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THE MANDATE FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE ADVOCACY IN COUNSELOR EDUCATION: USING SERVICE LEARNING TO TRAIN MASTERS' STUDENTS AS SOCIAL JUSTICE ADVOCATES

ABSTRACT

Nearly 20 years ago, the field of counseling was charged to take up its historic role of advocating for social justice, however, it appears that counselor education programs are not adequately preparing counseling students to fulfill the mandated role of social justice advocate. Advocacy is a complex role with foundations in multicultural competency (Speight & Vera, 2004) that requires the ability to view problems in a multi-systemic fashion. Considering students’ ability to engage in social justice concepts is critical in designing educational experiences that will prepare them for the full range of tasks in the counseling profession. Service learning is an academic strategy that links academic content with practical experience focused on solving community problems. In a quasi-experimental design, masters’ students enrolled in a community counseling internship course participated in a service learning intervention designed to promote moral development, intellectual development, and social justice advocacy competency. Results indicated that the use of a service learning intervention promoted significant gains in moral developmental levels, as measured by the Defining Issues Test-2 (Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, Thoma, 1999). A supplemental analysis also revealed significant growth in the advocacy competency domain of Public Information, as measured by the Advocacy Competency Self-Assessment Survey (Ratts & Ford, 2008). No significant differences were found between the service learning group and the non-service learning group on intellectual development at posttest. The study suggests that advocacy competency and
moral development may be promoted through the use of a service learning strategy. Service learning may be a promising approach that can be used by counselor educators to prepare students for the mandated role of social justice advocate.
THE MANDATE FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE ADVOCACY IN COUNSELOR EDUCATION: USING SERVICE LEARNING TO TRAIN MASTERS’ STUDENTS AS SOCIAL JUSTICE ADVOCATES
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This document will report a research study that examined the possible relationships between levels of moral and intellectual development of masters' level counseling trainees enrolled in Community Counseling Internship and their perceived skills and abilities in social justice advocacy, a mandated role for counselors. The first chapter will discuss the call for counselors to act as social justice advocates by leaders in the counseling field, the gaps in training necessary for counselors to be able to fulfill that mandate, and the need for a paradigm shift in counselor education that incorporates issues of social justice and training for advocacy. Cognitive developmental theory, specifically the domains of moral and intellectual development, will be introduced and suggested as a promising framework for training counselors as social justice advocates. Service learning will be presented as a possible strategy to promote cognitive development as well as social justice advocacy skills and knowledge in masters' level counseling students. Chapter 2 will provide a review of relevant literature on the above topics, and Chapter 3 will describe the study designed to promote social justice advocacy behavior through service learning in the context of Internship in Community Counseling. In Chapter 4, the results of statistical testing will be reported, and in the final chapter, results will be discussed and interpreted. Implications of the study will be identified as well as suggestions for future research and conclusions.

Statement of the Problem

At her inauguration as President of the American Counseling Association in 1990, Dr. Loretta Bradley called for the profession of counseling to return to its historic roots and again take up the mantel of advocating for social justice (Kiselica & Robinson,
During her time in office, Dr. Bradley selected the theme “Advocacy: A Voice for Our Clients and Communities” as the mission of her presidency. This emphasis reflected a growing movement in the profession towards a broader consideration of the impact of external forces on the mental health and wellness of the individuals, families, schools, and communities counselors serve. Dr. Bradley’s charge put the profession of counseling on the path of returning to its origins in promoting social justice and democracy for all members of our society through advocacy (2001).

Despite this charge, nearly 20 years later it remains unclear how counselors fulfill their role as advocates for social justice. Many of the challenges clients present in counseling have structural and systemic causes, and according to Dr. Bradley, counselors bear the responsibility to intervene at a societal level in order to address the problems that negatively impact healthy development (McWhirter & McWhirter, 2007). Counselors must gain the knowledge and skills needed for advocacy and social action in order to appropriately and effectively intercede for disempowered clients, families, and communities. However, it appears that counselor education programs may not be adequately addressing issues of social justice and advocacy. Counselor trainees may, likewise, not be effectively prepared to take on the historic mantle of social justice advocate when they enter the profession.

Justification for the Study

Counseling students practice and begin to hone counseling skills in the final programmatic practical experience, the internship. This practical course could be a context in which students can practice advocacy skills as well as counseling skills. A new framework is needed for introducing counseling students to the role of advocate and
providing opportunities for practicing this new role. Specifically, it will be proposed that the internship course could be designed using a service learning pedagogy intended to promote moral and intellectual development as well as social justice advocacy knowledge and skills in counseling trainees.

Social Justice Advocacy

The role of advocacy has been conceptualized as one of the four main components of the overall mission of counselors (Lewis, Lewis, Daniels, & D’Andrea, 1998), and leaders of the field have called counselors to embrace it (Kiselica & Robinson, 2001). In the most basic sense, to advocate is to argue or plead for a cause (Lee, 1998) or is the act of “speaking up for people whose rights may be in jeopardy” (Vera & Speight, 2007, p. 376). The counseling literature delineates this definition by describing the role of the counselor-advocate as using skills and actions to “help clients challenge institutional and social barriers that impede academic, career, or personal-social development” (Lee, 1998, p.8-9). The goal of these activities is to secure fairness, equity, and justice for groups that are disempowered, marginalized, exploited, and dominated by those in power (Speight & Vera, 2004). Advocacy activities could include actions as simple as making a phone call for a client to assist in securing services, to lobbying local, state, or national organizations and regulating bodies for changes that would positively impact the lives of disempowered groups. In examining the discussion of advocacy in the counseling literature, it is clear that advocacy is irrevocably linked to issues of social justice.

The term ‘social justice’ has been understandably criticized for its broadness and lack of specific meaning. Social justice has been referred to variously in the literature as a goal (Vera & Speight, 2003), a value (Constantine, Hage, Kindaichi, & Bryant, 2007), a
theory (Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005), and a process (Ratts, 2007), among others. Constantine, et al. (2007) offers a comprehensive definition of the term social justice as a:

...fundamental valuing of fairness and equity in resources, rights, and treatment for marginalized individuals and groups of people who do not share equal power in society because of their immigration, racial, ethnic, age, socioeconomic, religious heritage, physical ability, or sexual orientation status groups. (p. 24)

A social justice approach to counseling seeks to eliminate systemic and institutionalized oppression (Young, 1990), and to allow all groups in society full and equal participation (Bell, 1997) in the examination of relationships between institutions, systems, and groups in society. The goal is to seek fair distribution of resources among society members (Speight & Vera, 2004) as well as the "promotion of the values of self-development and self-determination for everyone" (p. 111). Additionally, social justice carries a vision that all people within our society will be “physically and psychologically safe and secure” (Bell, 1997, p. 3). While the term social justice can have many different meanings, it shall, for the purposes of this research, be defined as a set of constructs referring to the structure of systemic inequities and oppression in society, based on non-dominant group membership that fosters a set of goals aimed at equalizing the benefits and burdens of society equally to all members.

In examining how the term advocacy is used in the counseling literature, it becomes clear that the term refers to social action that is guided by social justice concepts and goals. Thus, perhaps a more descriptive term would be Social Justice Advocacy, since many authors articulate the description of counselors’ role of advocate in terms of social justice concepts. The term social justice advocacy will be used throughout the
remainder of this paper to refer to social action conducted with or on behalf of a client, family, or community, who are members of one or more non-dominant groups, that has the goal of removing the systemic barriers to healthy development and productive living.

Systemic barriers such as racism, sexism, and the unequal distribution of opportunities and resources are precipitant to many of the problems and challenges that bring clients into counseling. Yet counselor educators appear to prepare students almost exclusively to work with individual clients, couples, families, and students (Fox, 2003). If clients suffer mental health symptoms that result from systemic barriers, systemic interventions are appropriate. However, it does not appear that counseling students are taught how to intervene at local, regional, or national levels to ameliorate the causal inequities (Lee, 1998). Focusing individual interventions at problems with systemic causes can serve to blame the victim for systemic problems and can reinforce an unjust status quo (Goodman, Liang, Helms, Latta, Sparks, & Weintraub, 2004). Counselors need to be trained in the knowledge and skills necessary to aim interventions where the problems reside, and counselor education programs have a key role to play in this training (Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005).

The role of social justice advocate may not yet mainstream in the counseling world, even though it has begun to be incorporated into the American Counseling Association (ACA) Code of Ethics and statutes of regulatory bodies. The inclusion of social justice advocacy into counseling writing, associations, and regulation is an important step towards legitimizing this role. Advocacy is discussed in two important guiding documents for counselors, the ACA Code of Ethics (2005) and the 2001 Standards of the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational
Programs (CACREP). Counselors for Social Justice, a division of the American Counseling Association, was established within the last decade. A network of members of the counseling community, this group seeks “equity and an end to oppression and injustice affecting clients, students, counselors, families, communities, schools, workplaces, governments, and other social and institutional systems” (Counselors for Social Justice, 2008). The establishment of this professional association gives the social justice movement within the field of counseling strength and credibility.

Multiculturalism and Social Justice Training

Growth of the social justice movement is irrevocably linked to the movement for multicultural education in counselor training. Several authors have suggested that training for multicultural competence in counselor education is a prerequisite for social justice advocacy (Herlihy & Watson, 2007; Helms, 2003). Multicultural training has tended to focus on three main areas: knowledge, skills, and self-awareness (Constantine, et al., 2007; Sue & Sue, 2003). Sue and Sue (2003) identify a multiculturally competent counselor as someone who seeks to understand the cultural worldview of clients, who develops and uses a repertoire of culturally appropriate and sensitive counseling strategies, and who is actively engaged in a process of self-exploration related to held assumptions about human nature, biases, and values, among others. The knowledge component of multicultural training refers to developing a counselor’s ability to understand another’s lived experiences within a cultural context. Counselors must develop knowledge about various worldview orientations as well as the histories of marginalized populations, and “culture-specific values that influence the subjective and collective experiences of marginalized populations” (Constantine, et al., 2007, p. 24).
Training for multicultural skills involves promoting a counselor’s ability to effectively engage in therapy with diverse clients by drawing upon a developed bank of cultural knowledge to develop culturally appropriate and relevant interventions. Additionally, counselor training seeks to promote student self-awareness. Within a multicultural context, this requires counselors to be alert to personal values, biases, and attitudes about various forms of diversity including race, sexual orientation and class. Counselors are trained to see and understand the impact of cultural group membership on privilege and oppression, including the culture groups to which students themselves belong (2007).

Through these three foci, knowledge, skills and self-awareness, multicultural training in counselor education has the goal of producing culturally sensitive counselors (Vera & Speight, 2007).

Multicultural competence is now considered so important in proficient counseling practice that it has been incorporated into the professional guidelines for counselor education programs (CACREP, 2001) as well as into the ACA Code of Ethics (2005). This incorporation indicates that multicultural competence has gone mainstream; it is something that is considered necessary for every ethical counselor. As such, counselor education programs play a key role in preparing students for multicultural practice. Vera and Speight (2007) have noted how much attention has been given to incorporating multiculturalism into training curricula, but that less emphasis has been placed on what counselors actually do in practice related to issues of social justice.

Multicultural competence appears to be necessary for social justice advocacy (Constantine et al., 2007, Ratts, 2007), and training of multicultural knowledge, skills, and self-awareness serves as the precursor to social justice advocacy in counselors. A
counselor may be competent in effectively treating a client who is very different in background, worldview, and culture. Yet that same counselor may not be able to perceive the way complex social structures and problems impact disempowered individuals and groups or have the skills necessary to act to defeat these structures and problem. Multicultural training and competence may not be sufficient in facilitating students’ abilities to see problems at the level of complexity needed to understand systemic social problems, nor in teaching them how to act to defeat them. This is problematic in light of the mandate for social justice advocacy role taking. If counselors do not obtain the skills necessary for advocacy while in training, they may not be able to fulfill their mandated and needed roles as advocates.

**Multicultural Education: Necessary but Not Sufficient**

Many practitioners and educators may assume that multicultural competence is synonymous with proficiency in social justice advocacy. This is understandable in that these two areas have been “inexorably linked” (Speight & Vera, 2004, p. 117). However, training in multicultural knowledge, skills, and self-awareness alone may be insufficient for understanding complex social issues such as racism, oppression, and other complex problems that negatively impact non-dominant groups. While it is essential in developing advocacy competency, multiculturalism is not a comprehensive teaching tool for addressing needed social justice advocacy skills and knowledge. A broader understanding and analysis of social problems is essential to train counselors to fulfill their mandated roles as advocates.

It appears that the currently accepted multicultural competency model used in counselor training programs may be too narrow in focus and leaves out education for
social justice (Vera & Speight, 2003). The focus is on the counselor being able to conceptualize an individual client’s culture rather than on a broader understanding of the environmental stressors and the sources and causes of those environmental stressors. This narrow concept of multicultural counseling effectively keeps the counselor in the building and constrained by the parameters of one-to-one counseling. Multiculturalism does not teach counselors to approach social justice at a community or systemic level (Helms, 2003). The essential training in multicultural knowledge, skills, and awareness is necessary, but must be expanded to include interventions beyond the traditional contexts of counseling if counselors are to fulfill their mandated roles as advocates (Vera & Speight, 2003). Counselor educators may need to incorporate broader concepts of social justice in order to teach their students the knowledge and skills necessary to be advocates (McWhirter & McWhirter, 2007). Thus, there appears to be a difference between ‘multicultural counseling’ and ‘counseling for social justice’ (Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005).

While teaching multicultural counseling does appear to address the topic of oppression, (Vera & Speight, 2003), it does not seem to address to a sufficient degree the complexities of multi-systemic sources of oppression that can cause poor mental health for individuals in non-dominant groups. Indeed, Watts (2004) stated that if the field is to make progress towards aims of social justice, it will require new ways of thinking about the problems usually examined by scholars, counselors, and program administrators. The teaching of multicultural counseling seeks to promote students’ understanding of clients’ worldview. An expanded view of teaching counseling for social justice would require that programs enlarge their currently used training models to help counselors transform the world, not just to understand it (Vera & Speight, 2003). Counselor education
programs would need to teach students to "think systemically about the nature of psychological dysfunction and health" (Vera & Speight, 2003, p. 269), as well as develop a "nuanced understanding of issues in situational contexts" (Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997, p. 5). Developing a recognition that both clients and counselors themselves are embedded in various systems of oppression and are influenced by those systems is a crucial goal for such expansive thinking. This more complex view of social justice is a prerequisite to helping clients and counselors not only to understand but also to act to transform these systems as well (McWhirter & McWhirter, 2007).

An incorporation of social justice concepts in counselor training and practice would encourage a move beyond the realm of individual interventions (Vera & Speight, 2003). This requires, however, not just an add-on of another concept in one class or an additional lecture, but, rather, a paradigm shift (Herlihy & Watson, 2007). In order to adequately meet the demands of the role of advocate for social justice, counselors and counselor educators will have to think more broadly about the sources and causes of problems, develop strategies and interventions on multiple levels, and effectively reconceptualize the way counseling is conducted. Chronic systemic social problems that negatively impact the psychological and physical health of individuals, families, and groups such as oppression, generational poverty, and insufficient housing cannot be solved through micro level, individual interventions alone (Vera & Speight, 2007).

As places where future counselors are shaped and socialized into the profession, counselor education programs hold responsibility for training and teaching students to assume social justice advocacy roles. It is crucial that the format, curricula, goals, and requirements of counselor training programs shift to develop broad social justice
advocacy competencies in their students (Constantine, et al., 2007). The field of counseling has been criticized in the literature for being “markedly deficient” (Vera & Speight, 2007, p. 373) in advocating to defeat the various forms of oppression that impact millions of people in our society. Vera and Speight (2007) highlight that much work needs to be done in order to prepare successive generations of counselors to effectively work for social justice.

The current emphasis in training for advocacy and social justice focuses on what may be the precursors to these types of activities in the form of multicultural education. Herlihy & Watson (2007) argue that multicultural competence is a necessary antecedent for social justice advocacy in saying, “multicultural competence lies at the core of counseling for social justice” (p. 182). It appears that despite the call for counselors to become advocates for social justice issues, this value may not yet have filtered through graduate training programs to the students (Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005).

