estimates on the three-factor oblique model with the Sexual Orientation Counselor Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCS 1</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCS 2</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCS 3</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCS 4</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCS 5</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCS 6</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCS 7</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCS 8</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCS 9</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCS 10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCS 11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCS 12</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCS 13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6 is continued on the next page
The overall reliability estimate for the SOCS was run using SPSS 12.0 to determine the consistency, stability and precision of the instrument. Bidell (2003) reported that the SOCS has an overall reliability coefficient alpha of 0.91; 0.88 for the Awareness subscale; 0.92 for the Skills subscale; and 0.73 for the Knowledge subscale. From this study, the SOCS was found to have an overall Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.923; for the Awareness factor, 0.877; for the Skills factor, 0.918; and for the Knowledge factor, 0.784.

### Analysis of Directional Hypotheses

#### Hypothesis One: Relationship between MEI-R and Queer Theory Pedagogy

Counselor education faculty members who perceive the environment of their program to be more multiculturally inclusive (as measured by the MEI-R) will be more likely to use queer theory inspired pedagogy (as measured by the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale) than those who perceive the environment to be less inclusive.
A Pearson’s Correlation was employed using the MEI-R and the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale to determine what, if any, relationship exists. Specifically, the each of the two factors (Concrete and Conceptual) were correlated with the MEI-R total score and with each of the individual MEI-R factors (Table 7), significant findings have been highlighted.

With an alpha level at .05, there was a significant positive correlation between the Concrete factor and the MEI-R total, $r = .244$, $p = .00$. However, because there is some concern over the legitimacy of the one overall score on the MEI-R versus the four individual subscale scores, the Concrete factor was correlated with each of the individual subscales as well. A significant positive correlation was found between Concrete and Curriculum & Supervision, $r = .151$, $p = .022$; between Concrete and Climate & Comfort, $r = .194$, $p = .000$; between Honesty in Recruitment, $r = .293$, $p = .000$; and between Multicultural Research, $r = .285$, $p = .000$. While there is significance at the .05 level between the Concrete scale and each of the MEI-R subscales it must be noted that the strength of the correlation is weak. The strongest correlations are between Concrete and the Honesty in Recruitment ($r = .293$) and the Multicultural Research ($r = .285$).

There is a positive correlation between the Conceptual scale and the MEI-R total score, $r = .169$, $p = .010$ at the .05 level, however the same concern applies toward the legitimacy of one overall score. Therefore the Conceptual scale was correlated with each of the subscales as well. A significant positive correlation was found between Conceptual and Curriculum & Supervision, $r = .186$, $p = .005$; between Conceptual and Honesty in Recruitment, $r = .201$, $p = .002$; and between Conceptual
and Multicultural Research, \( r = .207, p = .001 \). While there is significance at the .05 level between the Conceptual scale and three of the MEI-R subscales the same concern exists as with the Concrete scale, the strength of each is weak. The strongest correlations are between Conceptual and the Honesty in Recruitment \( (r = .201) \) and the Multicultural Research \( (r = .207) \).

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mei total</th>
<th>curriculum</th>
<th>climate</th>
<th>Honesty</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Pearson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Conceptual     | Pearson   |            |         |         |          |
| Correlation    | .169      | .186       | .046    | .201    | .207     |
| Sig. (2-tailed)| .010      | .005       | .482    | .002    | .001     |
| N              | 232       | 232        | 232     | 232     | 232      |

Because the Pearson’s Correlation is Bivariate in nature and only measures the degree of a relationship between two variables, stepwise regression analyses were conducted. MEI-R total and each of the subscales (Predictor Values), and the Concrete factor (Dependent Variable) were entered into the stepwise regression (Tables 8 & 9), followed by the same Predictor Values with the Conceptual factor as the Dependent Variable (Table 10 & 11) to test hypothesis one.

Using the stepwise regression method with the MEI-R’s subscales and the Concrete scale, a significant model emerged \( (r \text{ squared } = .086, F(1, 230) = 21.58, p = .00) \) for Model 1, and for Model 2 \( (r \text{ squared } = .122, F(2, 229) = 15.96, p = .002) \).
Table 8

Stepwise Regression with Concrete Factors and MEI-R

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.293 (a)</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.88410425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.350 (b)</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.86814189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), honesty
b Predictors: (Constant), honesty, research

Table 9

Coefficients(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant) - .850</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>-4.428</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honesty .072</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>4.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant) -1.274</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>-5.463</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honesty .053</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>3.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research .089</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>3.088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Concrete

Using the stepwise regression method with the MEI-R’s subscales and the Conceptual scale, a significant model also emerged, \( r^2 = .043 \), \( F(1, 230) = 10.34 \), \( p = .00 \) for Model 1, \( r^2 = .061 \), \( F(2, 229) = 7.45 \), \( p = .00 \) for Model 2, \( r^2 = .078 \), \( F(3, 228) = 6.45 \) for Model 3, \( r^2 = .099 \), \( F(4, 227) = 6.23 \) for Model 4, and \( r^2 = .088 \), \( F(3, 228) = 7.38 \) for Model 5.
Table 10

Stepwise Regression using Conceptual Factors & MEI-R

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.207(a)</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.87509281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.247(b)</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.86867259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.280(c)</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.86261185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.314(d)</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.85476084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.297(e)</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.85779678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), research
b Predictors: (Constant), research, honesty
c Predictors: (Constant), research, honesty, climate
d Predictors: (Constant), research, honesty, climate, curriculum
e Predictors: (Constant), honesty, climate, curriculum

Table 11*

Coefficients(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.628</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>-3.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.873</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>-3.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.380</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>-1.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.477</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>-1.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Table 11 is continued on the next page
Hypothesis Two: Relationship between the SOCS and Queer Theory Pedagogy

Counselor education faculty members who have greater knowledge, awareness, and skills related to gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals (as measured by the SOCS) are more likely to use queer theory pedagogical practices (as measured by the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale) than those who are have less knowledge, awareness and skills related to gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals.

A Pearson’s Correlation was employed using the SOCS and the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale to determine what, if any, relationship exists. Specifically, the each of the two factors (Concrete and Conceptual) from the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale were correlated with the SOCS total score and with each of the individual SOCS factors (Table 12), significant findings have been highlighted.
There was a significant positive correlation between the Concrete factor and the SOCS total, $r = .342$, $p = .00$. However, because there is some concern over the legitimacy of the one overall score on the MEI-R versus the four individual subscale scores, the Concrete factor was correlated with each of the individual subscales as well. A significant positive correlation was found between Concrete and Skills, $r = .233$, $p = .00$; and between Concrete and Knowledge, $r = .358$, $p = .00$. While there is significance at the .05 level between the Concrete scale and each of the SOCS subscales it must be noted that the strength of the correlation is moderate. The strongest correlations are between Concrete and Knowledge ($r = .358$).