Theoretical Rationale

Issues of social justice are usually complex, multifaceted, and difficult to understand and address, often going unsolved for years or generations (Lee, 1998). Indifference is often cited as the reason for ongoing social injustices; however, lack of understanding could also be the culprit. The ability to understand complex social problems varies from individual to individual, just as intellectual capacity varies in the general population. Along with the need to teach students skills and knowledge in advocacy, instructors must understand students’ abilities in comprehension of these concepts. This does not appear to have been taken into account when considering how to best prepare counselors for the role of advocate. The most talented instructor may miss
the mark in teaching students to be advocates simply because the educational interventions do not match students' abilities to understand nuanced problems. Use of a theoretical framework that aids in understanding how counseling students engage with complex social justice issues is warranted, and cognitive developmental theory may provide such a framework.

Cognitive Developmental Theory

In the broadest descriptive terms, cognitive developmental theory could be defined as the view that humans develop in a predictable, hierarchal sequence from less complex to more complex ways of viewing and thinking about the world and problems in it. Developmental level and behavior are linked in that "reasoning and behavior are directly related to the level of complexity of psychological functioning," (Foster & McAdams, 1998). Higher stages of development have been conceptualized as more adaptable and adequate for dealing with the complexities of life. Individuals at higher stages tend to be more flexible, more able to show empathy, and more able to consider the good of others and of society at large. Lower levels tend to be more rigid, more concrete, and self-serving (Carlozzi, Gaa, & Liberman, 1983). The field of cognitive development has several different strands.

Dewey (1938) and Piaget (citation) were early leaders in the field of developmental theory and laid the groundwork for successive models (Evans, Forney, & Guido-DiBrito, 1997). Kohlberg (1971) postulated a theory of moral development that was later expanded by Rest (1994). Perry (1999) worked with college students to develop a theory of intellectual development, and the work of Hunt (1971) focused on conceptual development. Loevinger (1966) developed the ego development scheme, postulated to be
the master developmental theory in that it weaves together all of the disparate strands of
development, although Sprinthall (1994) posited that no one domain is an adequate
framework to understand all of human development. All theories of development have
common characteristics and assumptions. McAdams (1988) consolidated the central
assumptions of cognitive developmental theory into a list of eleven key points:

1. Development is intrinsic in humanity. Humans are motivated to make
   meaning of their experiences and to gain competence and mastery over their
   environment.

2. Cognitive development occurs in stages where each stage represents an
   individual’s current style of making meaning.

3. Stages of development are sequential, invariant, and hierarchical.

4. Development is directional: stages cannot be skipped.

5. Each stage is qualitatively different from every other stage, although lower
   patterns of meaning making are integrated into higher stages.

6. An individual is never in just one stage. Current functioning represents the
   modal stage of development.

7. Growth is not automatic and depends upon interaction between a person and
   environment.

8. There is a consistent relationship between developmental stage and behavior.

9. Physiological development is necessary for cognitive development.

10. Stage growth is domain specific and cannot be generalized to other domains.

    Domains refer to different strands of the human experience (e.g. thinking,
feeling, moral decisions and actions, interacting with others, making meaning of experiences, etc.).

11. Cognitive development is universal across culture and gender.

Because higher stages of cognitive development are related with more adequate ways of engaging with the world and the ability to think in more complex ways (Sprinthall & Theis-Sprinthall, 1983), promoting this development should be a central goal of counselor education.

Two domains of cognitive development appear to be particularly relevant when examining counselor training in the area of social justice advocacy. Moral development, which focuses on how people think through and make decisions about issues of right versus wrong, has the potential to illuminate how counselors engage with multifaceted social justice topics. Additionally, the domain of intellectual development and its exploration of epistemological orientations in college students can assist counselor educators in understanding how students think about knowledge, truth, and what is right. These frameworks can also aid in knowing how best to connect with graduate students on the topic of social justice advocacy. Monitoring and promoting development in these areas may prove to be what is needed in order to move social justice advocacy in counseling and counselor education ahead.

**Moral Development**

Moral development, a theory that conceptualizes how people make moral judgments, was developed by Lawrence Kohlberg (1971) at the University of Chicago (Evans, et al., 1998) He studied the moral reasoning of adolescent boys through
interviews and examinations of how they made decisions that involved values rather than facts. Kohlberg suggested that moral development occurs in an invariant sequence of stages with a constant order of succession. Each stage is qualitatively different from previous and following stages, although less developed stages are deconstructed and incorporated into higher stages when the right conditions are present. Progress through the stages is unidirectional, and each stage is mutually exclusive; however, James Rest (1994) later suggested that it is more useful to consider the percentage of a person’s moral judgment is at a certain stage than as the stages being mutually exclusive (Evans, et al., 1998). Kohlberg’s model contains three main levels with two stages per level that are shown in Table 1.1.
Table 1.1

*Kohlberg's Stages of Moral Development*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Preconventional</td>
<td>Stage 1: Heteronomous Morality</td>
<td>'Right' is obeying the rules to avoid punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 2: Individualistic,</td>
<td>Rules are followed when it is in the individual's interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instrumental Morality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2: Conventional</td>
<td>Stage 3: Interpersonally</td>
<td>'Right' is living up to the expectation of the social circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normative Morality</td>
<td>'Right' is upholding society's laws to maintain the system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 4: Social System Morality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3: Postconventional</td>
<td>Stage 5: Human Rights and</td>
<td>'Right' is evaluated based on what promotes human rights and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Welfare Morality</td>
<td>'Right' is based on universal principles, such as equality of human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stage 6: Morality of Universal and General Ethical Principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first level of Moral Development, Preconventional, has two stages. In Stage 1, right is defined as doing what one is told in order to avoid punishment. Rights of others are not considered. In Stage 2, an individual makes decisions about what is right based on what will satisfy a personal need. The next level of moral development, Conventional, has two stages. In Stage 3, an individual considers right to be that which will bring acceptance within the individual's social group. This stage could be considered to represent the morality of interpersonal concordance. At Stage 4, an individual views society as made up of law and rules that apply to and protect people equally. Rules are
followed in order to maintain social order and to fulfill one's obligations to society
(Evans, et al., 1998).

The uppermost level of Moral Development is the Postconventional level, which
also has two levels. At this level the self is differentiated from expectations of others, and
moral choices may be viewed as rights or duties. In Stage 5, moral decisions are based on
principles of a fair society. An individual considers the potential for changing a law for
social benefit and uses principled thinking for the greatest good. Individuals abide by a
social contract that involves respect for both self and others. Decisions are made that
result in the greatest good for the greatest number of people. Violating the rights of others
will be avoided. In the final stage, Stage 6, individuals follow universal ethical principles
that benefit all of humanity. These ethical principles will be acted on even if they are
counter to an agreed upon law. Universal values, such as the sanctity of life, justice,
tolerance, respect and trust are the emphasis of this stage. It is important to mention that
this stage was postulated, but has not been verified by empirical studies (Evans et al.,
1998).

As noted previously, moral developmental theory affords an understanding of the
process through which individuals engage with complex social and moral questions.
These are the types of questions that present themselves as issues of social justice. The
framework of moral development can help counselor educators conceptualize students'
ability to adequately understand and act on social justice issues. Targeted educational
interventions can promote growth to the higher levels of development needed for
effective understanding of social justice issues. This domain of developmental theory
appears to have utility when considering how to best prepare counseling students to be social justice advocates.

*Intellectual Development*

Another developmental domain, intellectual development as conceptualized by Perry (1999), may also be useful in this undertaking. In developing his scheme of intellectual development, Perry studied college students and their epistemological orientations.

William Perry, building from the work of Dewey, Piaget, and Kohlberg, studied teaching and learning in a higher education context. He conducted a longitudinal study interviewing students from Harvard and Radcliff, seeking to understand the course of development in patterns of thought. From the results of this study he based his Scheme of Intellectual Development (Evans et al., 1998) that, like Kohlberg’s scheme, is also represented as a linear, hierarchal stage model, where students develop from less to more complex epistemological assumptions and view of the world. The Scheme contains nine positions, which represent a point of view from which the individual looks at the nature of knowledge. It is presented in Table 1.2.
Table 1.2

Perry's Scheme of Intellectual Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Dualism</td>
<td></td>
<td>'Truth' is black and white, absolutistic, polar terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Differing opinions are seen as errors, mistakes, or put forth by poorly qualified authority figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2: Multiplicity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Differing options are allowed, but seen as temporary until the 'Truth' is discovered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Uncertainty is understood to be widespread, all opinions are seen as equally valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3: Relativism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge and values are understood to be correct based on context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Acknowledgement of a relativistic world causes anxiety due to understanding commitments must be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4: Commitment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Commitments to life direction and values begin to be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Relativism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Responsibility to selected commitments is explored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Affirmation of multiple commitments, responsibilities, and consequences occur</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the lowest level of intellectual development, Dualism, the view of the world and meaning making processes are dichotomous. Knowledge is seen positivistically with those in authority dispensing the right answers. In Position 1, reality, including
knowledge and information is seen in absolutist, polar terms. Knowledge is considered dichotomous: black and white, good and bad. Slightly more advanced is Position 2 in which multiple perspectives are beginning to be seen, but are perceived as confusion by poorly qualified authority figures. It is believed that the right answer will soon emerge when the confusion is remedied.

As students continue to develop, they move into Level 2, Multiplicity. In this level, diverse views are honored when right answers are not yet known. Pluralities of views are acknowledged, but no criteria have been set to establish the merits of one opinion against another. In Position 3, diversity of opinions and uncertainty are accepted as legitimate but considered only temporary, while in Position 4 uncertainty is understood to be extensive, and knowledge is translated into 'everyone has a right to their own opinion.'

The next level of intellectual development is Relativism. In this level, all efforts to define truth are no longer seen as valid. Knowledge is seen more qualitatively, is contextually defined, and is based on evidence and supportive arguments. This is a radical shift in the perception of knowledge and truth. In Position 5, it is understood that all knowledge and values are perceived as contextual and relativistic, and in Position 6, a sense of apprehension begins to build as students realize the necessity of orienting self in the relativistic world through some form of personal commitments.

In the final and highest level of intellectual development, Commitment in Relativism, students accept the responsibility of living in a pluralistic world and begin to shape their lives through making commitments in areas such as career, religious orientation, political views, and relationships. Students come to terms with the meaning
of these commitments and begin to establish a sense of identity in relation to them. In Position 7, initial commitments are made in some areas of life, while in Position 8 the implications of those commitments are experienced along with exploration of responsibility for making choices among many options for living. In the final position, Position 9, there is an affirmation of identity among multiple responsibilities and commitment to these responsibilities is an ongoing activity (Evans et al., 1998).

The framework of intellectual development illuminates how people perceive and relate to knowledge, truth, and authority. Counselors need to be developmentally advanced enough to understand that truth is not the sole possession of authorities, and that the status quo is not always right. Counselor educators have the charge of promoting development in this domain as a way to better prepare students for the roles of counselor, and as advocate.

Promoting Developmental Growth

Growth in these developmental domains is not automatic and requires optimal conditions to be present. A model for promoting development has been articulated by Sprinthall and Thies-Sprinthall (1983) and is called Deliberate Psychological Education. Five conditions are present in this model that are considered necessary for developmental growth to occur. Reinman and Peace (2002) summarized these conditions:

1. New role taking. When students undertake new roles, it frames and provides context for the development that results.
2. Guided reflection. Students participate in carefully planned activities that encourage reflection on performance, integration of readings with experiences,
and ongoing discussion. An instructor who is developmentally more advanced guides the reflection activities.

3. Balance between action and reflection. Action (new role taking) and reflection upon that action must remain in balance. The growth process slows or halts when too much time passes between action and reflection, or there are too few opportunities for reflection.

4. Continuity. The goal of promoting development through balancing action and reflection requires continuous movement between these two tasks. Typically, at least 6-9 months are needed for psychological growth to occur.

5. Support and Challenge. Providing adequate amounts of both support and challenge are necessary for developmental growth. With too little support, an individual will become overwhelmed if the challenge is too great. With not enough challenge, an individual’s growth will stagnate.

Counselor education encompasses each of the necessary components for the promotion of cognitive development as articulated in the DPE model. Students in counselor training are required to take on a significant new role, the role of professional counselor. This experience often provides much challenge for students. Faculty members, doctoral supervisors, and site supervisors are in place to provide adequate levels of support to balance the challenge. Students are asked to continually reflect on their experiences through journals, assignments, discussions, and case presentations. These tasks serve to help them integrate learning with experiences in the field. Finally, this process is continuous over the course of a two to three year program.
Counseling is a complex task that includes undertaking new roles and new ways of thinking for counselor trainees (Blocher, 1983). It not only requires the ability to develop an empathic understanding of clients’ experiences, but also the ability to understand how clients’ experiences fits into large and complex social structures. This requires skills and knowledge in social justice advocacy. While counselor education programs are structured to support cognitive development, it does not appear social justice advocacy skills and knowledge are currently taught. A new approach is needed that can adequately prepare students for the multifaceted professional roles they will face upon graduation. Service learning is a relatively new pedagogical approach that may promote both cognitive development and social justice advocacy competency in counselor trainees.

Service Learning

Counselor educators can use the new and innovative approach of service learning to blend many of the educational tasks in which they are engaged. Service learning combines conceptual and experiential learning into an educational strategy that address a curriculum-related need of the community (Kezar & Rhoads, 2001; Preiser-Houy & Navarrete, 2006; Kronick, 2007). Through the opportunity to put academic learning into practice, students can apply theoretical knowledge to actual situations while they connect the service experience to the academic curriculum (Simons & Cleary, 2006). Kronick (2007) defines service learning as “the process of integrating active assistance in the community into the learning that is occurring in the classroom” (p.4). Sigmon (1994) suggested that quality service learning programs enrich the curriculum, respond to actual community needs, and benefit all participants.
In using a service learning model, students and faculty apply their learning and teaching to community issues and engage in active participation in identifying and addressing community, state, and regional needs (Kezar & Rhoads, 2001). Academic knowledge is augmented through the application of theory and book learning to actual problems faced by clients and communities (Preiser-Houy & Navarrete, 2006). Students can analyze and put academic concepts into practice in the community while being guided by knowledgeable instructors. The link between community issues and learning (Schmidt, Marks, & Derrico, 2004) creates a “more engaged academic environment” (p. 206). Service learning has the potential additional impact of engaging the usually disparate communities of academics and the world outside (Baker-Boosmara, Guevara, & Balfour, 2006).

Several authors discuss the broad benefits of service learning to students, communities, and educational institutions (Strage, 2000; Bransford & Vye; 1989, Eyler, Root, & Giles, 1998). Because of the opportunity to put their academic learning into practice, students come to understand the concepts learned in a better and more genuine way than students who just memorize and repeat facts and abstract concepts (Rocheleau, 2004). This embodies the movement of knowledge from memory into action, (Bransford & Vye, 1989), experience, and competencies that students can utilize in their own communities (Eyler, Giles, Lynch & Gray, 1997). Service learning is similar to the Deliberate Psychological Education model used for promoting growth.

Service Learning as Deliberate Psychological Education

Service learning and the DPE model have many comparable components. In both service learning and DPE, students take on new roles, engage in regular guided reflection
and balance action with reflection. In service learning, adequate amounts support and challenge are not explicit goals, although learning and growth of all participants is sought. In DPE, developmental interventions usually span 6-9 months whereas service learning can occur in one day or an afternoon. There are several components of service learning that extend beyond the DPE model, including the emphasis on including student voice in all stages of project planning, preparation, and execution. Partnerships with community members are also given prominence, along with selecting projects that meet student interest and community need. Additionally, meaningful evaluation of the projects and experiences along with recognition and celebration of the work completed are important components of service learning. While DPE is always about promoting cognitive development, service learning does not always have this goal.

Service Learning, Cognitive Development, and Counselor Education

The use of service learning can be guided and strengthened by viewing it through the lens of developmental theory. As students connect to individuals and communities in need through service learning, they will be confronted with complex social and moral questions that may challenge current ways of thinking. Service learning provides students with the situations that have “power to evoke moral sensitivity and seriousness far better than concocting moral dilemmas or than raising questions based on even the best readings” (Strain, 2005, p. 65). Student cognitive development may be promoted from the new role taking experiences offered to them through service learning. Guided reflection will serve to help students make meaning of, and integrate their learning and growth in qualitatively different, and more adaptive ways.
John Dewey, the educational philosopher, is an early ancestor of both service learning and cognitive developmental theory. For Dewey, education was about preparing individuals to be equipped to transfer knowledge and skills to new situations that answered society’s problems, not just for training them for a particular job or career (Speck & Hoppe, 2004). Preparation for future, unforeseen problems and the concept of a flexible knowledge and skill base is foundational to cognitive developmental theory. The types of learning and experience that occur in the context of high quality service learning provide situations where students are challenged beyond their current capacities and where they come face-to-face with the complexities of humanity and society (Exley, 2004). Interaction with the complex and dynamic environment of social life was, to Piaget, key to development (Brandenberger, 1998). Service learning provides just this type of interaction potential and extends education beyond the traditional walls of the classroom (Brandenberger, 1998). Teachers and service learning practitioners must provide an intentional balance of support and challenge in order to use the experiences of service learning to promote cognitive growth and development in students.

Constantine, et al. (2007) have called for the use of the service learning model in counselor education, as it can provide students with a practical understanding of large-scale societal inequities along with mechanisms by which they may intervene to effect change. For example, service learning could offer opportunities to gain valuable research, evaluation, and program development skills in the context of community mental health settings, which counselor trainees could then transfer into other related settings. This model deserves consideration as a possible approach to the currently unmet need for social justice advocacy preparation in counselor education programs.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the current study was to examine the impact of a service learning intervention on social justice advocacy knowledge and skills and on moral and intellectual development in masters' counseling students enrolled in their Supervised Internship in Community Counseling Internship. Pre and posttest measures of participants' cognitive developmental levels and social justice advocacy knowledge and skills were administered. An intervention integrating academic content about social justice advocacy with service learning experiences in social justice advocacy was applied to students participating in Supervised Internship in Community Counseling. It was proposed that using a service learning model to prepare counseling students for the role of social justice advocate would increase their moral reasoning and intellectual developmental levels and provide a sense of increased competency in acting as social justice advocates. Promoting complexity in student counselors was expected to improve their ability to act as advocates to improve the mental health and wellness of their clients who face systemic barriers to development. Specifically, the study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between counseling students’ moral developmental level and social justice advocacy knowledge and skills?
2. Is there a relationship between counseling student’s intellectual developmental level and social justice advocacy knowledge and skills?
3. Is there a relationship between counseling students’ moral and intellectual developmental levels?
4. Will a service learning intervention designed to prepare counseling students for the role of social justice advocacy positively impact their moral developmental levels?

5. Will a service learning intervention designed to prepare counseling students for the role of social justice advocacy positively impact their intellectual developmental levels?

6. Will a service learning intervention positively impact counseling students' advocacy knowledge and skills?

Definition of Terms

Advocacy: Using skills and actions to help clients challenge institutional and social barriers that impede academic, career, or personal-social development in order to secure fairness, equity, and justice for groups that are disempowered, marginalized, exploited, and dominated by those in power.

Cognitive developmental theory: A theory based on the early work of John Dewey and Jean Piaget that postulates humans develop in a predictable, hierarchal sequence from less complex to more complex ways of viewing and thinking about the world and problems in it.

Intellectual development: A theory developed by William Perry that describes epistemological orientation towards truth, rightness, and authority. Individuals progress through positions to more advanced, multiplistic perspectives.

Moral development: A theory developed by Lawrence Kohlberg that describes the way individuals think and make decisions about issues of justice, fairness, and complex
problems. Moral development occurs in a univariate, hierarchal, fashion with higher stages representing more complex and nuanced perspectives.

*Service Learning:* The process of integrating active assistance to the community with learning that is occurring in the classroom.

*Social Justice:* A set of constructs referring to the structure of systemic inequities and oppression in society based on non-dominant group membership that fosters a set of goals aimed at equalizing the benefits and burdens of society equally to all members.

*Social Justice Advocacy:* Social action conducted with or on behalf of a client, family, or community who are members of one or more non-dominant groups that has the goal of removing the systemic barriers to healthy development and productive living.

**General Research Hypotheses**

This study examined the impact of a service learning intervention on the moral development, intellectual development, and advocacy skills and competencies of masters' level counseling students enrolled in Supervised Internship in Community Counseling. The intervention was expected to result in significantly higher posttest scores for the experimental group on the Defining Issues Test-II (DIT-2), a measure of moral development, the Learning Environment Preference (LEP), a measure of intellectual development, and the Advocacy Competency Self-Assessment Survey (ACSAS) a measure of students' perceptions of their abilities to act as advocates across the domains found in the *Advocacy Competencies*, as compared to control groups who did not participate in the service learning intervention. In addition, it was expected that the constructs of moral development, intellectual development, and advocacy competency would be significantly correlated, as measured by the respective research instruments.
Research Design, Sample Descriptions, and Data Gathering Procedures

The current study consisted of a quasi-experimental, pretest/posttest design with non-equivalent control groups. The experimental group consisted of masters' level counseling trainees registered for Supervised Internship in Community Counseling at The College of William and Mary in the Fall semester of 2008. Two control groups of masters' level students enrolled in their internships during the Fall semester, 2008 were used. The first control group consisted of students from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and students enrolled in Supervised Internship in School Counseling at The College of William and Mary. The second control group, who only took the posttest measures, was made up of students enrolled in Internship in Community Counseling at Marymount University. The first control group received the standard CACREP approved internship experience offered by their respective counseling programs. They completed the pretest instruments early in Fall semester 2008 and completed posttests near the end of the Fall semester, 2008. The second control group also completed the standard CACREP approved internship course. This group completed instruments only at the posttest time for the purpose of analyzing any testing biases. Along with the named instruments, biographical and demographic data including age, race, gender, progress in the academic program, and voting habits were also collected.

Data Analysis

Demographic data was examined using descriptive statistics and frequencies. Because the groups were not randomly selected or assigned to groups, a series of analysis of variance procedures was conducted to determine if there were any significant pretest differences between groups. In addition, the homogeneity of variance among groups was
examined using Levene's test. Research hypotheses were tested using correlational tests and a series of analysis of variance and multivariate analyses of variance procedures. A significance level of $p < .05$ was used to draw conclusions about the results of the statistical tests.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited in scope and had potential limitations. Threats to the internal validity of the study included differential selection and issues with instrumentation. One drawback of the quasi-experimental design, used in the current research, is that participants were not randomly selected to participate in the study nor randomly distributed into experimental and control groups. Thus, the generalizability of the results must be considered with caution. As the Advocacy Competency Self Assessment Survey was recently developed and does not yet have established reliability and validity, the measure may threaten the study's internal validity. Taking this limitation into account, however, the Survey appears to be the only measure of advocacy competency developed for counseling students and was used in the study.

In addition, the study had potential threats to external validity. Response bias, in the form of the Hawthorne effect, was possible since the participants knew they were involved in a research study. Participants may have responded to the instruments in a perceived socially desirable way that may not have accurately reflected their developmental or skill level. The primary researcher implemented the intervention and interacted with the experimental group regularly and only saw the control group members at the times of measurement. This participation of the researcher could have threatened the external validity of the study as well.
Conclusion

This chapter has presented relevant concepts and issues related to the lack of social justice advocacy training in counseling education, despite the call for counselors to take on the role of social justice advocates. Main concepts related to the study were introduced and discussed, including pertinent terms such as advocacy, social justice, and multiculturalism. The guiding theoretical frameworks of cognitive developmental theory and service learning were presented. Research design, questions and hypotheses were listed, participant groups were described, and possible limitations to the study were discussed. The next chapter will engage in a more thorough literature review of relevant concepts. The study’s design and methodology will be specifically laid out in chapter three. Chapter four will present the statistical results of hypothesis testing. The final chapter will present a discussion of the findings, the implications for the field of counselor education, and conclusions.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter will review the relevant literature on the primary topics of the current study. First, the role of social justice advocacy in counselor education will be discussed. Empirical research will be presented describing the current state of training for advocacy in counseling graduate programs. Secondly, connections between multiculturalism and social justice will be explained. Third, cognitive developmental theory, including the domains of moral and intellectual development will be described as the theoretical framework for the study. Relevant empirical research that supports their use in the current study will be examined. Finally, the pedagogical strategy of service learning will next be described, along with its components and supporting research.

In an introductory text on the Community Counseling model, Lewis et al. (1998) discuss a four-quadrant model that describes the basic tasks of community counselors (Table 2.1). Services provided by counselors are conceptualized as direct and indirect, with the target of those services either the community or the client. Indirect service to the community includes activities of prevention education and outreach. Direct service to clients includes the focus of most counselor education: individual, couple, or family counseling. When providing indirect services to the community, counselors engage in activities that may influence public policy to improve the lives of clients and communities. Finally, counselors provide indirect services to clients when they advocate for individual clients and provide consultation to various groups about community needs (1998).
Table 2.1

*The Four Facets of Community Counseling and Their Service Modes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Services</th>
<th>Client Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Preventative education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Influencing public policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While these four components have been conceptualized as equally important facets for community counselors, it appears that counselor education programs focus mainly on training students for one role, the provision of direct services to individual clients and client families (Lewis et al., 1998). This point is confirmed in reviewing the literature on preparing students in the other roles described above, which include the role of advocate for individuals as well as for broader issues of social justice. Few studies examine the question of how counselors are best trained for the role of social justice advocate.

**Social Justice Advocacy Training in Counselor Education**

As discussed in Chapter 1, much of the existing literature on social justice advocacy in counselor education focuses on the discussions of how social justice advocacy is defined and whether this is an appropriate role for counselors (Hunsaker, 2008). Counselor education programs are vital in the fulfillment of counselors’ mandate
for social justice advocacy, and while there are few empirical studies that illuminate how
counselor education programs teach students to fulfill their roles as social justice
advocates, a small number of studies are instructive.

In his unpublished dissertation, Ratts (2007) studied the current state of training
for social justice in counselor education programs accredited by the Council for the
Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (hereafter CACREP).
Ratts developed and distributed a survey to course instructors of CACREP core courses
that fulfilled the requirement for social and cultural diversity (CACREP, 2001). The
survey included demographic as well as open-ended questions regarding the current state
of social justice training. Each of 192 CACREP accredited programs were contacted and
asked to participate in the study, with an ultimate response rate of 56%. Results
illustrated how instructors prepare masters’ level counseling students for engagement
with social justice issues and concepts. Over 90% of respondents indicated that their
programs infused social justice principles into coursework and covered a variety of
topics, including oppression based on non-dominant group membership, as well as issues
of power in the counseling relationship.

While the response rate was adequate, the results should be interpreted with
cautions when considering their relevance for social justice advocacy training. First, as
multicultural competence and social justice issues are sensitive topics, participants may
have had a response bias in which they waned to appear in a positive light. Second,
survey respondents were designated instructors of courses that fulfilled the CACREP
requirement for social and cultural diversity. As such, instructors of these courses were
more likely to feel passionate about issues of social justice. There was no confirmation of
whether curricular infusion of these topics extends to other courses or other faculty members in the programs. Finally, it appeared that many of the concepts instructors identified as part of the curriculum focused on concepts that could also be considered under the ‘multicultural training’ banner instead of the broader concepts of social justice. It is possible that participants considered training for multicultural competence to be the same as training for social justice. Operational definitions of these constructs may not have been clearly articulated.

Despite its potential drawbacks, this study’s results show some social justice concepts are being taught many counselor education programs. Counseling students appear to be receiving at least some instruction in social justice concepts. These findings are encouraging in light of the current mandate for counselors to become advocates. However, more research needs to be conducted using operational definitions to determine the actual degree of social justice training currently in place in counselor education.

Another question that was not answered by this research was how instructors engaged their students in topics of social justice and advocacy. It is not clear whether faculty were teaching students using traditional, didactic methods or more experiential ones. Research focusing on which pedagogical models are most effective in training students in these skills would be helpful in best preparing students to take on the role of social justice advocates.

Another line of research that could assist counselor educators in the task of preparing students for social justice advocacy would be determining whether certain individual characteristics make students more or less likely to engage in activism and advocacy. While there are few studies that look at this question, one conducted by
conducted by Nilsson and Schmidt (2005) sought to examine variables that contributed to social justice advocacy work specifically among counseling graduate students. Their study examined variables that might predict social justice advocacy behavior in counseling graduate students. One hundred and thirty four participants completed demographic questionnaires and several different instruments. No reliable and valid measures of social justice advocacy among counseling students were available at the time of the study, so the instruments used were adapted from closely related uses. Two subscales were used from The Activity Scale developed by Kerpelman (1969). Developed in the 1960s, these scales focused on aspects of social justice activity such as organizing meetings around social issues, protesting, and involvement in political discussions and activities. The researchers also used three measures to examine students’ values, characteristics, and worldviews: the Problem-Solving Inventory (Heppner, 1988) that measures problem solving skills and related issues, the Social Interest Scale (Crandall, 1975) that measures interest and concern for the welfare of others, and the Scale to Assess World Views (Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987) that measures beliefs, values and assumptions about worldviews. Reported Chronbach’s alphas for this sample on all of the measures used were at least adequate, ranging from .60 to .92. Researchers also collected demographic information to determine what variables might serves as predictors of social justice advocacy.

Using two regression models, one for desired engagement in social justice activity and one for actual social justice engagement, results showed that age, number of courses, political interest, concern for others, problem solving skills, and optimistic worldviews predicted desire to engage in social justice advocacy with 30% of the variance accounted
for. These variables also predicted actual involvement in social justice activism with 40% of the variance accounted for in the model. Students who were more interested in politics tended to have a greater desire to be involved in social justice work; students with a desire to be involved and interested in politics tended to be actually engaged in social justice work more. Men and gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgendered individuals had greater desire to be involved in social justice work, but showed no difference in actual engagement than women or heterosexual students. No differences in desired or actual engagement were found between religious groups, between racial groups, or between political parties. Of all the variables, only political interest individually predicted social justice advocacy behavior. Political interest and desire to be engaged in advocacy work predicted actual involvement in this type of activity.

The process used to select participants in this study was unclear and thus, the sample may not have been representative of all counseling graduate students. Additionally, the scale used to determine social justice activity was developed in a different era, where ideas about involvement in social justice might have been different than today’s conception. Counseling students coming into programs directly from traditional undergraduate school were not yet born when this measure was developed so it is unclear whether the choice of this measure was representative. Despite these potential drawbacks, however, this exploratory study illustrated that the two most important factors in engagement in social justice advocacy work are political interest and desire to be engaged in this work. These results have important implications for the promotion of social justice advocacy in counselor education programs. Counselor education programs can use this information to discuss relevant political issues that pique
student interest as a way to motivate students to advocacy. In addition, by giving students an opportunity to engage in advocacy around topics of personal interest for them a passion for advocacy might be encouraged.

These two studies described above may indicate new research is being conducted into how counselor education programs engage students with the topics of social justice and advocacy and what characteristics make students more likely to engage in advocacy. The empirical literature to date has not addressed what curriculum content counselor educators should use to educate students. However, the American Counseling Association (ACA) has put forth a document that may provide a framework for developing this type of curricula in order to help counselors and counselor educators make the concepts of advocacy clear, the ACA adopted a document in 2003 intended to guide counselors in social justice advocacy practice.

*The Advocacy Competencies*

*The Advocacy Competencies* (Lewis, Arnold, House, & Toporek, 2003) describe six domains of advocacy activity along two intersecting continua (Figure 2.1). According to these guidelines, advocacy can occur with a client or on behalf of a client on a micro, meso, or macro level. In the document, necessary skills, suggested activities, and outcomes are described for each of the six advocacy domains (Appendix I).

*Acting with the client.* At the intersection of the acting with the client and the microlevel lies the Client Empowerment domain. It involves increasing client awareness of contextual factors (social, political, cultural, etc.) that have negative impacts on their lives. Counselors who act to empower their clients must be able to identify these factors and their respective impacts on clients, as well as identify client strengths and abilities.
Social justice advocates train clients in and help them carry out plans for their own self-advocacy and empowerment. Moving up from the microlevel of advocacy to the mesolevel, counselors are allies to various disempowered groups in the competency domain referred to as called Community Collaboration. As counselors become aware of recurring issues that create challenges to individuals and groups, they seek to connect with existing agencies already engaged in the struggle for positive societal change. Counselors inform appropriate agencies of specific problematic trends. Skills needed in this area include the ability to build collaborative relationships with and assist in connecting organizations, such as schools and non-profit organizations, which can work together to improve the lives of people served. At the macrolevel of advocacy, counselors act with their clients in the Public Information domain. Using their knowledge about healthy human development and their skills in communication, counselors act to educate the public about systemic issues that negatively impact human dignity. This area includes necessary skills such as public dissemination of collected information in written and multi-media formats. Counselors work with clients and collaborate with other professionals in collecting data, planning information campaigns, and in distributing information for the promotion of healthy development for all groups and individuals.