There is a positive correlation between the Conceptual scale and the SOCS total score, $r = .557$, $p = .00$ at the .05 level, however the same concern applies toward the legitimacy of one overall score. Therefore the Conceptual scale was correlated with each of the subscales as well. A significant positive correlation was found between Conceptual and Awareness, $r = .197$, $p = .003$; between Conceptual and Skills, $r = .369$, $p = .00$; and between Conceptual and Knowledge, $r = .419$, $p = .00$. It is worth noting that while there is significance at the .05 level between the Conceptual scale and all three of the SOCS subscales, the strength of the Awareness correlation is weak. The other two (Skills and Knowledge) are moderate with $r = .369$ and $r = .419$ respectively.
Table 12

Correlations between Concrete and Conceptual Factors and SOCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>soc_total</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concrete</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conceptual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the Pearson’s Correlation is bivariate in nature and only measures the degree of a relationship between two variables, stepwise regression analyses were conducted. SOCS total and each of the subscales (Predictor Values), and the Concrete factor (Dependent Variable) were entered into the stepwise regression (Tables 13 & 14), followed by the same Predictor Values with the Conceptual factor as the Dependent Variable (Table 15 & 16) to test hypothesis two.

Using the stepwise regression method with the SOCS’ subscales and the Concrete scale, a significant model emerged ($r^2 = .128$, $F(1, 230) = 33.91$, $p = .00$) for Model 1, and for Model 2 ($r^2 = .178$, $F(2, 229) = 24.75$, $p = .00$).

Table 13

Stepwise Regression using Concrete Factors & SOCS
Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.358(a)</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.86321082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.422(b)</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.84029188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Knowledge
b Predictors: (Constant), Knowledge, Skills
Using the stepwise regression method with the SOCS’ subscales and the Conceptual scale, a significant model also emerged, $r^2 = .175$, $F(1, 230) = 48.90$, $p = .00$ for Model 1, $r^2 = .303$, $F(2, 229) = 49.70$, $p = .00$ for Model 2, $r^2 = .334$, $F(3, 228) = 38.04$ for Model 3.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.419(a)</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.81234751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.550(b)</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.74863388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.578(c)</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>.73345278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Predictors: (Constant), Knowledge  

b Predictors: (Constant), Knowledge, Skills  

c Predictors: (Constant), Knowledge, Skills, Awareness
Table 16

Coefficients(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Conceptual

There was a significant positive relationship found between the Concrete factor on the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale and the Knowledge and Skills subscales of the SOCS, which accounts for almost 18% of the shared variance. There was also a significant positive relationship found between the Conceptual factor on the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale and all three of the SOCS subscales (Knowledge, Skills, and Awareness), which accounts for 33.4% of the shared variance. Therefore, this hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis Three: Relationship between the SOCS and MEI-R

Counselor education faculty member’s scores on a measure of self-perceived sexual orientation competency (the SOCS) will be positively correlated to their scores on a measure of perceived multicultural environment (the MEI-R) which will be positively correlated to the use of queer theory pedagogy.
A Pearson's Correlation was employed using the SOCS total and each of its subscales and the MEI-R total and each of its subscales to determine what, if any, relationship exists (Table 17), significant findings have been highlighted.

With an alpha level at .05, there was a significant positive correlation between the MEI-R and the SOCS total, r = .160, p = .015. However, because there is some concern over the legitimacy of the one overall score on the MEI-R and SOCS versus the individual subscale scores, the subscales were correlated with each other as well. The only significant positive correlations that were found were between three of the MEI-R subscales (Curriculum & Supervision, Climate & Comfort, and Multicultural Research) and the SOCS’ Skills subscale (with Curriculum & Supervision r = .154, p = .019; Climate & Comfort, r = .132, p = .044; Multicultural Research, r = .149, p = .023. While there is significance at the .05 level between these subscales it must be noted that the strength of the correlation is very low and there is very little correlation between the other subscales. However because there was significance found, this hypothesis is accepted.

Table 17*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Soc total</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mei_total</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Table 17 continues on the next page
### Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>.146</th>
<th>.101</th>
<th>.132</th>
<th>-.031</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Honesty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>.074</th>
<th>-.072</th>
<th>.062</th>
<th>.117</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>.232</th>
<th>.056</th>
<th>.149</th>
<th>.231</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conclusion

This chapter presented the results of an exploration of the relationships among Counselor Education faculty members' scores on the Multicultural Environmental Inventory – Revised, the Sexual Orientation Counselor Scale, and the researcher developed Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale. The next chapter examines the implications that the statistically significant findings in Counselor Education, as well as the limitations of the study.
A review of the current literature and research has demonstrated that counseling programs are not effectively training counselors to appropriately work with issues relevant to gay men and lesbians, and are leaving new counselors feeling incompetent to provide services to this segment of society (Bieschek, et al., 1998; Flores, et al., 1995; Phillips & Fischer, 1998; Thomas & Fishburn, 1977). However, the major professional counseling and credentialing boards have charged their members to challenge heterosexual bias and to disseminate accurate information about sexual orientation (ACA, 2003; CACREP, 2001). Counselor educators have also been ethically mandated to impart information on human diversity in all of their courses (ACA, 1995).

The review of the literature also highlighted factors that may perpetuate the exclusion of frank discussions about sexual orientation from counselor education programs. Two specific factors that have been identified are: 1) counselor educators themselves may have a limited knowledge of issues related to sexual orientation (Eliason, 2000); and 2) the organizational climate within the graduate mental health training program may not support it (Pilkington & Cantor, 1996). These two factors appear to contribute heavily to whether or not sexual orientation is infused into the overall training component of counselor trainees. Queer theory has offered a platform to examine the pedagogy and curriculum that are accommodating to the incorporation of sexual orientation and related issues.
This study surveyed 1283 Counselor Education faculty members from 180 CACREP-accredited schools in 45 states, the District of Columbia, and British Columbia, Canada. From this group, 236 individuals completed the surveys; resulting in an 18.4% return rate, however, four of these responses were invalidated due to not completing the entire instrument, leaving 232 completed surveys for analysis. The instruments included in the survey were the Multicultural Environmental Inventory – Revised (MEI-R), the Sexual Orientation Counselor Scale (SOCS), and the researcher developed Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale which was attached to the demographic survey. Initially the data from each instrument was factor analyzed to determine the factor structure. Following this the data was put through Pearson’s correlations and stepwise regression analyses to test the study’s three directional hypotheses.

Hypothesis One

Counselor education faculty members who perceive the environment of their program to be more multiculturally inclusive (as measured by the MEI-R) will be more likely to use queer theory inspired pedagogy (as measured by the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale) than those who perceive the environment to be less inclusive.