*Acting on behalf of the client.* The domain of Client Advocacy focuses on the microlevel, where the counselor acts directly on behalf of the client. Working in this competency area, counselors become aware of and act against environmental factors that impede healthy individual development. This requires knowledge of relevant services and systems, as well as the ability to build alliances with other professionals and groups that seek to defeat the barriers to development. Counselors act to acquire services needed for
their clients or to remove obstacles to development. Moving to the mesolevel on behalf of the client is the Systems Advocate who has an awareness of something at a community level that is systemically impacting some groups negatively. The counselor collects data about the problem and presents it to stakeholders along with plan for change. A visionary plan is developed with collaborative partners to address the identified problems. The counselor working in this area understands and works to address resistance as well as assesses the impact of advocacy on stakeholders, the system, and clients or groups.

Working in the final domain, Social/Political Advocacy, counselors work on behalf of clients and groups at a macrolevel. Counselors identify areas that must be addressed at this level and collaborate with others to develop a plan to engage the appropriate avenues for addressing the problems. This may include lobbying legislative bodies, collecting data, writing convincing rationales for change, and maintaining open dialogue with disempowered groups to ensure their needs are being accurately represented (2003).

Figure 2.1. Advocacy Competency Domains.
Multiculturalism and Social Justice

The micro-macro level distinction highlighted in the ACA *Advocacy Competencies* (2003) is particularly important when discussing how multicultural competence relates to social justice advocacy activity. In examining the domains and the needed skills and knowledge for each, it becomes clear that the guidelines assume a certain level of practitioner multicultural competence. Specified skills include the ability to identify cultural, political, and societal factors, including oppression, that impact development as well as the capability to develop partnerships in order to intervene at institutional and societal levels against problematic policies or processes. The *Advocacy Competencies* appear to encompass multicultural competencies and extend them into action in broader ways.

Another interpretation of the micro-macro level distinction can be found in the literature, namely a social justice continuum. It appears that when social justice at a microlevel is discussed in the counseling literature, authors are often referring to multicultural competence (Constantine, et al, 2007). Multiculturally competent practice is referred to as micro social justice because a counselor is responding in culturally appropriate and non-oppressive ways to individual clients and families (2007). Discussion of the macrolevel of social justice, however, appears to refer to social justice advocacy work, such as working at institutional and systemic levels to reduce barriers to healthy development. Having the knowledge and skills to act as a social justice advocate, then, appears to require multicultural competence. Speight and Vera (2004) highlight this connection in stating, “to embrace a social advocacy agenda . . . one must be willing to
examine issues of diversity at a microsocial (i.e. interpersonal) and macrosocial level (i.e. institutional)” (p. 110).

Similarities in these conceptualizations of the micro-macro continuum support the assertion that in order to prepare counseling students as social justice advocates, counselor education programs need to educate students in both multicultural competence and social justice advocacy. Training students in these complex and delicate topics can be a difficult task (Helms, 1995). There are no clear guidelines in the literature about how to prepare students as social justice advocates. Further, the ability of counseling students to engage with the complex topic of social justice advocacy has not been taken into account in the literature. Cognitive developmental research has suggested that learning effectiveness is related to a match between the learner and learning environment (Hunt, 1971). Hayes (1991) suggested that promoting cognitive development of counselors enhances their abilities to advocate for social and community change. However, counselor education programs may not have considered the way student cognitive developmental levels may impact their understanding of complicated social problems requiring counselor action. Developing understanding of difficult and multifaceted social problems such as racism and poverty would seem to require a considerable complexity of thought. A clear conceptualization of the developmental levels of students could help to ensure appropriately matched educational interventions to promote social justice advocacy.

Developmental Considerations

As noted previously, a multicultural approach in counseling is comparable to social justice concepts in action on a microlevel (Ratts, 2007), and social justice
advocacy, which includes engaging larger systems to solve complex social problems, to be macrolevel action. With this movement from the micro to macro levels of engagement with social justice concepts, the complexity likely rises accordingly. Whereas a counselor can use multicultural competence to understand and empathize with the worldview and experiences of an individual client or family, these same skills and ability may not be adequate to engage in macro level social justice work in the form of advocacy. There is little known, however, about how counseling students and counselors develop a sense of professional identity and competence in the role of advocate (Corning & Myers, 2002). Because being able to engage in social justice advocacy at a higher, more complex macrolevel is expected of counselors, and because there is little knowledge about how that ability develops, taking a developmental perspective in examining the questions of training counseling students in social justice advocacy may be warranted. Perhaps one way to determine students' capacities for engaging in social justice advocacy is through assessment of cognitive developmental levels. Cognitive developmental theory could provide a guiding framework for determining how to target teaching interventions and strategies in order to best reach students. A thorough description of cognitive developmental theory will be provided to justify this premise.

Cognitive Developmental Theory

History, Development, and Basic Tenets

The basic assumptions of cognitive developmental theory were presented in Chapter 1. In tracing the history of cognitive developmental theory, one must begin with John Dewey. A philosopher and an educator working in early 20th century, Dewey's ideas provided the foundation for cognitive developmental theory. William James (1904), the
father of American psychology, wrote about John Dewey’s ideas in the premier edition of *The Psychological Bulletin*. He reported Dewey believed that individuals continually reconstruct their perceptions of situations, and that this reconstruction “is the process of which all reality consists” (p.3). Dewey posited that as individuals continue to experience new things, old truths become obsolete and thus, new truths must be found. Views of the world shape reality for each individual and at times and these views become inadequate with the presentation of more difficult challenges. The reconstruction of perspectives must occur in order for a more adaptive understanding of the world to develop (1904). In these views, cognitive developmental theory was born.

In the creation of his own theory of development, Piaget credited Dewey for laying the groundwork. Piaget was interested in describing and explaining the growth and development of intellectual structures and knowledge (Rest, 1994). He focused on uncovering the structure and process of cognitive developmental functioning in children through the teenage years and in doing so, developed many concepts that contributed significantly to developmental theory. Major tenets of Piaget’s developmental theory include schemata, assimilation, accommodation, equilibrium, and disequilibrium. Schemata are cognitive or mental structures used by individuals to organize and adapt to the environment. They are created and modified through the dual processes of assimilation and accommodation. Assimilation refers to the cognitive process through which individuals integrate new information into existing schemata. At times, new information and experiences cannot be incorporated into existing schemata. When this occurs, new schemata must be created. This is the process of accommodation. People seek to maintain a sense of equilibrium, between assimilation and accommodation; this
balance ensures “efficient interaction with the environment” (Rest, 1994, p.16). When that balance cannot be maintained, individuals are said to be in a state of disequilibrium. This activates the processes of assimilation and accommodation in order to again reach equilibrium (1994). From the foundational concepts of Dewey and Piaget came many more developmental theories useful in considering how to address the training for social justice in counselor education.

There are several domains under the umbrella of cognitive developmental theory, yet regardless of which is examined, it appears that higher stages of development represent more adequate ways of engaging with and understanding the world. Rest & Narvaez (1994) proposed that higher levels of development contain “better conceptual tools for making sense out of the world and deriving guides for making decisions” (p. 16). Individuals at higher stages of development are capable of taking a wider range of information into account and can see a broader scope of issues, problems, consequences, and concerns. These higher capabilities equip individuals to more adequately and efficiently address and navigate the challenges of life. Kohlberg (1971) asserted that if higher stages of development more adequately equip individuals for the challenges of life, then promoting that development is what education ought to be about.

Higher is Better

Research has confirmed that higher levels of development are associated positive behavior in a variety of participants. A study conducted by Arbuthnot and Gordon (1986) examined the effect of an intervention designed to promote moral development of adolescents at risk for juvenile delinquency. Forty-eight students between the ages of 13 and 17 were nominated for the intervention by at least one school teacher. A comparison
group of 32 students was used who were considered by teachers to be typical, non-behavior-disordered youth. Participants in the experimental group attended moral dilemma discussion session for one class period each week for 16 to 20 weeks. Dilemma scenarios included topics about property, truth, contract, authority, civil rights, and punishment among others. Results indicated that moral reasoning, as measured by the Moral Judgment Interview (Colby, Kohlberg, Gibbs, Candee, Speicher-Dubin, Hewer, Kauffman, & Power, 1982), was significantly higher for the experimental group as a result of the intervention at posttest. Results also showed significant improvements in several behavioral areas, including reductions in behavioral referrals to the educational administration, tardiness, and police contact. Participants in the experimental group also made significant increases in academic performance as measured by school grades.

The study had a limitation important for consideration. The control group was made up of students who did not exhibit the same type of problematic behavior as the students in the experimental group. It is possible that the significant differences between groups at posttest resulted from the preexisting differences between the groups at pretest. However, this study illustrates that gains in moral reasoning are significantly associated with increases in pro-social behavior.

A meta-analysis of 75 studies conducted by Blasi (1980) examined links between moral reasoning and behavior such as delinquency, honesty, altruistic behavior, and independence in judgment. Results indicated that individuals identified as delinquents because of problematic behavior tended to score significantly lower on moral reasoning measures than non-delinquents. Significant positive relationships between moral reasoning levels and honesty were found. Altruistic behavior and independence in
judgment were both found to significantly relate to moral reasoning levels. A difficulty in conducting meta-analyses is that not all studies use the same operational definitions for terms like honesty or altruism. The individual studies that made up this meta-analysis may have had methodological shortcomings and thus, generalizability of the results must be done with caution. However, the study offers strong support for the assertion that higher stages of moral reasoning are significantly related to positive behaviors.

A study conducted by Richardson, Foster, and McAdams (1998) examined the correlation between moral developmental levels, as measured by the DIT, and parenting and childcare strengths and weaknesses, as measured by the Adult-Adolescent Parenting Inventory (Bavolek, 1984) in foster care parents. One hundred and three certified foster parents completed the research instruments. Results indicated there was a significant positive correlation between moral developmental levels and positive behavioral outcomes in the foster parents. Higher moral reasoning was associated with demonstrating empathic understanding of children, having a better understanding of appropriate parent-child roles, and with not approving of corporal punishment. An overall response rate was not reported in the study. However, the results support the link between higher levels of moral development and positive behavior.

Deliberate Psychological Education

From the outset of cognitive developmental theory, it was recognized that development is not automatic, and growth requires certain elements to be present in the learning environment and the individual. As noted in Chapter 1, the five components of DPE that promote development are: significantly new role taking experiences, support and challenge, guided reflection, a balance between action and reflection, and continuity
(Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983). Research supports the use of the DPE model to promote development. Sprinthall (1994) examined the DPE component of new role taking to determine its effectiveness in promoting developmental growth. He reviewed 11 experimental and quasi-experimental studies where participants engaged in new roles, such as counseling, tutoring, childcare, and companion to the elderly. Guided reflection also appeared to be part of the each study, although it was not made explicit whether this was the case. The meta-analysis specifically examined moral development, as measured by the DIT P score and the Moral Judgment Interview (Kohlberg, 1964), an interview-format measure of moral judgment. The reviewed studies also measured participants on ego development, using the Sentence Completion Test (Loevinger, 1966) or conceptual level, as postulated by Hunt (1974), using the Conceptual Level instrument (1974). Sprinthall followed the Light and Pillemer (1984) procedure for conducting the meta-analysis, which consisted of comparing posttest means between two groups and then dividing the difference by the standard deviation of the control group. He then weighted the average effect size by the sample size with larger studies being given more weight.

Results indicated that overall, the average effect sizes of role taking in the studies were very strong, at +.85 for the measures of moral judgment and +1.10 for either ego or conceptual development. Individual studies making up the meta-analysis were conducted in settings that differed by geographic location, school type, participant socioeconomic status and other demographic differences. The high effect sizes in light of these wide-ranging differences make the results even more impressive. These results indicate that interventions where participants engaged in new role taking experience appeared to promote moral, ego, and conceptual development in a significant way.
The study did not report the number of participants in each study or the overall sample of participants; thus, it is difficult to understand the true scope of the study. However, the results of this meta-analysis make a strong case for significant impact of new role taking experiences in promoting development. This appears to be a crucial component that should be included in any attempt to advance students developmentally.

Individual studies also highlight the utility of DPE in promoting development. Using DPE, Morgan, Morgan, Foster, and Kolbert (2000) sought to promote higher moral developmental levels in law enforcement trainees. The authors cited the history of ethical problems and corruption in law enforcement as justification of a study designed to promote moral and conceptual development in this population. The researchers offered a DPE intervention to law enforcement officers and trainees as well as junior college students in a 10-week introductory criminal justice course. Sixty-four subjects were evenly divided between the experimental and control groups, although they were not randomly assigned to groups. Both groups took similar courses, with the experimental group being taught using a DPE model. The DPE intervention curriculum included group dilemma discussions, reading, and writing assignments in which students were asked to reflect on personal experiences in their current roles (in law enforcement or school). Small and large group discussion formats were used. Students watched video clips on topics such as police corruption, and capital punishment, and discussed reactions. The intervention lasted one academic semester. Pre and posttest measurements were conducted using the Defining Issues Test (Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, & Thoma, 1999) (P and N scores), a measurement of moral development, and the Paragraph Completion Method (Hunt, Butler, Noy, & Rosser, 1978), a semi-projective instrument used to
measure conceptual level. Results showed that the experimental group made significant gains on both the Defining Issues Test P and N2 scores compared to the control group at posttest. While scores on the Paragraph Completion Method for the experimental group showed a positive trend over the control group, scores did not reach a level of significant difference. Significant differences were found in posttest Defining Issues Test P scores between police officers in the experimental and control groups, but this was not the case for Defining Issues Test N2 scores.

While this study contributed to the understanding of what might be necessary in order to increase the moral and conceptual development of law enforcement trainees, it had some limitations. The experimental and control group classes were taught in consecutive semesters. The generalizability of the results could have been increased in teaching the experimental and control groups during the same semester to minimize the impact of history and maturation on the participants. In addition, a random assignment would have increased the generalizability of the results. Future studies could examine a year long intervention and the long-term effects of such an intervention on the moral development of law enforcement members as well as use random assignments as well as multiple instructors. Despite these limitations, this study illustrates the potential utility of using the Deliberate Psychological Education model to promote growth in moral and conceptual developmental domains. In addition, this study shows that a one semester intervention using the DPE model can promote significant growth in moral development as measured by the DIT-2.

Foster and McAdams (1998) conducted a study using the Deliberate Psychological Education model and found significant impact of the model with
supervisors working in residential treatment facility for aggressive youth. The researchers delivered a seven 6-hour in-service training sessions to participants over a 14-week period. Thirty-five participants who worked at three different locations of a residential treatment agency for aggressive youth were introduced to all of the necessary components for DPE. Each of the participants had recently become supervisors in their work sites; this satisfied the new role-taking component. Guided reflection was integrated into the intervention through journals in which researchers encouraged the participants to think about problems from a variety of perspectives through careful feedback. Action and reflection were balanced through the use of regular opportunities for activity and discussion. The program continued for a 26-week period with 14 weeks of the intervention followed by 12 weeks of field-based application. During the second period of the intervention, participants had monthly meetings with researchers and other participants. This addressed the continuity component of DPE. Finally, the intervention offered both support and challenge through the new roles, and the continuous opportunities for reflection and feedback with the instructors.

The researchers evaluated participant pretest and posttest scores on measures of moral development, including the DIT-2 (Rest, et al., 1999) and the Moral Judgment Interview (Kohlberg, 1964). Findings indicated that on both instruments, participants made significant gains in moral development between pretest and posttest. The results must be considered with caution because there was no comparison group used in the design. Thus, the generalizability of the results beyond the specific sample is limited. However, the research appears to show that a DPE intervention significantly impacted the moral development of supervisors in residential youth treatment centers.
These studies, taken together, illustrate the utility of the Deliberate Psychological Education model in promoting various domains of development across a wide variety of settings, populations, and scenarios. In that the model has been shown to be effective, it was selected for application in the current study.

Level or phase advancement is not the only goal of the educational models designed to promote development. Décalage is also an important consideration (Kohlberg, Higgins, & Power, 1991). Novy (1993) described the notion of décalage in development as “the tendency for a person to be at different levels with respect to different issues” (p. 333). Developmental levels across domains are not always synchronous; an individual can be at a higher level of intellectual development and a lower level of moral development, for example.

**Moral Development**

Kohlberg (1971) originally postulated a theory of moral development that focused on how people make moral judgments. Successive stages of development did not just include the ability to take in more information about a given problem, but, instead, they represented nothing short of transformations in the individual’s structure of thought (Evans, et al., 1998). Kohlberg asserted that development occurred in hard stage fashion where stages were mutually exclusive, and development through stages was unidirectional and invariant. His work in the area of moral development was critiqued and expanded by later researchers. These expansions have helped to clarify and further define the realm of moral development.

One theorist’s critique of Kohlberg’s original theory is particularly well known. Carol Gilligan (1987) took issue with how Kohlberg developed the theory of moral
development. A student of Kohlberg, she was critical of the way in which moral development as a theory was originally developed. In the creation of his theory of moral development, Kohlberg studied only male subjects. Gilligan took note of this and put forth a critique of Kohlberg’s theory in its supposition that men’s development describes all of human development. She claimed that this unwarranted generalization had the effect of pathologizing women in the sense that women were not seen as able to develop as highly as men. Women, as a group, averaged lower scores than men on tests that measured moral development, and many interpreted this to mean that women were not as developmentally advanced than men (Evans et al., 1998). Gilligan (1987), in an attempt to correct this bias, studied women in order to represent their unique developmental trajectory. She put forth a new variation on moral development that attempted to shift the discourse from objective individualism to relationship and care that she asserted was more characteristic to women. Gilligan’s claims of moral developmental theory being biased against women were not supported in later research; however, her work expanded Kohlberg’s original theory. Kohlberg later included “respect for persons” to Stage 6 in an attempt to incorporate the ethic of care.

Rest (1979) has made significant contributions to the field of moral development through his research and subsequent modification of Kohlberg’s theory. Along with other researchers, he asserted that limitations to the model required changes for it to more accurately reflect the construct of morality (Rest, et al., 1999). The reconstruction of Kohlberg’s theory is now known as the Neo-Kohlbergian Model. One criticism of Kohlberg’s theory was that the construct of moral judgment failed to adequately address all the domains that make up moral behavior. Thoma (1994) has found that moral
reasoning typically accounts for only 10-20% of variance in moral behavior. Rest et al. (1999) remedied this by putting forth a more comprehensive conceptualization of moral behavior, which included moral judgment, moral sensitivity, moral motivation, and moral character (Thoma, 1994). This is referred to as the Four Component Model. Moral Judgment is related to considering what actions to take in a moral dilemma. Moral sensitivity refers to an awareness that moral problems exist between people and to the ability to consider possible responses. Bebeau (1994) has regarded moral sensitivity as an affective process that relates to the use of empathy skills. Moral motivation refers to prioritizing moral values and taking responsibility for outcomes of moral decision making. Moral character refers to the ability to persevere in a moral task despite obstacles (Morton, Worthley, Testerman, & Mahoney, 2006). These components of morality are highly interactive rather than being linear and isolated from each other (Rest, et al., 1999).

Another criticism of Kohlberg's model was that the hard stage, stair-step progression through stages of development was contrary to the gradually shifting developmental process that Rest et al. observed (1999). They suggested that instead of locating an individual in only one stage at a given time, it was more appropriate to consider what percentage of an individual's reasoning fits with particular schemata. Development was conceptualized as occurring in a fluid fashion that was not unidirectional and invariant. Instead of using three levels of development with two stages each, Rest et al. (1999) identified three developmentally ordered schemata that characterize ways people make sense of moral situations. These three schemata were identified as a result of research conducted using the DIT-1. They generally followed
Kohlberg’s basic model and included Personal Interest, Maintaining Norms, and Postconventional Thinking. The Personal Interest schema involves making decisions based on what is at stake for the individual and for those with whom the individual has close relationships. The Maintaining Norms schema relates to a need for social norms, rules, and laws to inform decisions about moral actions. The Postconventional schema related to decision making based on values that have been established through open debate, consistency of results, and experience of the community. These schemata are the basis for scores on the Defining Issues Test, a pencil and paper test of moral judgment (Rest et al., 1999). Several studies have been conducted using the DIT and its new version, the DIT-2 to illustrate how moral development relates with a wide variety of constructs.

When in a professional context, moral behavior is often synonymous with ethics (Rest, 1994). Preparing student counselors to determine an appropriate and ethical course of action in an ambiguous situation is a major task of counselor training. In the CACREP (2001) training model, professional ethics is one of the eight primary components of counselor education programs. The utility of a moral developmental framework when considering how to best prepare students for ethical dilemmas is clear. Higher levels of moral reasoning allow individuals to take in a greater amount of information and to consider problems with greater degrees of complexity. With the multifaceted issues often faced by counselors and clients, higher reasoning skills are desired. Thus, the one purpose of counselor training programs should be to promote the type of reasoning that will lead to moral and ethical professional behavior and to move students toward higher levels of moral reasoning. Other components of morality, such as moral sensitivity and moral
character also seem particularly relevant to the counseling context. Little research has explored these areas.

Evans and Foster (2000) conducted a study using a correlational design to determine whether any relationships existed between moral developmental levels and white racial identity development (Helms, 1990) of counselor education students. Sixty-eight participants at one institution completed the instruments, which included the DIT (Rest et al., 1999) and the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (Helms & Carter, 1990), a measure of six levels of white racial identity development. Many of the participants had previously taken multicultural training and some previous counseling experience, although none were currently enrolled in multicultural course at the time of the study.

No relationship was found between white racial identity development and moral development as measured by the instruments. The researchers conducted a stepwise multiple regression analysis in order to determine the contribution of demographic variables on instrument scores. Results of the regression analysis showed that hours of multicultural training significantly contributed 7% of the variance to scores on Autonomy scale, the highest level of white racial identity development. More hours of multicultural training were significantly related to higher scores on the Autonomy scale. Age of participants significantly contributed to scores on the Pseudo-Independence scale, the second highest level of white racial identity development. Age accounted for 8% of the variance of Pseudo-Independence scale scores.

This study had a relatively small sample size and non-random sampling; thus, the results must be interpreted with caution. However, the study's significant findings relating the impact of multicultural training on more positive racial attitudes for white
counseling students are important for programmatic considerations in counselor education. In addition, this study provides a foundation for further research investigating the links between multicultural concepts, which are related to issues of social justice as discussed in Chapter 1, and moral development.

A correlational study conducted by Eriksen and McAuliffe (2006) examined the question of whether the ability of student counselors to learn the basic skills of counseling are related to moral and intellectual development. Participants included 119 graduate counselor education students enrolled in a basic counseling skills course at three different institutions. Data was collected over four years. Researchers assessed students during the first week of counselor training on three instruments, the DIT (Rest et al., 1999), a measure of moral development, the Learning Environment Preferences, a measure of intellectual development on the Perry scheme, and the Counseling Skills Scale (CSS, Eriksen & McAuliffe, 2003), a measure of counseling skill performance. The CSS was used in conjunction with a video taped section of counseling where trained raters indicated the skill level of the counselor on a variety of micro skills, including body language, minimal encouragers, and others that are common to counseling practice. The raters examined 10-minutes sessions recorded by student participants at the beginning of the first semester of counselor training.

Researchers used stepwise multiple regression to determine the impact of each variable on the statistical model. Results indicated that DIT scores (N2 and P score) contributed significantly to the CSS scores, with 16% and 18% of the variance accounted for by N2 and P score, respectively. These results were strong in light of other tests used to predict performance and their variance accounted; the GRE predicts only 6% to 9% of
the variance of first year graduate student grades (Eriksen & McAuliffe, 2003). Scores on the LEP did not contribute significantly to the model, which contradicted previous research (Haag-Granello & Hazler, 1998). Some limitations to the study may threaten its generalizability and internal validity. Because participants hailed from three different institutions, the conceptualization of basic counseling skills may have been different. There was no description of whether participating faculty had the same operational definitions of or emphasis on these skills. In addition, no inter-rater reliability statistics were reported for the CSS, so it is not clear whether all raters were congruent in their assessment of participants’ taped counseling sessions.

Despite these limitations, this study highlights the usefulness of using a moral developmental framework for conceptualizing counselor skills. Results suggest use of the DIT as a selection tool for counseling program applicants may be useful in selecting students who have a high probability of success in gaining counseling skills. Higher levels of development are related to better performance on basic counseling skills as measured by the CSS. While cause and effect relationships were not studied in this research, the findings suggest that promoting development may help to increase basic skills in counseling students. In summary, the moral developmental framework has shown promising utility in conceptualizing growth needed during counselor education to prepare students for their professional tasks. However given the limitations in existing studies, further research into how pedagogical strategies that can promote moral development in counselor training appears to be warranted. Accordingly, this research applied a second developmental framework for exploring how students change during counselor preparation might also be instructive.
**Intellectual Development**

William Perry, (1999) was interested in how people view their learning experiences. He conducted a series of year-end interviews with students at Radcliffe and Harvard over the course of their four year college careers. As described in Chapter 1, these interviews became the basis for his theory of intellectual development, similar to Rest’s conceptualized model of moral development (Rest et al., 1994), Perry postulated that developmental positions were not static and represented central tendency in viewpoint at the given moment. In general terms, Perry’s theory describes how individuals move from simplicistic forms of thought where only dualities can be perceived (good-bad, black-white), to more complex thought structures where individuals embrace the personal commitments they have made in a world they understand to be relativistic. Perry’s scheme of intellectual development speaks to the way individuals view the nature of knowledge, authority, and an individuals’ role in these (Evans, et al., 1998). While the theory was originally crafted to conceptualize undergraduate students, much research has been conducted using this framework with graduate students as well.

Students who enroll in counseling programs tend to show an increase in cognitive development on the Perry scheme over the course of their graduate program, according to a study conducted by Granello (2002). This study sought to determine the overall impact of counselor training on students’ cognitive development as measured by the Learning Environment Preferences (LEP) test (Moore, 1989), an instrument designed to determine position on the Perry scheme. The researcher conducted a cross-sectional analysis of 205 masters-level counseling students distributed among 13 different colleges and universities. Participants were engaged in five specialty areas within counseling,
including community, mental health, school, rehabilitation, and marriage and family. Participants who were enrolled in a variety of counseling courses including beginning counseling and a mid-range courses, counseling practicum, and counseling internship completed the Learning Environment Preference instrument. The researcher used a monotonic trend analysis within a MANOVA procedure because the intervals for program levels were not equal. Results revealed a statistically significant monotonic trend for the LEP score and stage in the counseling program. Students advanced intellectually, as a function of their level in the program, during counselor training. This suggests that counselor education programs serve to promote the intellectual development of students.

Limitations in the generalizability of the study’s results must be considered. Its cross-sectional design has lower internal validity than a longitudinal design. The participants may have systematically differed based on educational institution, and these differences could have accounted for the desired results found. Additionally, the sample consisted of a large majority of white, female participants. Generalizability beyond this demographic group should be done with caution. However, despite these limitations, this study illustrated that progression through counselor education is positively related to intellectual development. Given that individuals at higher stages of intellectual development are able to see the world in more adaptive, complex ways. Counselor education may positively impact the preparation of students for the complexities of social justice advocacy. However, further research is needed to show what certain types of experiences, teaching strategies, or program structures are most effective toward this goal.
A study by Steward, Boatwright, Saure, Baden, and Jackson (1998) studied relationships between white racial identity development, intellectual development, and gender. Using a correlational design, 82 counseling graduate students from three, large, predominantly white research-oriented universities participated in the study. Two of the three programs were CACREP accredited, and one program was not. Participants completed a demographic questionnaire, the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale, (Helms & Carter, 1990), and the Scale of Intellectual Development (SID, Erwin, 1983), a 115-item instrument that measures intellectual development based on the Perry scheme. Scores on the SID are assigned on four subscales: Dualism, Relativism, Commitment, and Empathy.

Results indicated that levels of dualistic thinking (Perry Level 1) were significantly related to modes of white racial identity development that deny racial issues exist or that believe in the superiority of whites. In addition, female students were found to have lower levels of dualistic thinking and higher levels of racial identity status. Male participants with lower levels of intellectual development also had lower levels of white racial identity developmental levels.

The study had some potential limitations that may limit the generalizability of the results. The sample consisted of both masters’ level and doctoral level students. Inclusion of two developmentally different groups (Perry, 1999) may have confounded the results. Additionally, the participants attended similar institutions (mostly white, large research institutions); thus, the results may not be generalizable to a larger population of white counselors. Despite these limitations, the study provides some evidence that levels of intellectual development are significantly related to levels of white racial identity
development. Intellectually advanced white counselors tend to think in more flexible, less stereotypic ways about racial issues. While this evidence is useful in understanding how intellectual development and white racial identity development are linked, it does not shed light on how counselor educators can promote more complexity in intellectual and racial identity development. More research may be needed in this area.

One of the central constructs within counseling and counselor education is empathy, or the ability to understand the experience and emotions of another person (Ivey, 1991). Lovell (1999) conducted a correlational study to determine the relationship between student counselor levels of intellectual development, as measured by the LEP, and levels of empathy, as measured by the Hogan Empathy Scale (EM, Hogan, 1969). A sample of randomly selected student members of the ACA participated in the study, with an overall return rate that was acceptable (33%). Three hundred and forty participants received and returned packets that included a demographic questionnaire, the LEP and the EM. Results of the study found a moderate, yet significant, relationship between intellectual development, using the cognitive complexity score (CCI), and empathy levels ($r = .31, p < .001$). Further analysis of the relationship between Perry levels and empathy was conducted using the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test. Results indicated that higher levels of intellectual development were significantly related to higher levels of empathy.

The study had a few important limitations that may impact how the results can be interpreted. The response rate was low, although for the purposes of statistical analysis, it was considered by the study’s author to be adequate. Additionally, no follow up studies were conducted to determine whether the non-responders differed in systematic ways
from participants. Despite the limitations, the study showed that empathy, an important attribute for counselors, is directly related to intellectual developmental level.

These studies, taken together, illustrate that intellectual development, as articulated by Perry, appears to increase during counselor education. Thus, the use of this developmental model as a framework for conceptualizing how counselors change throughout the course of preparation is potentially useful for educators.

Counselor Cognitive Development

Developmental models of counselor cognitive development are based on many of the same principles of general cognitive developmental theory. Development is seen as a progressive change in thought patterns toward great complexity and integration of multiple sources of information. Progress is sequential and hierarchical (Borders & Brown, 2005). Early in the stages of counselor development, counselor trainees usually display black and white thinking patterns along with somewhat simplistic understandings of client issues. They frequently want to know the rules about the one right way to conduct counseling. Anxiety is often high at this stage, as beginning counselors doubt their skills and do not have an accurate view of their strengths and weaknesses (Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Crethar, 1994). Counseling students at mid levels of development are more flexible and differentiated in their approaches with clients. They have begun to develop realistic perspectives of clinical strengths and weaknesses, although they frequently cycle between doubt and confidence as they engage with unfamiliar client issues. In the upper stages of counselor development, client conceptualizations are comprehensive and client specific. Counselors are comfortable with the ambiguity and paradoxes often present in clinical work and are more
sophisticated in relational skills (Borders & Brown, 2005). If higher developmental levels better equip counselors with more adequate ways of viewing the world and the problems in it, then counselor education should be about the business of promoting development.

Service Learning

*History and Philosophy*

No discussion of service learning is complete without an introduction to the influence of John Dewey. His ideas provided the foundation for service learning, although Dewey himself never used the term. Dewey, father of a progressive educational movement, believed that education should focus on the most important problems and issues in society, and that education should prepare students for the duties of a citizenry engaged in an active and participatory democracy. This included preparing students “for lifelong commitment to civic involvement and social reconstruction” (Cummings, 2000, p. 97). For Dewey, an effective education oriented students toward solving problems collectively and through discussion, experimentation, reflection, and democracy. The overall goal of education was nothing short of social transformation (2000), while at the same time promoting intellectual, social, and moral student development (Carver, 1997).

Two preeminent service learning scholars, Giles and Eyler (1994), traced the roots of service learning back to John Dewey, and stated that “it appears the service-learning reflects, either consciously or unconsciously, a Deweyian influence” (p. 78). Dewey had four requirements he believed to be essential if learning experiences were to be truly educative for students. Specifically, learning experiences: (a) must generate interest in students, (b) must be intrinsically worthwhile, (c) must awaken curiosity and generate a need and demand for new information in students, and (d) must continue over
a period of time sufficient to promote development (1994). Service learning would seem to incorporate each of these criteria (Eyler, Giles, Lynch, & Gray, 1997). It provides an opportunity for students to apply their accumulated knowledge base through application and actual experience. According to Dewey, for knowledge to be transferable and usable in the future, it had to be gained in the context of actual experiences. Otherwise, it would be less relevant and would not transferred to new situations where it would be useful. Experience is key in Deweyian education (Giles & Eyler, 1994). Service learning provides an example of the type of education conceptualized by Dewey in that it links a student’s knowledge base with practical experience in examining and collectively working to solve community problems. Through Deweyian education, students can learn that “context matters, that stereotypes may not reflect reality, that multiple viewpoints have merit, that social problems have complex etiologies, and that solutions come from dialogue and cooperation (Brandenberger, 1998, as cited in Duffy & Bringle, 1998, p. 118). Direct engagement in applying knowledge to important problems increases student motivation and the intensity of student experience (Hepburn, 1997). Translating, testing, and analyzing knowledge is crucial for true learning to take place (Duckenfield & Madden, 2000).