There are two methods in which to score the MEI-R. The first method provides a total score of the participant’s perception of the multicultural environment in which they teach. The second method provides four individual scores for each of the subscales (factors) related to the individual aspects of the multicultural environment (Curriculum & Supervision, Climate & Comfort, Honesty in Recruitment, and Multicultural Research) (Pope-Davis et al., 2000). However, this research found no support through factor analysis to reduce the four individual factors into one overall
factor, therefore all separate regression analyses were run on each of the four. The factor analysis of the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale produced two separate factors (Concrete, and Conceptual) which also warranted a separate regression analyses to be run on each.

Using the stepwise regression analyses with the MEI-R’s subscales and the Concrete scale, a significant model emerged for hypothesis one (r squared = .086, F(1, 230) = 21.58, p = .00) for Model 1, and for Model 2 (r squared = .122, F(2, 229) = 15.96, p = .002). Significance was found using the stepwise regression method with the MEI-R’s subscales and the Conceptual scale as well (r squared = .043, F(1, 230) = 10.34, p = .00 for Model 1, r squared = .061, F(2, 229) = 7.45, p = .00 for Model 2, r squared = .078, F(3, 228) = 6.45 for Model 3, r squared = .099, F(4, 227) = 6.23 for Model 4, and r squared = .088, F(3, 228) = 7.38 for Model 5).

Because a significant positive relationship at the .05 level was found between the Concrete factor on the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale and Honesty in Recruitment and Multicultural Research subscales of the MEI-R (which accounted for 12% of the shared variance), and between the Conceptual factor on the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale and Honesty in Recruitment, Climate & Comfort, and Curriculum subscales of the MEI-R (which accounted for almost 9% of the shared variance), this hypothesis was accepted.

**Hypothesis Two**

Counselor education faculty members who have greater knowledge, awareness, and skills related to gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals (as measured by the SOCS) are more likely to use queer theory pedagogical practices (as measured by
the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale) than those who are have less knowledge, awareness and skills related to gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals.

There are two methods in which to score the SOCS. The first method measures the overall awareness, skills, and knowledge that counselors when working with gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals and issues. The second method provides individual scores for each of these three factors (Bidell, 2003). However, this research found no support through factor analysis to reduce the three individual factors into one overall factor, therefore all separate regression analyses were run using each individual factor combined with each of the factors from the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale.

Using the stepwise regression method with the SOCS’ subscales and the Concrete scale, a significant model emerged ($r^2 = .128, F(1, 230) = 33.91, p = .00$) for Model 1, and for Model 2 ($r^2 = .178, F(2, 229) = 24.75, p = .00$). Significance was found using the stepwise regression method with the SOCS’ subscales and the Conceptual scale as well, ($r^2 = .175, F(1, 230) = 48.90, p = .00$ for Model 1, $r^2 = .303, F(2, 229) = 49.70, p = .00$ for Model 2, $r^2 = .334, F(3, 228) = 38.04$ for Model 3).

Because a significant positive relationship at the .05 level was found between the Concrete factor on the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale and the Knowledge and Skills subscales of the SOCS (which accounts for almost 18% of the shared variance), and a significant positive relationship at the .05 level was also found between the Conceptual factor on the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale and all three of the SOCS subscales (which accounts for 33.4% of the shared variance), this hypothesis was accepted.
Hypothesis Three

Counselor education faculty member's scores on a measure of self-perceived sexual orientation competency (the SOCS) will be positively correlated to their scores on a measure of perceived multicultural environment (the MEI-R).

With an alpha level at .05, there was a significant positive correlation between the MEI-R and the SOCS total, \( r = .160, p = .015 \). However, because there is some concern over the legitimacy of the one overall score on the MEI-R and SOCS versus the individual subscale scores, the subscales were correlated with each other as well. The only significant positive correlations that were found were between three of the MEI-R subscales (Curriculum & Supervision, Climate & Comfort, and Multicultural Research) and the SOCS’ Skills subscale (with Curriculum & Supervision \( r = .154, p = .019 \); Climate & Comfort, \( r = .132, p = .044 \); Multicultural Research, \( r = .149, p = .023 \). While there is significance at the .05 level between these subscales it must be noted that the strength of the correlation is very low and due to this and the fact that there is no correlation between the other subscales, however because there was significance found this hypothesis is accepted.

Discussion

The direction of this study was guided by the three research questions, further discussion of the study’s results will be used to answer these questions:

1. Does a counselor education program’s multicultural environment, as measured by the MEI-R, have a relationship to the use of queer theory inspired pedagogy?
2. Does a counselor education faculty member’s knowledge, skills, and awareness of gay and lesbian issues, as measured by the SOCS, have a relationship to the use of queer theory inspired pedagogy?

3. Is there a relationship between counselor education faculty member’s score on the SOCS and the score on the MEI-R?

**Multicultural Environment and Queer Theory Pedagogy**

In recent years, Counselor Education programs have begun to recognize the importance of incorporating culturally sensitive information into the curriculum and have been devoting resources to improving the multicultural climate of the training program (Ponteroto, et al., 1995; Pope-Davis, et al., 2000). However, much of this attention and increased funding have revolved around little more than the addition of a multicultural counseling course to the present curriculum. D’Andrea & Daniels (1991) have said that this type of inclusion is the beginning of multicultural competency development and that programs require additional attention and consideration to multicultural issues to be considered multiculturally competent.

Many multicultural training programs are unlikely to succeed without having a multicultural training philosophy specifically defined and embedded throughout the entire program (Leach & Carlton, 1997). According to Ridley, et al., (1994) this multicultural training philosophy needs to be the foundation from which learning objectives, instructional strategies, program designs, and evaluative mechanisms are derived. All training programs are philosophically based, however many programs have philosophies that are based on Eurocentric, middle-class values and beliefs. The
criticism of this approach arises from the belief that it overlooks the sociopolitical realities of diverse groups (Sue & Sue, 1999).

Programs that have incorporated philosophies reflective of the Eurocentric organizational, theoretical, clinical, supervisory, and research models often appear to be diametrically opposed to culturally based models that emphasize holism, collectivism, spirituality, sociopolitical influences, culture-specific values, lifestyles, and historical context (Ivey, 1994). Examples of this can be seen by examining the manner in which programs do or do not incorporate student input in faculty meetings (hierarchy, power, control), use traditional or nontraditional teaching and testing methods (logical, positivism), and attend to traditional and nontraditional therapy models (intrapsychic, reliance, individualism) (Leach & Carlton, 1997; Sue & Sue, 1999). Multicultural awareness must also include an understanding of one's own cultural socialization and associated biases and is a necessary component of understanding the world views of others (Arredondo et al., 1996; Sue et al., 1992; Sacco-Benne, 2004). For a counselor to be able to work competently with diverse clients, it is imperative that this knowledge and awareness to extend beyond race and ethnicity and into all forms of cultural difference, including sexual orientation.