Service learning has also been informed by the work of Paulo Freire, an educational and political leader in Brazil. Freire disliked the dominant educational model known as the “baking model of education,” a model in which the teacher, who has knowledge and information, deposits it into passive student-ATM machines (Battistoni, 1997). To Freire, education was a political activity that could promote democracy and equality in society. His work helped to inform the service learning community about
issues of power and privilege that are embedded in service experience (Brandenberger, 1998). Traditionally, service has been given by those with 'more' to those with 'less.' According to Freire, this structure strengthens the status quo instead of working to defeat it.

Although its roots link it to John Dewey and Paulo Freire, service learning is a recent development. Members of the Southern Region Education Board in Oak Ridge, Tennessee originally coined the term “service learning” in 1969. They sought ways to promote an ethic of community service and stronger connections between students and their communities. Additionally, they wanted to connect learning in school to the world of work, and in doing so, to prepare students to make the transition between these two segments of life.

Since that time, several public and private organizations have come into existence to promote service learning across the country and the world. Some of these organizations are well known, such as Americorps, while others, such as Learn and Serve America and the Corporation for National Service, are more obscure (Hepburn, 1997). In 1985, the presidents of Brown, Georgetown and Stanford universities, as well as the president of the Education Commission of the States began an organization that has become known as Campus Compact. Believing that college students were not as materialistic and as self-absorbed as portrayed in the media, the founders of Campus Compact recognized that many students were engaged in community service. They believed that with the proper infrastructure, guidance, and encouragement, many more students would become engaged in community service (Campus Compact, n.d.).
In 2006, Campus Compact reported it had over 1,000 member colleges and universities in 31 states (n.d.). The organization provides resources for educators, institutions, and administrators to assist them in becoming involved in the service learning movement. In another solidification of the service learning movement, a conference convened in 1989 by The Johnson Foundation produced the Wingspread Principles. These ten principles were written “to clarify the role of service-learning and its acceptance within educational institutions” (Mintz & Hesser, 1996, as cited in Erickson & O’Connor, 2000, p. 60).

Components of Service Learning

As a distinct pedagogical strategy, service learning has several defining components that set it apart from other educational models. Several authors discuss components of successful service learning (Allen, 2003; Kahne, Westheimer, & Rogers, 2000; Kraft, 1996; Pritchard, 2002). A viable service learning program must include: student voice, community partnerships and collaboration, the identification of a community “felt need,” guided student reflection, meaningful evaluation of the experience for partners and students, and finally, celebration and recognition the results of the projects and experience.

Student voice. Active student participation in selecting and designing service learning projects increases student motivation and engages them in the planning process (Warter & Grossman, 2002). Learning appears to be enhanced when students are allowed to select their project topic and participate in its design; they are more likely to take initiative to connect with community partners, learn about political decision making, and gain knowledge of communication among and between organizations (Battistoni, 1997).
Creating conditions where students are allowed to select and design projects that meet their personal and professional interests, values, and talents is “most likely to show positive student outcomes of service involvement” (Warter & Grossman, 2002, p. 86).

Community partnerships. Community partners are those individuals and organizations who develop conditions where students can carry out service learning projects. Ward & Wolf-Wendel (2000) stated “Without community partners, there would be no service learning” (p. 768). The learning in service learning occurs through a relational process. Students learn not only in the classroom but also from their personal experience in interacting with community members and classmates (Boyle-Baise & Efiom, 2000). In service learning the service providers and the service recipients are recognized to have valuable attributes to bring to the collective table. Conducting the service learning experience through a collaborative model teaches students to value community voices, and to respect multiple perspectives (Warter & Grossman, 2002).

Identifying a community ‘felt need.’ Service project design should come out of an understanding of what are a community’s felt needs (Exley, 2004). Not to have such an understanding risks subjecting community members to well-intentioned, but unneeded and even potentially harmful service. Misappropriated services may act to strengthen the unjust status quo, not work to defeat it. Community needs can be identified through community agencies and in collaboration with service recipients where communities are empowered to bring their voices to the service learning process. Community strengths and assets can also be identified and incorporated into the design of service learning projects (Warter & Grossman, 2002).
Guided reflection. Similar to the Deliberate Psychological Education model described previously, a central element in the promotion of student development in service learning is the use of guided reflection exercises. Throughout the process of service learning, students reflect on what the experience means to them and to their community partners, as well as the implications for the larger social system (Warter & Grossman, 2002). Reflection allows students a forum “in which to gain a greater understanding of social issues and their causes, as well as gain an appreciation for individual and contextual differences” (Warter & Grossman, 2002, p. 89). Guided reflection encourages new construction of reality (Eyler, Root, & Giles, 1998) while students make connections between course curriculum and service experiences.

Meaningful evaluation. In order to understand the impact of the service learning experience for all participants (students, community partners, institution), meaningful evaluation of the experience is critical. All stakeholders and involved parties should engage in evaluation at appropriate levels. This includes assessing the benefit and impact of the service from the community perspective. In this way, those who are most directly affected by the service evaluate its overall impact (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2000).

Celebration and recognition. At the conclusion of projects, instructors should plan for and carry out celebration that includes all stakeholders including community partners, students, and other supporters. Spending time recognizing and celebrating the accomplishments made during service learning helps to solidify the meaning making process for students by drawing conclusions about the experience. It can also serve to encourage students to continue to engage in service after the projects are over (Pennsylvania Service Learning Alliance, 2002).
A Comparison of Service Learning to Other Service-Based Models

Service learning is a distinct educational model that has a unique focus, set of goals, purpose, and components. It is different from programs that focus on community service, as well as those that promote service-based internships, the type that is typically found in the counselor educational curriculum. Table 2.2 summarizes the differences between these service-based educational models (Furco, 2002, p. 24).

Community service. In community service, sometimes also called volunteerism, the focus is on the service itself and is intended to benefit the service recipient (Furco, 2002). Community service seeks to promote civic and ethical development in the servers and is usually based on a social cause, such as fighting homelessness or domestic violence. While community service may be encouraged by educators and sometimes even made a requirement for graduation or completion of a course, it is usually not intentionally integrated into the curriculum, instead taking a peripheral role to the academic content. Community service is important and beneficial to society overall, but is not an integrated educational strategy that intentionally forwards academic goals (2002). Service learning differs from volunteerism and community service in several ways. The service in service learning has intentional academic goals as well as seeks to increase “students’ personal involvement in academic and civic life” (Allen, 2003, p. 51.).

Service learning. Service learning may be considered a model that combines elements of community service with elements of service based internship to create a distinct and powerful pedagogical strategy. In service learning, the focus is on providing
benefit both to the recipient of service and the provider of service. The academic content is emphasized equally with the
Table 2.2

*Distinctions Among Service-Based Educational Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internships</th>
<th>Community Service</th>
<th>Service Learning</th>
<th>Service Based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primarily Intended</strong></td>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>Recipient AND</td>
<td>Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Focus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service AND</td>
<td>Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intended</strong></td>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Purpose</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integration with</strong></td>
<td>Peripheral</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Co-curricular/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supplemental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Service</strong></td>
<td>Based on a</td>
<td>Based on an</td>
<td>Based on an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>social cause</td>
<td>academic discipline</td>
<td>industry or career</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service component; one is not more important than the other. Each piece of the academic and the service components inform and strengthen the other through reflection. Service
projects are intentionally selected and designed to integrate with the academics of the course in which they are embedded.

The combination of academic development with civic and moral development is unique to service learning (Furco, 2002). Duffy and Bringle (1998) highlight the importance of the learning objectives that are part of service learning. These objectives focus on “civic involvement and social responsibility, and students not only learn through service but also learn to serve” (p. 114).

Service-based internships. Service based internships are designed to benefit the student through learning about academic and career related topics. Students spent time at agencies and organizations learning about their chosen field and how to function within it. The goal of service-based internships is to promote vocational and academic development in student interns. Students gain valuable experience that is usually co-curricular or supplemental to the rest of their academic experience (Furco, 2002). While both service learning and service-based internships are focused on academic development, internships tend to emphasize professional and career development over civic and moral development (2002). The internship experience is often separate from other academic courses and has a different set of goals and experiences.

Within the counselor education curriculum, the clinical experiences of practicum and internship play very important roles in the development and education of new counselors. CACREP is the accrediting body that sets programmatic standards for counselor education programs. In the 2001 CACREP Standards (CACREP, 2001), practicum and internship are described as “the most critical experience elements in the program” (p.17). The focus is on providing for students the best preparatory experience
possible for the role of professional counselor. There is no discussion in the CACREP standards (2001) about how the students are to provide benefit to the clients, although clearly the intention of the field is to help clients to the best of counselors’ abilities. The official description of internship given by CACREP makes it clear that the focus is on the professional development of the student counselor, consistent with Furco’s general description of service-based internships (2002). Barbee, Scherer, and Combs (2003) suggest that in counselor education, “service-learning projects are distinct from internships and practicum training” (p.109).

Service Learning Research

Research designs exploring the impact of service learning on students have been both qualitative (Quezada & Christopherson, 2005; Jones & Abes, 2004, Kronick, 2007; Schmidt, Marks, & Derrico, 2004) and quantitative (Simons & Cleary, 2006; Wells & Grabert, 2004; Hoffman & Wallach, 2007; Strage, 2004). Researchers have found much benefit for students who participate in service learning.

In a large study that sought to examine the impact of service learning on college students, Eyler, Giles, and Braxton (1997) collected data from 1544 students, including 1140 service learning participants, from 20 colleges and universities. Participants completed a survey designed to measure community-related values, perceptions of social problems and social justice, and students’ self-efficacy with regard to their ability to make a difference in communities. T-tests were used to compare service learners to non-service learners, and linear regression modeling was applied in determining the impact of various predictor variables, such as age and gender on research instruments. Differences in demographic factors such as age, socio-economic status, gender, and race were
statistically controlled using ANCOVA analysis. Results illustrated that service learning was a significant predictor of higher scores on measures of, community related values, self-efficacy, political skills, and perceptions of social justice. Students who participated in service learning were found to exceed non-service learners in their ability to make a difference, to view social problems systemically instead of individually, and to value helping people and engaging in political action.

In interpreting these results, several limitations should be considered. First, subscales Chronbach’s alphas for the survey used were between .46 and .80, which may not be adequate to show validity. Second, the service learning group was more than twice as large as the non-service learning group, and no reporting was made as to the homogeneity of variance between these groups. Thus, assumptions of the statistical tests used may have been violated due to the unequal sample sizes. Despite these drawbacks, this study illustrates the service learning may be correlated with growth on a variety of factors that relate to civic engagement, political skills, and social justice. More research using reliable and valid instruments and equal sample sizes is recommended.

Using a qualitative research design with a constructivist approach, a study by Jones & Abes (2004) focused on the potential long-term impact of participation in service learning. The researchers conducted interviews with 8 participants who had completed an undergraduate service learning course two to four years prior. The constructivist framework of qualitative research seeks to understand how participants make personal meaning of experiences. Knowledge is seen as constructed by individuals within their social contexts (Charmaz, 2000; Crotty, 1998). Interview data was examined using the constant comparative process (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) in which several strategies were
used to assure the trustworthiness of the study, including member checks, prolonged engagement, and auditing. Results illuminated several themes reflecting the impact of service learning two to four years after its completion. Findings revealed that participants gained understanding of economic privilege and related benefits as well as becoming more open to experiences, people, and ideas that were different from what they had previously known. In addition, they became more interested in critical thinking and in a multiplicity of views, which resulted in developing relationships with people they might not have encountered or appreciated otherwise (Jones & Abes, 2004). In summary, participants reported their engagement in service learning “caused them to reflect on their values, beliefs, and attitudes in a way that very few other activities had encouraged,” (p. 154).

This study was well constructed and, as noted previously, used several procedures to ensure trustworthiness and authenticity. One limitation of the study was that researchers were also associated with the service learning program participants took part in and thus had dual relationships with the participants. This could have impacted the nature of what participants reported during the interviews. However, this study served to richly describe and explain the personal experience of service learning and its impact on college students in their own words. Corroborative research into the qualitative experience of service learning for students would strengthen the utility of its findings and is, thus, recommended.

A study conducted by Strage (2000) sought to examine the academic impact of service learning on students enrolled in an introduction to child development course. Four hundred and seventy-seven students enrolled in the course over four semesters. Three
hundred and eleven participants completed the course with no service learning component and 166 participants completed the course with a service learning component. Participants in the courses with service learning were placed in a variety of school contexts that they were allowed to select, including preschools, elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools, where they worked with children in unspecified tasks. They wrote weekly journals where they reflected on the links between the course content and their service learning experiences. Students who did not engage in service learning had an observation assignment where they spent time in school observing children based on classroom concepts such as interaction with peers. These students also wrote journals about the links between the academic content of the course and their classroom observations. Results showed that students in the courses with service learning earned significantly more points on exams than did students who did not participate in service learning.

The study had an important limitation. One component of the exams, on which service learners scored significantly higher, was narrative essays. The researcher, as the primary instructor for the course, also scored the exams. This introduces the possibility that researcher bias may have impacted the essay scores and may have confounded the results. However, the higher essay scores could also reflect a better understanding of the course material as a result of the service learning experience. Despite this limitation, the study shows that engaging in service learning appears to have a positive impact on student learning of academic content.
Service Learning for Social Justice: Considerations of Power and Privilege

When communities and students are linked through service learning, larger issues of social justice and social change usually emerge (Baker-Boosmara, et al., 2006). For example, when students plan a project to provide tutoring services to urban schools that have low graduation rate, they may notice that schools these schools tend to have a large population of minority students. These topics cannot be responsibly addressed without looking at the embedded issues of power and privilege. Warren (1998) stated that engaging in service learning without an awareness of social justice issues is difficult. It is the instructors’ responsibility to explore the consequences of social injustice. This exploration is critical to the student’s understanding of their service learning experience.

Baker-Boosmara, et al. (2006) address the link between issues of social justice, power and privilege, and service learning. The authors caution educators that the potentially powerful force of service learning can actually do harm to the community it is intending to serve if well-intentioned benefice perpetuates issues of paternalism and privilege. Similarly, Kronick (2007) cautions educators not to fall into the “self-congratulatory trap of patting ourselves on the back from idealism and service to those in need” (¶ 25). In order to mitigate these risks, Kahne recommends that service learning leaders and educators intentionally weave the service learning experience together with social analysis throughout the process (as cited in Allen, 2003). Students need to be prepared by instructors for the differences in class, race, and ethnicity they will likely encounter. This preparation must include the political and social dimensions of the difficult and complex problems faced by non-dominant populations such as racism, poverty, violence, and substance abuse (Warren, 1998). Failure to provide such
preparation risks the students locating social problems in the individual rather than in social systems, which maintain oppression (Warter & Grossman, 2002). Students can be taught and helped to see that while individual and family problems exist in the populations they are working with, the powerful social structure and pervading culture frequently cause and continue to support and perpetuate them (Chesler & Vasquez Scalera, 2000). It is important for students to understand that relieving complex social problems through social change is neither easy nor finite but requires sustained and creative efforts by all stakeholders (Warren, 1998). This will help students to be more realistic in their approaches, more genuine and mutual in their relationships with community partners, and, better prepared to deal with the inevitable disappointments that come when fighting systems of oppression. Wade stated that service “should be about working with others rather than just for them. Service, in the highest sense, goes beyond meeting individual needs to empowering the other to work on their own behalf” (Wade, 2000, p. 97).