While it is important to address issues directly related to teaching and knowledge, the learning environment also needs to be addressed. It is import for the environment of the program to model and reinforce a cultural environment that both honors and includes diversity and multiculturalism. Choosing not to acknowledge attitudes, beliefs, and experiences that do not support a diverse environment is to assume that it does not impact the learning environment (Gloria & Pope-Davis, 1997).
Ponterotto et al. (1995) have identified several themes that they see as necessary for counselor training programs to address to become multiculturally competent: 1) curriculum issues; 2) counseling practice and supervision; 3) research considerations; 4) student and faculty competency evaluations; 5) physical environment; and 6) minority representation. Queer theory offers one avenue to address all of these issues and to provide the basis for a new training philosophy. The MEI-R directly and indirectly measures these six themes, while the Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale looks at the manner in which faculty incorporate pedagogical practices that are consistent with culturally based models rather than traditional Eurocentric ones.

Programmatically it is necessary for counselor educators to evaluate the cultural values and assumptions that are implicit in the current structure of the training program – including course offerings, counseling populations to whom trainees are exposed, research encouraged and/or permitted by students and faculty, admissions and evaluation decisions, and the overall culture of the program (Fassinger & Richie, 1997). The positive correlation found in the present study demonstrates that Counselor Education faculty members who perceive their program to be more multiculturally inclusive are more likely to use pedagogical techniques that are closely related to the tenets of queer theory than those who find their program to be less inclusive. Based on the results of this study, queer theory may provide a viable framework for enhancing the cultural environment and the education of future counseling trainees.

*Sexual Orientation Competency and Queer Theory Pedagogy*

The results from this study have shown a positive correlation between faculty member's knowledge, attitudes, and skills toward gay men and lesbians and their use
of pedagogy consistent with the tenets of queer theory. The Conceptual aspect of queer theory pedagogy accounts for 33.4% of the shared variance with the subscales of the SOCS, while the Concrete accounts for 17.8%. These findings lend support to the queer theory canon that curriculum and pedagogy have the obligation to interrupt heteronormative thinking in order to promote social justice and to broaden the possibilities available to students for perceiving, interpreting, and representing the vast potential of the human experience (Sumara & Davis, 1999).

Queer theory proposes that curriculum and pedagogy can be used as an avenue to assist students understand the difference between categories of people and the individual person him- or herself. Queer theory challenges counselor educators to assist students to become reflective practitioners that are able to understand the constructed nature of identity categories and how these have been developed in relation to dominant group norms.

Sue and Sue (1999) identify three broad categories for defining a culturally competent counselor, based on their attitudes, knowledge, and skills as related to cultural difference. Attitude refers to counselors’ awareness of their own assumptions, values, and biases and includes an awareness of their own cultural and culturally induced beliefs and attitudes. It also includes individuals respect for differences and motivation to recognize their personal limitations without feeling threatened. Knowledge refers to counselors’ understanding of the worldview of the culturally different client, and includes specific knowledge of the social/political/cultural factors and barriers that impact clients. Knowledge also encompasses familiarity with counseling techniques that address these features. While skills refers to counselors’
aptitude for developing appropriate intervention strategies and techniques for working with diverse clients, and includes a varied behavioral repertoire regarding communication skills as well as an awareness of the impact of their therapeutic style on the client and the therapeutic relationship (Fassinger & Ritchie, 1997).

Bidell (2003) uses these same broad categories as the framework for the SOCS. In this case the attitudes component encompasses personal beliefs and assumptions concerning sexual minority individuals and clients. It also refers to the internalized societal homoprejudice that some counselors may find challenging to overcome, particularly those that have little (known) contact with gay men or lesbians. In this case, the knowledge component also includes having an understanding of the social, political, cultural, and legal realities experienced by sexual minorities living in a society that rewards heterosexuality. Knowledge also encompasses the ability for a counselor to use existing theoretical counseling models with their lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients. The knowledge component is closely related to the skills component in this case as well. Most counselors’ have been trained in fairly traditional methods of counseling, so it becomes necessary to expand their intervention and therapeutic techniques to allow for effective counseling with sexual minority clients. This includes having the awareness and being able to act as a referral and information source regarding community resources for their queer clients.

Incorporating consideration of sexual orientation into counselor training programs must be done in numerous ways and at a number of levels. Queer theory offers a mode of pedagogy that evaluates how knowledge about sexuality comes to be produced and known (Luhman, 1998) and how this is constructed as knowledge by
counselor trainees (Sumara & Davis, 1999). Queer theory also offers methods to address sociopolitical issues, such as power, privilege, and/or fear, which may serve to block the infusion of cultural competence into counseling programs (Toperek & Reza, 2001). The queer theory perspective may also be particularly important when considering the role that a counselor educator’s personal identity and history plays in their ability to incorporate cultural diversity into their current curriculum and pedagogy.

The positive correlation found in this hypothesis supports the idea that the greater the sexual orientation competency the more likely one is to use pedagogical techniques inspired by queer theory. However, whether queer theory pedagogical practices are a result of having greater competence in issues related to sexual orientation or the competency influences the pedagogy or if there is a third variable influencing both is unknown at this point. Whichever the case may be does not change the fact that counselor educators have a responsibility not only to their students, but also to the potential clients those students will counsel, to provide training that will increase counselor competence with diverse clients (Israel & Selvidge, 2003).

**Multicultural Environment & Sexual Orientation Competency**

While the results of this study have found a correlation between the multicultural environment of the program and the knowledge, attitudes, and skills related to sexual orientation competency which warrants accepting the hypothesis, the low power and lack of correlation between the other subscales, it was decided to ultimately reject the validity of these findings. One reason that these findings have been rejected is due to the decision to use the MEI-R as the instrument to measure the
multicultural environment. The instrument's reported structure was unable to be replicated through factor analysis using the data collected in this study. There are no published reports that have tested the psychometric properties of the revised version of the Multicultural Environmental Inventory. The only information that was available was based on the initial validation study the used 53 items, everything that has been attributed the MEI-R has been hypothesized from this original study.

Because the factor structure as hypothesized by the instrument's authors and the factor structure identified using the data from this study were so vastly different, it would be prudent to question the whether or not the instrument is truly measuring what it reports it does. Another factor that may have affected these results is that while this study used only faculty members, the original validation sample of the MEI was made up of faculty members (31%) and graduate students (66%). There were also several of the respondents from this study that included additional comments such as "on the first questionnaire [MEI-R], some of the questions were not appropriate, they seemed to be designed for students not faculty members", and "some of the questions in the first instrument [MEI-R] cannot be answered accurately by using the response set". These two specific concerns along with some more general ones suggest that the instrument may not be measuring what it is reported to measure or may not be designed in a manner that would provide a true reflection of the multicultural environment.

Other possible explanations for the lack of correlation between the environment and competency is that the degree of competence an individual counselor educator has about gay men and lesbians may be outside of the range of what the
environment of the program will accept or reject. While the environment may influence the manner in which information about sexual orientation is infused into the program or even into the individual classes, it appears to have little influence on what someone knows or chooses to learn.

The other side of this issue is that counselor educators who do have higher sexual orientation competency are not influencing the multicultural environment of their training programs. This may be because their research agenda lies in areas other than improving the environment for gay men and lesbians, or that the environment is not welcoming and inclusive, those that have the competencies may be reluctant to step forward because the environment is not inclusive and welcoming. Whatever the reasons may be, this issue does warrant further study.

Another possible explanation for these results is that current multicultural knowledge, practices, and training do not sufficiently provide for the unique counseling needs of different cultural groups, specifically those related to gay men and lesbians. This seems to counter conventional wisdom, which says that the counseling skills required for working with racial and ethnic minorities are the same that are needed for working with sexual and other cultural minorities (Pope, 1995). If this is the case, the current practice of the single-course approach to multiculturalism, while generally ineffective for teaching about racial and ethnic minorities, is even less effective for teaching about sexual and other cultural minorities.

Although the multicultural environment and sexual orientation competency are not correlated with each other, each is (as has been noted previously) correlated with the use queer theory inspired pedagogy. These findings may provide additional
support for the use of queer theory into counselor education pedagogy and curriculum. Since the use of queer theory inspired pedagogy is related to more inclusive multicultural environments, and to increased sexual orientation competency, it would follow that using queer theory as a theoretical umbrella for the program will assist to effectively prepare future counselors to affirmatively provide services to gay men and lesbians.

**Limitations**

While reviewing the findings, it is equally as important to bear in mind the limitations of this study. To begin with while this study was designed as a census in an attempt to limit the threats to generalizability that may be seen when using convenience, random, non-random, systemic, or cluster sampling, the low return rate (18.4%) still negatively impacts the generalizability. The generalizability is also lowered because participation was voluntary and the characteristics of those that volunteer may not be representative of the target population as a whole (Borg, Gall, & Borg, 1996). An additional limitation was the subject matter being studied; sexual orientation is a topic that most people in the United States have very intense feelings about (Greene, 1994). This may have had two different effect, those who have very strong negative or very strong positive feelings about issues of sexual orientation may have been more inclined to participate so that their views would be reflected. However, on the other hand, there may have been some who chose not to participate because the wanted to have nothing to do with the topic of sexual orientation.

Other limitations to this study are that participation was solicited near the end of the academic year, since the target audience was counselor educators, their work
load may have prohibited them from participating, while others may have just had no incentive or investment in the topic. Demographic information on counselor educators in CACREP accredited programs is minimal at best, so it is not clear whether the participants in this study are representative of the population as a whole. Another potential limitation to the results of this study is the correlational analysis. Gall, Borg, & Gall (1996) state that while the correlational method “is highly useful for studying problems in education” (p. 414), “the correlations cannot establish cause-and-effect relationships” (p. 420) because they break down complex concepts into basic elements.

Additional potential limitations of this study include the instruments used. The MEI-R and the SOCS are both fairly new measures that have not been widely used aside from initial validation by the authors. The factor analysis that was conducted the MEI-R using the data collected in this study did not match that of the authors. Also neither of the factor solutions from the MEI-R or the SOCS were able to be reduced down to one factor, as was suggested by both authors for the scoring of the instruments. The Queer Theory Pedagogical Scale was researcher developed and had not been used prior to this study. The reliability estimates were conducted on the instrument provided Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.931 overall, 0.897 for the Concrete scale, and 0.915 for the Conceptual scale. However, the validity of the instrument is still in question. Emailed and web surveys are subject to many of the same limitations inherent to mailed measures. This may include, but is not limited to, participants failing to understand the directions, participant’s dishonesty or desire to give socially acceptable answers. One additional limitation is the general population that was identified. Using faculty members only from CACREP-accredited schools, although easier to locate and
contact, may have resulted in the loss of an unknown number of other counselor educator who work in programs that have accreditation other than CACREP or have not been accredited but are still educating counselors.

**Contributions and Implications of Findings**

**Contributions**

This study began by identifying the problem of counselors are completing graduate level training programs without having the self-awareness and knowledge necessary to provide competent counseling services to gay men and lesbians. Previous research has shown that gay men and lesbians seek out counseling services two to four times more often than heterosexuals do and that 50% of these clients report dissatisfaction with the services that they receive due to negative and prejudicial attitudes, and because of the counselors lack of understanding of gay and lesbian issues, lifestyles, and resources (Phillips & Fisher, 1998; Rudolph, 1988). Counselor Educators have a moral and ethical responsibility to train counselors so that they are able to competently and affirmatively provide appropriate services to all clients, not just those that fit into the heterosexual matrix.

Queer theory was introduced as the theoretical framework for this investigation, in particular was queer theory's relationship to curriculum and pedagogy and the multicultural environment within counselor training programs. Using queer theory in this perspective requires deconstructing the meaning of deviance in relation to the norm and how institutions, higher education in this case, control and legitimize discourses that have been deemed appropriate by those in power (Pinar, 1998). Both
the multicultural environment and sexual orientation competencies were studied because it has been suggested that these two areas are factors in the inclusion or exclusion of accurate depictions of sexual minorities into counselor education training programs.

This study was the first to explore the relationships among counselor education pedagogy, the multicultural environment of the program, and the competency that counselor education faculty members regarding sexual orientation. The findings from this study were very interesting. While the use of queer theory pedagogy was positively correlated with the perceived multicultural environment of the training program and the individuals’ competency regarding sexual orientation, neither the multicultural environment nor the sexual orientation competency were correlated with the each other. Nevertheless, this study’s primary contribution was it identified that queer theory pedagogical techniques are used more frequently by individuals who have greater sexual orientation competency and who view the training program in which the work to be more multiculturally inclusive. This tangentially corresponds to the claims that sexual orientation content is not included in counselor training programs because the faculty member does not have the knowledge and/or because the environment does not support it (Eliason, 2000; Pilkington & Cantor, 1996).

These findings lend support to the belief that in order to provide counselors-in-training with the skills that are necessary to counsel sexual minority individuals there needs to be a concerted effort to ensure that those teaching have the correct information and to ensure that environment of the program is open to the incorporation of diversity. While it was beyond the scope of this research to explore causality, it was
an important first step toward identifying that there is a relationship between these factors.

Implications

Taken as a whole, the information obtained from this research may be useful in identifying characteristics that could influence counselor training programs to begin to adequately provide developing counselors with the competencies necessary to serve all diverse client groups not only sexual minorities. Specifically, the use of queer theory as an overriding umbrella may provide the theoretical and practical grounding that is required to ensure that future counselors are being provided with the necessary knowledge to appropriately provide affirmative counseling services to gay men and lesbians. According to Allison, et al., (1994) the responsibility for reaching this goal must be taken on by all faculty and administrators in the program. Faculty members and administrators will be required to increase their competence in issues of diversity, significantly modify the training curriculum, clinical training, and supervision to incorporate diversity, and to make a genuine commitment to remove institutional and programmatic barriers that block the infusion of diversity (Das, 1997).