Reinforcing the unjust status quo. The service learning relationship is often between affluent college students and the underprivileged groups. Non-dominant groups, who are often marginalized as the “other,” must not be further objectified and minimized in this way by service learners who are unaware of these issues. This kind of demeaning, stratified relationship insinuates that the university knows best and that the community needs its help (Kezar & Rhoads, 2001). Speck and Hoppe (2004) elaborate:

... students needs to come to understand that they have no simple solutions to offer the disadvantaged ... middle- and upper- class students tend to think that a little bit of charity and dissemination of their own middle-class values will suffice
to lift the impoverished and exploited out of their conditions. The principle of experiential learning is precisely to deconstruct this arrogant and misguided missionary self-understanding of the student. (p. 17)

The implications of the service learning relationship must be critically examined in order to avoid reinforcing the hierarchical system currently in place. Service learning that lacks the social analysis and focus on social justice could be seen as more similar to volunteerism. While volunteer work is valuable to society, and those who do it often have positive intentions, its implications may warrant examination to ensure that is does not support unjust wealth distribution (Warren, 1998). According to Boyle-Baise and Efiom (2000), volunteer service “may suffer from benefaction: people with more give to people with less, service starts in privilege and ends in patronage” (p. 209). In order to avoid this, service learning participants need be aware of their privilege and status in society and how that impacts the service relationship (Ward & Wolf-Wendel, 2000).

Service learning frequently takes place with communities that are diverse and are different from the typical white, middle to upper class university student. Chesler and Vasquez Scalara (2000) stated that when engaging in community service learning, issues of diversity inevitably arise. A white, middle class student may not have interacted with members of specific minority groups, such as racial minorities or recent immigrants. Interactions may cause students to reflect on and question racism, sexism, and other types of discrimination. They can be guided to transcend their current perspectives and unexamined biases begin to see a “plurality of visions” (Strain, 2005, p. 71) that fall outside of their own cultural norms. Opportunities to reflect on themselves and others within the context of the larger society are enhanced. Students gain a new understanding
of themselves as privileged people who can then use that privilege to assist others (Jones & Abes, 2004). When students engage with those different from them, they report that “stereotypes break down and they learn to appreciate cultural differences when they engage in culturally integrated activities” (Erickson & O’Connor, 2000, p. 62).

Research on Service Learning for Social Justice

The use of a cognitive developmental framework to structure service learning for social justice may be helpful in understanding how students engage with the complex scenarios presented during the service learning experience. Using the Perry scheme of intellectual development as a guiding framework, Wang and Rodgers (2006) conducted a study of quasi-experimental pretest-posttest design to determine the impact of different types of service learning on college student’s cognitive development. Service learning courses at universities were divided into two groups: those with a social justice focus and those without. Seventy-three students were enrolled in seven different courses with a service learning component, with students nearly evenly dispersed among the social justice service learning courses and service learning courses without a social justice focus. Student academic levels varied from freshmen to graduate students in order to address the range of Perry levels of development. Results showed both groups who participated in service learning to post significantly higher scores on the Measure of Epistemological Reflection (Baxter Magolda & Porterfield, 1985), a measure of Perry intellectual level. Additionally students who participated in the service learning with a social justice component had significantly higher scores on the MER than did those who were in the regular service learning classes when age, gender, class rank, and Perry level at the beginning of the study were statistically controlled. Thus, service learning and
social justice education in combination seemed to have greater impact on the cognitive
development of students than service learning alone.

Limitations to the study included the lack of a control group to compare scores on
the MER. In addition, participants were all enrolled at one university, thus the results
could lack in generalizability to other institutions. Despite these limitations, the results
speak to the potential power of social justice education on student development and
indicate it may be important to add to counselor education. While service learning
appears to be a powerful developmental impetus for intellectual development of college
students, using a social justice focus within the context of service learning appears to
have an even stronger impact on development. Further research into the inclusion of
social justice education in counselor education appears to be in order.

One hundred and forty-nine students participated in a study conducted by Prentice
(2007) that examined correlations between different levels of participation in service
learning courses and scores on the Civic Engagement Survey, an instrument developed
for the purpose of the study. The measure assessed students on three different types of
citizenship: participatory citizenship, justice-oriented citizenship, and personally
responsible citizenship. Students either participated in one service learning course, two or
more courses, or no service learning courses. Results showed students who had engaged
in service learning experiences scored significantly higher on the Civic Engagement
Survey than student who had not engaged in service learning.

Since the measurement tool used in this study was developed for the purpose of
this study, no reliability or validity scores were reported; thus representativeness of actual
differences are uncertain. Nonetheless, this correlational study included students from six
different geographical regions of the country and illustrated that there is a positive correlation between service learning participation and participatory and social justice citizenship types. This link suggests that service learning may be a tool used to promote these types of citizenship in counseling students as well. Service learning promises to be a potent strategy for promoting the cognitive development needed for fulfillment of the social justice advocacy role.

Service Learning in Counselor Education

Service learning, a relatively new pedagogy, is just beginning to make its way into counselor education. To date, only one refereed research article has been published in a counselor education journal about the use of service learning as a curricular strategy. A study designed by Barbee et al. (2003) examined the impact of a service learning intervention on counselor trainees at the pre-practicum level. Seventy-seven students participated in the study, with 39 in the service learning group and 77 in the control group who did not participate in service learning. Many of these first-semester counseling students had never engaged in direct client service before entering the counseling program. As noted in the counselor developmental literature, this early stage of development is marked by high anxiety and a low sense of self-efficacy for students (2003). These pre-practicum service learning students all completed 30 hours in a school or community setting engaging in direct, but non-counseling tasks such as mentoring, giving psychoeducational presentations, and assisting with groups. In comparing service learning participants with non-service learning participants on measures of counselor self-efficacy and anxiety, the researchers found that service learning experience at the
pre-practicum level was positively correlated with counselor self-efficacy and negatively correlated with student anxiety.

Problems with samples sizes represent an important limitation to this study. The control group size was double the size of the experimental group. Additionally, no homogeneity of variance statistics were reported for the groups, thus, the validity of the statistical findings is subject to question. In addition, the study did not describe how students were placed in service learning sites. If students were not allowed to select a site, their level of engagement and the impact of the service learning may have been reduced. Although the variable of previous work experience accounted for more variance than service learning on the self-efficacy measure, the researchers concluded that service learning provides the opportunity for "counselor educators to create an immediate linkage between concepts presented in the classroom and early field experiences" (p.109). As long as students are placed in appropriate settings based on their developmental levels and interests, service learning shows promise in promoting counselor development and anxiety reduction.

Service learning, as an emerging and innovative approach to counselor education, blends and makes intentional many of the tasks in which educators are engaged. Constantine et al. (2007) have called for the use of the service learning model in counselor education to provide students with a practical understanding of large-scale societal inequities and mechanisms by which they may intervene to effect change. Service learning could offer opportunities to gain valuable and transferable research, evaluation, and program development skills in the context of community mental health settings. The service learning model deserves consideration as a possible route to
improved training for social justice advocacy, a mandated, but unmet goal in counseling programs.

Service Learning and Cognitive Developmental Theory

The examination of service learning can be guided using the lens of developmental theory. Students develop cognitively from the real world experiences offered to them through service learning experiences because it provides students with situations that have “power to evoke moral sensitivity and seriousness far better than concocting moral dilemmas or than raising questions based on even the best readings” (Strain, 2005, p. 65). John Dewey is an early ancestor of both service learning and cognitive developmental theory. For Dewey, education was about preparing individuals to transfer knowledge and skills to new situations that answered society’s problems, not just for training them for a particular job or career (Speck & Hoppe, 2004). Preparation for future, unforeseen problems and the concept of a flexible knowledge and skill base is foundational to cognitive developmental theory. The types of learning and experience that occur in the context of high quality service learning provide situations where students are challenged beyond their current capacities and where they come face-to-face with the complexities of humanity and society (Exley, 2004). Interaction with the complex and dynamic environment of social life was, to Piaget, key to development (Brandenberger, 1998). Service learning provides just this type of interaction potential and “extends the classroom beyond traditional walls” (Brandenberger, 1998, p. 69). Service learning practitioners must provide an intentional balance of support and challenge in order for the experiences of service learning to promote cognitive growth and development in students.
Two particular domains of cognitive development provide rich lenses to view and describe the benefits and challenges of service learning. Moral development can inform service learning and students’ experiences in order to facilitate dynamic, reflective learning and psychological growth. Perry’s scheme of intellectual development provides scaffolding for understanding the developmental milestones of the college student population, and thus frames the experience of service learning in the educational contexts.

Moral development

Many authors discuss the link between service learning and moral development. Boss (1994), in conducting a study examining the impact of service learning in an ethics class, suggested that it was in combining service learning and intentional reflection that moral development is maximized. This is due to the tendency of service learning to raise complex and difficult moral issues upon which the students can reflect and consider. She suggested that enhanced moral development occurs through the introduction of social disequilibrium, which is inherent in service experiences (1994). The goals of moral development, which include the ability to see problems from multiple perspectives, solve problems with complex thinking skills, and to separate oneself from social rules and convention, resonate strongly with the goals of service learning (Brandenberger, 1998).

Learning goals for the service learning experience are often relative to moral development, including shifting students’ views of service from charity to social justice (Strain, 2005). Eyler and Giles (1994) described service learning as a transformational process that moves students from seeing service as patronizing charity work to understanding the greater importance of political action to obtain social justice (p. 47).
Service learning helps students to consider the systemic causes of injustice and to frame moral judgments based on this understanding (Strain, 2005).

*Intellectual development*

Although it occurs less frequently in the service learning literature, Perry's scheme of intellectual development is also relevant when discussing the use of service learning, particularly with college students. Perry (1970) suggests that "students’ ultimate purpose is... to find those forms through which they may best understand and confront with integrity the nature of the human condition" (p. 201). According to Exley (2004) the use of guided reflection, which service learning and cognitive developmental theory both hold as essential, is also useful in Perry's scheme of cognitive development. Reflection on problems and experiences encountered during service learning activities encourages development along Perry's stages (2004).

**Conclusion**

Counselor educators, in their role to prepare successive generations of counselors as social justice advocates, should consider adopting service learning as a pedagogical approach that would facilitate both increasing cognitive complexity and mastery of social justice advocacy. Such a model can promote effective assimilation of academic material with practical advocacy experience, and such a fusion will enable students to apply this competency in subsequent contexts (Preiser-Houy & Navarrete, 2006). Service learning can help students develop a nuanced understanding of situational contexts that can inhibit healthy development (Giles & Eyler, 1994) as well as to look beyond individual explanations of mental health problems. Service learning exposes students to complex social problems, and this subsequently provides a more systemic viewpoint from which
to approach and understand social issues (Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997). This strategy deserves consideration as a possible solution to the lack of training for social justice advocacy, a mandated, but unfulfilled role, in counseling programs.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

This chapter of the dissertation will describe in detail the design and methodology of the research project. Included is specific information about the design and procedures of the project, the participants, the data collection methods and timelines, descriptions of the materials used for data collection, and identification of the data analysis techniques employed in the research. The service learning intervention design and details will be described, along with the social justice advocacy classroom curriculum that was used in the intervention. The study will then be critiqued to highlight possible limitations and cautions.

Research Design and Procedure

The current study was a quasi-experimental, pretest/posttest design with non-equivalent control groups. Its purpose is to examine the impact of a service learning intervention in a Community Counseling Internship course designed to promote cognitive complexity as well as social justice advocacy knowledge and skills in masters’ level counseling students. Results may lend insight into whether specific training in social justice advocacy through a service learning model promotes growth in moral and intellectual development, and how development in these areas might be related to growth in advocacy knowledge and skills.

The experimental group consisted of masters’ level counseling students enrolled in Internship in Community Counseling at The College of William and Mary during fall semester, 2008. Two comparison groups were utilized. The first was made up of masters’ level counseling students enrolled in Internship in Community Counseling at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University during the same time frame. Members of the
Internship in School Counseling at The College of William and Mary course in fall semester 2008 participated in the first control group as well. This group was very small (n = 7) and thus was combined with the Virginia Tech group to make up the first control group. The first control group completed both the pretest and posttest measures. The second control group completed only the posttest measures and was made up of students enrolled during fall semester 2008 in Internship in Community Counseling at Marymount University.

The researcher attended class in each of the control groups to explain the project, ask for participation, and to read the instructions for the measures. All student participants were informed of the project and asked for their participation. No students in any of the groups declined to participate in the research. Upon agreeing to participate, they first read and signed an informed consent (Appendix A) and then were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire about their gender, age, racial group, progress in the counseling program, and how many multicultural counseling classes they had taken (Appendix B). Next, participants were asked to complete a battery of measurements including the Defining Issues Test-II (Appendix C), the Learning Environment Preferences Measure (Appendix D) and Advocacy Competency Self-Assessment Survey (Appendix E). The first control group completed measurements early in the fall semester 2008, and then at the end of the semester in December, 2008. The second control group completed only posttest measures at the end of fall semester, 2008.

This research was conducted in accordance with the American Counseling Association Code of Ethics (2005) guidelines on the ethical treatment of research participants. Participants were informed of the potential risks associated with
participation in the project. All testing materials were handled in a secure and confidential manner. Each participant was assigned a unique code to ensure the confidentiality in the submission of measurement instruments. Students retained the right to refuse participation at any time, and were informed that lack of participation would not impacted forward progress or academic standing in their respective counselor education programs. The researcher received approval from the Institutional Review Board at The College of William and Mary.

Population and Sample

The population targeted by this study is comprised of students in CACREP accredited Community Counseling Masters’ programs in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Samples were selected from available groups at three different universities throughout the Commonwealth, including The College of William and Mary, Marymount University, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. The experimental group consisted of all second year masters’ of counseling students enrolled in EDUC C47, Supervised Internship in Community Counseling, in the fall semester of 2008 at The College of William and Mary. The first control group consisted of students enrolled in the same course at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in the fall semester of 2008, and students enrolled in Internship in School Counseling at The College of William and Mary, fall 2008. The second control group consisted of students enrolled in Internship in Community Counseling from Marymount University in the fall semester of 2008. Participants were informed of the project nature and potential risks at the time their participation was requested.
Materials

Participants completed five items, including: (a) an informed consent form (Appendix A), (b) a Demographic Information Questionnaire, (Appendix B), (c) the Defining Issues Test II (Appendix C), (d) the Learning Environment Preferences Measure (Appendix D), and (e) the Advocacy Competencies Self-Assessment Questionnaire (Appendix E).

Informed Consent

The informed consent form briefly described the purpose and the method of the research project to participants. It notified participants of the procedures used to ensure secure and confidential treatment of responses. Additionally, participants were made aware of the voluntary nature of participation and of their right and ability to withdraw from the project at any time without consequences to their class grade or progress in the program. Finally, participants were given contact information for the Institutional Review Board members at The College of William and Mary where complaints could be lodged if they arose. Participants were asked to sign and date the form, and the researcher did so as well. Participants were given a copy of the informed consent for their records.

Demographic Information Questionnaire

The demographic questionnaire collected general information about participants including gender, race, age, and progression in the program. It also asked participants whether they have completed any multicultural counseling classes and if so, how many. This question was included to determine how much prior exposure the participants had to multicultural issues, which has been identified by the literature as a necessary precursor to successful engagement with social justice topics (Helms, 2003; Herlihy & Watson,
In addition, participants identified any previous counseling related activities they had engaged in before entering the masters' program in counseling, including volunteer work, internships, or paid employment. If participants have previous experience, they were asked to identify how much time (in years) they engaged in these activities. The work of Barbee et al. (2003) identified that previous counseling related work was a significant predictor of lower anxiety when using a service learning design in prepracticum. Questions about participants' previous related work and volunteer experiences were included in the demographic questionnaire because of these findings. Finally, participants were asked how frequently they vote in public elections because research by Nilsson and Schmidt (2005) found that desired and actual participation in the political process was one significant predictor of engagement in social justice advocacy.

Defining Issues Test-II (DIT-2)

The Defining Issues Test-II (DIT-2) is the instrument most commonly used to measure stages of moral development and is a newer version of the first Defining Issues Test. It provides an assessment of how adolescents and adults come to understand, interpret, and make decisions about moral issues (Thoma, 2006). This paper and pencil test includes five hypothetical moral dilemma stories to read. Then it asks the subjects to rate 12 issues in terms of importance in making a decision about the dilemma. The 5-point Likert scale for responses ranges from "no importance" to "great importance." Finally subjects rank order the three most important issues to them in deciding what decision to make about the moral dilemma. This results in several scores of interest, primarily the Postconventional (P score) and the N2. The P score, reported as a percentage, can range from 0 to 95 and represents the proportion of items selected that
relate to Stage 5 and 6 moral reasoning. The N2 score, a new score with the advent of the DIT-2, has been found to be better than the P score on construct validity (Rest et al., 1999). The N2 score represents not only development of more advanced moral judgment, but also a reduction of lower developmental levels of thinking. The N2 score is considered to be the most valid score, although it is highly correlated with the P score ($r = .71$) (Bebeau & Thoma, 2003).