There are implications from this study for counselor educators as well. First, is since we have seen that the multicultural environment is not related to the sexual orientation competency that someone may have but each of these are related to the degree that Queer Theory Pedagogy is used in counselor education programs. However, because the use of this type of pedagogy is positively correlated with both the environment and competency, these findings may support incorporating an educational approach that is in line with the tenets of queer theory. Some specific
examples may include: including content on non-traditional approaches to counseling in all relevant courses or encouraging and fostering students who are active learners.

A second implication that applies to counselor educators relates to the incorporation of the multicultural training philosophy. While the components of a multiculturally competent environment have been well documented (Israel & Selvidge, 2003; Leach & Carlton, 1997; Ponterotto, Alexander, & Grieger, 1995; Pope-Davis, et. al., 2000), there is very little that has been documented about how to go about implementing these changes (Ponterotto, et. al., 1995). The underlying philosophies of queer theory may assist with the realization of these goals. Queer theory’s influence on curriculum and pedagogy provide an appropriate starting place for developing an overriding comprehensive multicultural counseling training philosophy that better prepares future counselors to be more multiculturally competent.

Future Research

The results of this study highlight many possibilities for future research. The Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale itself warrants further research. This may include further defining queer theory pedagogy, and development of the psychometric properties of the measure itself. There may also be benefit to using a different measure of multiculturalism, perhaps the MCKAS (Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale) which may better measure the constructs related to queer theory pedagogy. Several of the respondent commented on the structure of the MEI-R, stating that the answer matrix did not match well with the question that was being asked. Some participants also expressed concern that the wording of the question was more
appropriate for students than it was for faculty members. Adding a social desirability measure also seems to be an appropriate consideration for future research. There may also be benefit in adding a religiosity component to future research to determine to what extent an individual’s level of religiosity influences their sexual orientation competency and use of queer theory pedagogy.

Replicating this study and opening it up to all counselor educators, not just those from CACREP-accredited programs may also provide a better picture of what is happening in counselor training programs than was seen in this study and would ensure a larger more adequate representation of counselor educators. It may also be beneficial to develop a student version of this survey to determine if what counselor educators believe is happening in their programs is consistent with what the students are experiencing, which may lend more legitimacy to the recommendations that will follow this research.
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APPENDICES
Dear Counselor Education faculty member,

I am a doctoral candidate at the College of William & Mary in the process of completing my dissertation research under the supervision of Dr. Charles F. Gressard. The purpose of my dissertation study is to gather information about Counselor Education faculty member’s perceptions of the multicultural environment of the program in which they teach, their knowledge, attitudes, and skills toward gay and lesbian individuals, and to determine the relationship between these factors and their pedagogical approach to counselor education.

As a counselor and future counselor educator, I realize that it can be incredibly challenging to incorporate additional subject matter, particularly that which may be seen as controversial into the curriculum. I believe that this study may shed some light on this important topic. Whether you choose to participate is, of course, entirely up to you, however, I do hope that you will be willing to participate. This project is designed to anonymously gather information on faculty members who teach in a counseling preparation program that has been accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). If you are not a counselor education faculty member or if your program is not accredited by CACREP I apologize as this email has reached you in error.

Your assistance is greatly appreciated, so I’ve designed this research project to gather the necessary information while taking only a minimal amount of your time. By following the electronic link below and completing the forms and instruments, you will provide valuable data for the study. Completion of the entire packet is anticipated to only take 15-25 minutes. Please complete the entire survey in one setting to ensure the most accurate collection of data as possible and to allow for correlation of the data. All responses will completely anonymous and will be held in the strictest confidence. By voluntarily completing the research instruments you are granting me consent to use the data as part of my dissertation research.

The link at the bottom of this page will take you to a secure page located on the College of William & Mary’s School of Education website. Please follow this link which will take you directly to the consent form for this research. After reading the consent form, please click on the “I agree” button to continue on to the following research instruments:

1. Multicultural Environmental Inventory-Revised (MEI-R)
2. Sexual Orientation Counselor Scale (SOCS)
3. Demographic Survey and Likert-type questions.
I sincerely wish to thank you for your time, effort, and contribution to the field of Counselor Education. If you have any questions or comments, or if you’d like to have a copy of the results emailed to you, please contact me through this email address.

Sincerely,

Dennis A. Frank, II MA NCC
Doctoral Candidate, College of William & Mary
dxfran@wm.edu

Charles F. Gressard, Ph.D, LPC, NCC
Professor, College of William & Mary
cfgres@wm.edu

http://web.wm.edu/education/research/dfrank/
Appendix B

Consent Form

I acknowledge that by clicking on the "I agree" button located at the bottom of this page I am willing to participate in a study of Counselor Educators. I understand that the study is being conducted by Dennis A. Frank, II, a doctoral candidate in counselor education at the College of William & Mary. The purpose of this study is to explore Counselor Educator’s perception of the multicultural environment of the program in which they teach, their knowledge, attitudes, and skills toward gay and lesbian individuals, and their pedagogical approach to counselor education. My involvement in this study will take approximately 15-25 minutes.

As a participant in this study, I am aware that I will be asked to complete three research instruments: the Multicultural Environmental Inventory-Revised (MEI-R), the Sexual Orientation Counselor Scale (SOCS), and a Demographic Survey.

As a participant in this study, I am aware that participation is voluntary, that I may refuse to answer any question that is asked, and that I may choose to withdraw at any time during the study. I understand that a copy of the results of the study will be emailed to me upon request. I am aware that I may report dissatisfactions with any aspect of this research project to the Chair of the Dissertation Committee, Dr. Charles F. Gressard, (757) 221-2352, or to the Chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee, Dr. Stan Hoegerman, (757) 221-2240.

By participating in this study, I understand that there are no obvious risks to my physical or mental health.

Confidentiality Statement

As a participant in this study, I am aware that all responses are entirely anonymous and that the records will be kept strictly confidential. I am also aware that my name or identifying characteristics will in no way be associated with any of the results of this study. I fully understand the above statements, and do hereby consent to participate in this study.

I agree
Follow-up Email Request for Participation

Dear Counselor Education faculty member,

HELP! I am appealing to you for your assistance. I am still collecting data and desperately need your survey responses. Since this survey is anonymous I do not know who has completed it and who has not. For those of you who have completed it, you have my deepest gratitude. Those who have not had the opportunity to complete it I am pleading for your help. Each person’s data is very important. Without a high enough response rate, I will not have enough to complete my dissertation. The three instruments that I am using will take approximately 15 minutes of your time. I am asking for you to please complete survey over the Internet by May 19, 2004.

The link to my dissertation survey is:

http://web.wm.edu/education/research/dfrank/

Thank you very much for your time and assistance,

Dennis A. Frank, II MA NCC
Doctoral Candidate, College of William & Mary
dxfran@wm.edu

Charles F. Gressard, Ph.D, LPC, NCC
Professor, College of William & Mary
cfgres@wm.edu
Appendix D

Multicultural Environment Inventory - Revised

copyright, 2000
Pope-Davis, Liu, Nevitt, & Toporek

Please indicate to what extent the question applies to your department or program. Disregard questions that do not apply.

For the purposes of this instrument, please consider the definition of multicultural issues to mean ethnic and racial issues. The term "minority" refers to those persons of Asian American, African American, Latino/a American, and Native American backgrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A little bit</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. _____ I believe that multicultural issues are integrated into coursework.
2. _____ The course syllabi reflect an infusion of multiculturalism.
3. _____ There is a diversity of teaching strategies and procedures employed in the classroom (e.g. cooperative and individual achievement).
4. _____ There are various methods used to evaluate student performance and learning (e.g. written and oral assignments).
5. _____ Multicultural issues are considered an important component of supervision.
6. _____ There is at least one person whose primary research interest is in multicultural issues.
7. _____ Faculty members are doing research in multicultural issues.
8. _____ Awareness of and responsiveness to multicultural issues is part of my overall evaluation.
9. _____ Being multiculturally competent is valued.
10. _____ I am encouraged to integrate multicultural issues into my courses.
11. _____ I am encouraged to integrate multicultural issues into my work.
12. ____ I feel comfortable with the cultural environment in class.

13. ____ I feel my comments are valued in classes.

14. ____ During exams, multicultural issues are reflected in the questions.

15. ____ The environment makes me feel comfortable and valued.

16. ____ There is a place I can go to feel safe and valued.

17. ____ I generally feel supported.

18. ____ When recruiting new students, I am completely honest about the climate.

19. ____ When recruiting new faculty, I am completely honest about the climate.

20. ____ When recruiting new staff, I am completely honest about the climate.

21. ____ The faculty are making an effort to understand my point of view.

22. ____ A diversity of cultural items (pictures, posters, etc.) are represented throughout my program/department.

23. ____ All course evaluations ask how/if multicultural issues have been integrated into courses.

24. ____ All courses and research conducted by faculty address, at least minimally, how the topic affects diverse populations.

25. ____ I feel comfortable discussing multicultural issues in supervision.

26. ____ There are faculty with whom I feel comfortable discussing multicultural issues and concerns.

27. ____ There is a demonstrated commitment to recruiting minority students and faculty.
There are two methods for scoring the MEI-R. The first method provides a total score of a participant’s perceptions about the degree to which a training environment focuses on multicultural issues. The second method provides four individual subscale (factor) scores for a person’s perceptions about the multicultural nature of various aspects of multicultural training environments.

The total score is the sum of participant’s responses for each item. Score range is 27-135 with high scores indicating a greater degree of focus on multicultural issues within the training program.

When using subscale (factor) scores, researchers should not also use the Total score. As expected, the Total score and subscale scores are highly correlated and therefore, to use both would be redundant.

**Scoring subscale or factors:**

**Factor 1: Curriculum and Supervision**
The score for this subscale is the sum of items 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 22, 23, & 24. Score range is 11-55.

**Factor 2: Climate and Comfort**
The score for this subscale is the sum of items 3, 4, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 25, 26, & 27. Score range is 11-55.

**Factor 3: Honesty in Recruitment**
The score for this subscale is the sum of items 18, 19, & 20. Score range is 3-15.

**Factor 4: Multicultural Research**
The score for this subscale is the sum of items 6 & 7. Score range is 2-10.
Appendix E

**Sexual Orientation Counseling Survey**

Copyright 2000
Markus P. Bidell

Using the following scale, rate the truth of each item as it applies to you by circling the appropriate number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not At All True</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somewhat True</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totally True</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I have received adequate clinical training and supervision to counsel lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) clients.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

2. The lifestyle of a LGB client is unnatural or immoral.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

3. I check up on my LGB counseling skills by monitoring my functioning/competency - via consultation, supervision, and continuing education.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

4. I have experience counseling gay male clients.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

5. LGB clients receive “less preferred” forms of counseling treatment than heterosexual clients.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

6. At this point in my professional development, I feel competent, skilled, and qualified to counsel LGB clients.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

7. I have experience counseling lesbian or gay couples.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

8. I have experience counseling lesbian clients.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

9. I am aware some research indicates that LGB clients are more likely to be diagnosed with mental illnesses than are heterosexual clients.

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. It's obvious that a same sex relationship between two men or two women is not as strong or as committed as one between a man and a woman.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I believe that being highly discreet about their sexual orientation is a trait that LGB clients should work towards.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I have been to in-services, conference sessions, or workshops, which focused on LGB issues in psychology.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Heterosexist and prejudicial concepts have permeated the mental health professions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I feel competent to assess the mental health needs of a person who is LGB in a therapeutic setting.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am knowledgeable of LGB identity development models.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I believe that LGB couples don't need special rights (domestic partner benefits, or the right to marry) because that would undermine normal and traditional family values.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. It would be best if my clients viewed a heterosexual lifestyle as ideal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I have experience counseling bisexual (male or female) clients.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I am aware of institutional barriers that may inhibit LGB people from using mental health services.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I am aware that counselors frequently impose their values concerning sexuality upon LGB clients.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. I think that my clients should accept some degree of conformity to traditional sexual values.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. Currently, I do not have the skills or training to do a case presentation or consultation if my client were LGB.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. I believe that LGB clients will benefit most from counseling with a heterosexual counselor who endorses conventional values and norms.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. Being born a heterosexual person in this society carries with it certain advantages.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. I feel that sexual orientation differences between counselor and client may serve as an initial barrier to effective counseling of LGB individuals.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. I have done a counseling role-play as either the client or counselor involving a LGB issue.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. Personally, I think homosexuality is a mental disorder or a sin and can be treated through counseling or spiritual help.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

28. I believe that all LGB clients must be discreet about their sexual orientation around children.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29. When it comes to homosexuality, I agree with the statement: “You should love the sinner but hate or condemn the sin”.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
SCORING INFORMATION IS NOT GIVEN TO RESPONDENTS
Calculating Sexual Orientation Counselor Scale (SOCS) Scores
Instructions: First, reverse score those questions in parentheses (so $1 = 7$, $2 = 6$, $3 = 5$, $4 = 4$, $5 = 3$, $6 = 2$, $7 = 1$). For each subscale, add up the scores of the question listed (remembering to add the reverse score for questions in parentheses) and divide by the number of questions in each subscale. To calculate total SOCS scores, add up all items and divide by 29.

Note. This scoring information not provided to study participants.

Awareness

$$ (2) + (10) + (11) + (16) + (17) + (21) + (23) + (27) + (28) + (29) = \frac{X}{10} $$

Skills

$$ 1 + 3 + 4 + 6 + 7 + 8 + 12 + 14 + 15 + 18 + (22) + 26 = \frac{X}{12} $$

Knowledge

$$ 5 + 9 + 13 + 19 + 20 + 24 + 25 = \frac{X}{7} $$

Total SOCS Score

$$ 1 + (2) + 3 + 4 + 5 + 6 + 7 + 8 + 9 + (10) + (11) + 12 + 13 + 14 + 15 + (16) + (17) + 18 + 19 + 20 + (21) + (22) + (23) + 24 + 25 + 26 + (27) + (28) + (29) = \frac{X}{29} $$
Appendix F

Demographic Survey & Queer Theory Pedagogy Scale

1. Age: ______

2. Gender: _____ Female  _____ Male  _____ M to F  _____ F to M

3. Race/Ethnicity:  _____ African/Black  _____ American Indian  
                     _____ Asian  _____ Caucasian/European  
                     _____ Latino(a)/Hispanic  _____ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander  
                     _____ Other

4. Nationality:  _____ American  _____ Canadian  _____ Other

5. Sexual Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exclusively Heterosexual</th>
<th>Equally Heterosexual and Homosexual</th>
<th>Exclusively Homosexual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Highest degree earned to date:  _____ MA/MS  _____ EdS  
                                   _____ EdD  _____ PhD  
                                   _____ PsyD  _____ Other: ______

7. Program’s CACREP Accreditation (check all that apply):

   _____ Career  _____ College  _____ Community  _____ Gerontological
   _____ Marital, Couple, and Family  _____ Mental Health  _____ School
   _____ Student Affairs  _____ Counselor Education

8. Which of the CACREP programs do you regularly teach in?

   _____ Career  _____ College  _____ Community  _____ Gerontological
   _____ Marital, Couple, and Family  _____ Mental Health  _____ School
   _____ Student Affairs  _____ Counselor Education

9. Number of years that you’ve worked as a Counselor Educator

   _____ 1-5  _____ 6-10  _____ 11-15  _____ 16-20  _____ 21+

10. Do you regularly teach a multicultural counseling course?

    _____ yes  _____ no
11. Are you licensed as a professional counselor (LPC, LMFT, LMHC, etc.) in the state that you teach?

____ yes  _____ no

12. Are you currently providing counseling services (individual, couple, family, group, etc.) in addition to your teaching responsibilities?

____ yes  _____ no

13. Does your educational institution have a nondiscrimination policy that includes:

   sexual orientation  ____ yes  _____ no  _____ unsure
   gender identity     ____ yes  _____ no  _____ unsure

14. Does your education institution offer domestic partner benefits for:

   same-sex couples   ____ yes  _____ no  _____ unsure
   opposite-sex couples ____ yes  _____ no  _____ unsure

15. To what degree do you incorporate sexual orientation subject matter into your counseling classes?

   I do not include sexual orientation in my courses
   I occasionally include sexual orientation in my courses
   I regularly include sexual orientation in my courses

   0  1  2  3  4  5  6

16. To what degree do you include sexual orientation subjects in your counseling courses' syllabi?

   I do not include sexual orientation in my syllabi
   I occasionally include sexual orientation in my syllabi
   I regularly include sexual orientation in my syllabi

   0  1  2  3  4  5  6
17. To what degree do you consider sexual orientation subjects when choosing text books and readings for your courses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I do not consider sexual orientation when choosing text books and readings</th>
<th>I occasionally consider sexual orientation when choosing text books and readings</th>
<th>I regularly consider sexual orientation when choosing text books and readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. To what degree do you initiate discussions of power, control, and oppression into your counseling courses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I do not initiate this type of discussion</th>
<th>I occasionally initiate this type of discussion</th>
<th>I regularly initiate this type of discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. To what degree do you initiate discussions of the author(s) and or editor(s) “position and voice” (perspective) in the readings that you assign in your counselor education courses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I do not discuss the writers “position &amp; voice” in readings</th>
<th>I occasionally discuss the writers “position &amp; voice” in readings</th>
<th>I regularly discuss the writers “position &amp; voice” in readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. When compared with other issues of diversity (race, ethnicity, age, gender, etc) how much attention do you give to issues of sexual orientation in you classes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less attention</th>
<th>Equal attention</th>
<th>More attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. To what degree do you emphasize nontraditional approaches to therapy (e.g. constructivist, narrative) that promote an adherence to an “ethics and practice of freedom” (i.e. behaviors are not dictated by universal laws and rules)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I do not emphasize nontraditional approaches</th>
<th>I occasionally emphasize nontraditional approaches</th>
<th>I regularly emphasize nontraditional approaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. To what degree do you challenge traditional definitions of gender and sexuality in your counselor education classes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I do not challenge traditional definitions of gender and sexuality</th>
<th>I occasionally challenge traditional definitions of gender and sexuality</th>
<th>I regularly challenge traditional definitions of gender and sexuality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. To what degree do you work to give a “voice” to (include) all marginalized groups (e.g. racial, sexual, cultural, ability) in your counselor education program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I do not give a “voice” to marginalized groups</th>
<th>I occasionally give a “voice” to marginalized groups</th>
<th>I regularly give a “voice” to marginalized groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. To what degree do you initiate dialogues with students about alternative systems of meaning as compared to dialogues about fixed and static knowledge?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I do not initiate in this type of dialogue</th>
<th>I occasionally initiate in this type of dialogue</th>
<th>I regularly initiate in this type of dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. To what degree do you initiate discussions with students about the impact that power and control in society have on the construction, organization, and dissemination of knowledge and meaning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I do not initiate this type of discussion</th>
<th>I occasionally initiate this type of discussion</th>
<th>I regularly initiate this type of discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. To what degree do you initiate discussions in your counseling courses about the manner in which current identity categories (e.g. African American, gay & lesbian, disabled) include or exclude individuals and groups of individuals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I do not initiate discussions of identity categories</th>
<th>I occasionally initiate discussions of identity categories</th>
<th>I regularly initiate discussions of identity categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. To what degree do you recognize power differentials between faculty and students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I do not recognize power differentials</th>
<th>I occasionally recognize power differentials</th>
<th>I regularly recognize power differentials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. To what degree are you knowledgeable about Queer Theory?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am not knowledgeable about Queer Theory</th>
<th>I have a basic knowledge about Queer Theory</th>
<th>I am knowledgeable about Queer Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Please provide any thoughts or feelings that you have about any aspect of this survey (optional)

Thank you for your participation in this survey.