Normative data for the DIT-2 was established by Bebeau, Maeda, & Tichy-Reese (2003) through examining data from 176 data sets resulting in 10,870 completed measures. P scores for those who had completed a masters' degree was 41.06 on average with a standard deviation of 15.77. N2 scores for this same sample averaged 40.56 with 15.06 as a standard deviation. In comparing P score norms from the original DIT with the newer DIT-2, studies have suggested that means and standard deviations are similar for lower levels of education and are very similar at upper levels.

The reliability of the DIT-2 has been established through the reliability of the original DIT, which has recognized reliability and validity. Chronbach's alpha for the DIT has been found to be in the upper .70s to the lower .80s, with test-retest reliability found to be in the same range (Rest, Thoma, & Edwards, 1997). Validity of the DIT was established on several criteria. It was found to differentiate age and education groups (30 to 50 percent of variance accounted for by DIT level), to be significantly related to cognitive capacity measures (effect size .80) and to be sensitive to moral education interventions (effect size .41), among other criteria. The correlation between the original DIT and the DIT-2 is .79. Thus, the DIT-2 is a reliable and valid measure of moral judgment and acceptable for use in the current study.
Learning Environment Preferences (LEP)

The Learning Environment Preferences is an instrument that assesses learning and epistemological stances in college students. It has been used widely across the United States in a variety of educational institutions, from community colleges to research universities. It was designed to avoid the drawbacks of conducting interviews while still capturing information about student intellectual developmental level. It is cost and time effective while being well grounded in qualitative research on the Perry scheme of development.

An objective paper and pencil instrument, the LEP examines respondents' views on five domains of the educational experience: knowledge and course content, role of the instructor, role of the students and peers in the classroom, classroom atmosphere, and role of evaluation. Sentence stems are followed by statements respondents rate on a four-point Likert scale. Respondents then identify and rank the three most important of the options to them. The central purpose of the test is to examine epistemology with respect to learning and other educational issues.

Chronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for individual domains range from .63 to .84. Test-retest reliability was found to be .89, a high degree of reliability. Moderate levels of concurrent validity have been established with the Measure of Intellectual Development (r = .57), another measure of Perry's scheme (Evans, et al., 1998). Normative data for masters' level psychology students for the CCI score is 360.9 with a standard deviation of 42.9. The reported norm for master's level psychology students' R score is 26.4 with a standard deviation of 14.1. An excerpt of the LEP can be found in Appendix D.
Advocacy Competency Self-Assessment Survey (ACSAS)

Ratts and Ford (2007) recently developed the Advocacy Competency Self-Assessment Survey. It was developed to allow counselors to determine their competency in advocacy along the six domains described in the ACA Advocacy Competencies. While it has been piloted and reviewed by two of the authors of the Advocacy Competencies, no validity and reliability statistics have yet been established for the measure (M. Ratts, personal communication, July 8, 2008). However, the ACSAS is the only instrument that has been developed specifically to measure advocacy competency specifically in counselors and was used in the current study (see Appendix E).

Scoring Procedures

Two of the measures used in the current study, the DIT-2 and the LEP, require scoring to be conducted by the authors of the tests. The third test, the ACSAS, did not require scoring to be completed by the authors. The completed DIT-2 tests were reviewed to ensure that all marks were dark and written properly so they could be correctly scored. The DIT-2 tests were sent to The Center for the Study of Ethical Development, housed at the University of Alabama. Tests are processed through an optical scoring machine and then the Center compiled a report of the data, which was returned to the researcher. The completed LEP tests were also reviewed to ensure marks could be read and thus scored appropriately. If a mark was light, the research darkened it without changing the response. Tests were then sent to the author of the test, Bill Moore, at The Center for the Study of Intellectual Development and The Perry Network. The test results and a general report assisting with interpretation of the results were sent to the researcher. The final measure used in the current research, the ACSAS, is designed to be hand scored.
Included in the testing materials is a scoring guide and a description of how to interpret the scores. This objective instrument was scored and interpreted by the researcher.

Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses for the proposed study were as follows:

1. Participants’ scores on the DIT-2 will be positively correlated with scores on the Advocacy Competency Self-Assessment Survey.
2. Participants’ scores on the LEP will be positively correlated with scores on the Advocacy Competency Self-Assessment Survey.
3. Participants’ scores on the DIT-2 and will be positively correlated with scores on the LEP.
4. Moral development for the experimental group will be significantly greater than for the control groups as indicated by posttest scores on the DIT-2.
5. Intellectual development for the experimental group will be significantly greater than for the control groups as indicated by posttest scores on the LEP.
6. Advocacy competency for the experimental group will be significantly greater than for the control groups as indicated by posttest scores on the Advocacy Competency Self-Assessment Survey.

Intervention

The group targeted to receive the service learning intervention was masters’ level counseling graduate students enrolled in EDUC C47, Supervised Internship in Community Counseling during the fall semester of the 2008 academic school year at The College of William and Mary. This practical course fulfills partial requirements for completion of the Masters’ of Education in Community Counseling degree. Students
attend class once weekly for 2 ½ hours in order to receive supervision from peers and the course instructors. During the course of the academic year, students complete 600 clock hours of clinical work and supervision in community counseling agencies and organizations within the context of this course that is divided over two semesters. Sixteen students were enrolled in the course for fall semester, 2008 and all participated in the research. The lead instructor for the class was Dr. Charles R. McAdams, III. He was assisted by Kristi Lee Wyatt, doctoral candidate and researcher.

Syllabus

In order for the intervention to be coordinated within the Supervised Internship in Community Counseling course, the instructor and researcher built components of the intervention into the class syllabus (Appendix F). CACREP details specific areas that must be included in all counseling classroom syllabi (2001), including general course objectives, specific learning objectives, and course format and requirements. Intervention topics (i.e. information about social justice advocacy skills and knowledge) were integrated into each of these areas. Specific instructions and steps for the Advocacy Project were also included in the syllabus.

There were two main components to the service learning intervention. First was the Advocacy Project that students developed and conducted in collaboration with community partners over the course of the semester. Second was the instruction in a curriculum designed to promote social justice advocacy skills and knowledge. The components were delivered over the course of the fall semester 2008 and are described below.
Advocacy Projects

At the outset of the semester, students were given instructions for successful completion of the Advocacy Project. Seven steps for the projects were included in the course syllabus. Students formed themselves into small groups at the outset of the semester based on common interests in working with certain disadvantaged populations or groups (Step 1). Groups received a list of potential agencies that had already been contacted by the researcher and had confirmed their interest in participating in the study. This form was called the Advocacy Project Information form (Appendix G). Student groups could select from this list or they could identify another agency of interest (Step 2). Groups of two to three students then met with a selected agency serving the population or group of interest to them (Step 3). In collaboration with the agency partner, students developed an advocacy project idea and planned steps for the successful completion of the project. The researcher provided students with various possible project ideas for Advocacy Projects such as designing a brochure for the agency to disseminate information about its services, creating a psycho-educational group related to employability topics for victims of domestic violence, or presenting to a school board or city counsel about a topic the group believed to be critical for their selected population or agency. However, students were encouraged to develop a project with their community partners which would best serve the population of specific interest to them. This point was emphasized to the students.

After students met with their community partner to develop a project idea, they completed and submitted an Advocacy Project Proposal form to the researcher (Appendix G). This document asked students to detail what they planned to do, who their
community partner was, as well as what skills and resources they needed to be successful in the projects (Step 4). Students were encouraged to select a project that could be successfully completed in one semester and that would not require an unreasonable number of hours above their current class and internship loads. The researcher and the course instructor reviewed the proposals in order to gauge the projects' appropriateness in scope, content, and difficulty level. Upon approval of projects, students were authorized to proceed (Step 5).

Seven groups developed and carried out Advocacy Projects. Their projects included the following list:

1. Mathews Truancy Response: assessing the truancy needs of Mathews County from a multi-agency perspective.
2. Health Literacy Education: Assisting those in need to navigate the health care system.
5. Development and implementation of group facilitation training for direct care staff at the Merrimac Juvenile Detention Center.
6. Advocating for Advocacy: teaching sociology undergraduate students about how to advocate for others.
7. Advocating for funding translation services for non-fluent English speakers: A grant proposal.
The researcher consulted regularly with students about the progress of the Advocacy Projects through discussions during class and through email contact. Students were informed at the outset of the semester that the researcher would be available to them throughout the duration for questions, problem solving, and other types of assistance they required. Groups frequently used this offer of assistance for help with project ideas, help getting through barriers, or just for support.

As the semester continued and projects came to a conclusion, students completed self-evaluations about the Advocacy Projects and their experience in executing them. See the self-evaluation form in Appendix G. The purpose of the student self-evaluation was to encourage reflection on the experience and to help students draw conclusions and gain closure on the experience. Groups were also required to have their community partners complete an evaluation of the project at the conclusion of the semester experience (Step 6). This form can be found in Appendix G. Partners were asked to complete evaluations to determine whether the Advocacy Projects were helpful to their organizations and how the process might be improved in future years.

During the last two class periods of the semester, students presented their projects to the Internship in Community Counseling class (Step 7). The researcher invited faculty of the counseling program to attend, as well as administrators within the college. However, only the researcher and the course instructor were able to be present during the student presentations. Advocacy Project groups each presented their projects for twenty minutes, following a specific set of parameters. A description of these presentation parameters can be found in Appendix G. A majority of the presentations were recorded with video equipment for future use and reference.
On the last day of class, students were required to turn in their evaluations, the evaluations conducted by their community partners, as well as products they developed in the course of their Advocacy Projects. In addition, students completed narrative descriptions of the Advocacy Projects for the portfolios, a class requirement.

**Classroom Curriculum**

Each week, the researcher presented short lessons (30 to 45 minutes) related to the counseling role of social justice advocate after housekeeping or business issues for the class were addressed. Classroom curriculum and content was based on the ACA *Advocacy Competencies* as well as from the counseling literature on the skills, attitudes, and knowledge needed for social justice advocacy competency (see Appendix H for curriculum).

*Week 1: Introduction to the Course and the Syllabus.* The goal of this introductory session was to introduce students to the course and its expectations. Students were given the syllabus for the course (see Appendix F). The instructor and the researcher described the course requirements and expectations. The researcher explained the purpose of the Social Justice Advocacy component of the course and reviewed with the participants the Advocacy Project requirement and the steps involved in the project (Appendix F). Participants were free to ask questions about the requirements. The researcher asked participants to begin thinking about a target population they would like to work with for the Advocacy Project. A list of possible agencies who had already been contacted by the researcher was distributed (Appendix G). Participants were asked to identify their two target populations for discussion the following week. They were informed at that time that small groups would be formulated based on similar interests.
Week 2: Introduction to the Research and Measures. The goal for this class session was to introduce students to the research project, ask for their participation, and to have the participants complete all of the paperwork and the instruments for the project. The researcher described the study and asked for students to participate; all students in the class agreed to participate. Informed consent forms were signed and collected, and then the participants completed the demographic questionnaire and all of the research instruments. Participants were asked to share with the class the two populations with whom they would most like to work on the Advocacy Project. Potential small groups were established based on common interests, and participants were informed that the groups were to be finalized by the next class meeting.

Week 3: Introduction to the Role of Advocate. The goal of this class session was to introduce participants generally to the role of counselor as advocate. This began the advocacy curriculum component of the intervention. The role of social justice advocate was discussed generally as a way to introduce students to the topic. Participants had been asked to read and come prepared to discuss Kiselica & Robinson's (2001) article entitled Bringing Advocacy Counseling to Life: The History, Issues, and Human Dramas of Social Justice Work in Counseling. The article introduces the role of counselor as advocate. The assigned reading led to a discussion (see Appendix H for discussion points) in which participants were asked to discuss the role of social justice advocate in their work as counselors. As previously noted, Step 1 of the Advocacy Project was due at this class meeting, which required students to have finalized their small groups and report them to the researcher. Groups indicated what population their project would target and
what agency they had selected to partner with in addressing the needs of that population. Groups were directed to meet with the agency as soon as possible to discuss project ideas.

*Week 4: Introduction to ACA Advocacy Competencies.* The goal for this class session was to introduce participants to *American Counseling Association Advocacy Competencies* (2003) upon which the remainder of the advocacy curriculum was based. Participants were assigned to read the *Competencies* (Appendix H) in preparation for this class meeting. The researcher discussed relevant points of the document, including the two continua on which the *Competencies* are based (see Appendix H for discussion points). Participants were asked to share thoughts and reflections about the document and how they felt about this new role. Step 2 of the Advocacy Project was to be completed by this class period in which groups were expected to have identified agencies serving the population with whom they wanted to collaborate in the Advocacy Project. Groups who already determined and met with their agency reported to the larger group regarding how the meetings went and the potential projects being considered.

*Week 5: Client/Student Empowerment.* For this class session, the goal was to educate students about the first of the six advocacy competency domains, which was discussed in depth during this classroom session. Various components of this competency, Client/Student Empowerment, were highlighted including the multicultural and multi-systemic perspectives needed to adequately advocate for clients and students (see Appendix H for discussion points). The application of this competency area was further explored through the use of a case study in which participants were asked to discuss questions related to how they might work with the client from the case study in light of Student/Client Empowerment competency area (Appendix H). In small project
groups and with community partners, participants continued to refine ideas for the Advocacy Project. The researcher was available to answer questions as they arose for the participants.

**Week 6: Client/Student Advocacy.** The second of the six advocacy domain competencies was discussed in this classroom session. The list of skills for Client/Student Advocacy was reviewed and participants discussed how they might act as advocates for students and clients on this micro level (see Appendix H for discussion points). Step 3 of the Advocacy Project was to have been completed for this class. Groups were to have meet with agency representatives to collaboratively identify a “felt need” for social justice advocacy that would serve as the focus of their project and to determine a specific advocacy initiative aimed at addressing that need.

**Week 7: Reflection.** This class session was spent in reflection, consistent with good service learning practice (Eyler, Root, & Giles, 1998). Students were asked to think about and share with the group in session the experience thus far of conducting their Advocacy Project and of their new role as counselor advocates. Participants discussed the things that surprised them, the barriers they had faced, and the relationships with their community partners, among other topics (see Appendix H for discussion points). This week Step 4, the Advocacy Project proposal, approved by the agency contact, was due to the researcher (see Appendix G for the Advocacy Project Proposal form).

**Week 8: Community Collaboration.** This class period’s goal was discussion of mesolevel advocacy. This commenced with the topic of Community Collaboration. Participants were asked to share themes of systemic difficulties in the environment they might be seeing for their clients at internship sites that might need advocacy efforts. This
discussion had the goal of tying the advocacy curriculum to the participants’ clinical work. The research highlighted the importance of building relationships with other professionals in the community in order to best advocate for clients (see Appendix H for discussion points). By this class period, participants had begun to implement their advocacy efforts (Step 5). The researcher continued to be available for any questions or problems that arose for the participants.

Week 9: Systems Advocacy. Educating students about working to change systems that negatively impact clients, families, and communities was the goal for this week. Participants were asked to reflect on and discuss power structures within their internships that might impact organizational change efforts. Students discussed experiences they have had where systems change was needed as well as ideas they had about how things could have been changed to lessen or remove barriers to healthy development and progress (see Appendix H for discussion points). The researcher used a model of organizational change by Kotter and Rathgeber (2005) to instruct in how students might engage in changing organizations (appendix H). Groups continued work on the Advocacy Projects.

Week 10: Public Information. The goal for this session was to teach students about the macrolevel of advocacy. This broadest level of advocacy occurs at a state or national level, and is framed in the Competencies as the advocacy area of Public Information. Participants were asked to reflect on public information campaigns they were aware of and highlight the aspects of these campaigns that seemed to be particularly effective. The researcher introduced two video clips of commercials that educated the public about domestic violence (Gibbs, 2005) as well as mental illness (Department of
Participants discussed the elements of the commercials that seemed important in making an impact. These included evoking emotion without being blaming or judgmental and the importance of capturing the attention of the viewer (see Appendix H for discussion points). Groups continued work on the advocacy projects and reported to the class lessons learned as well as both positive and negative experiences.

**Week 11: Social/Political Advocacy.** This class curriculum session covered the final competency area, Social and Political Advocacy. The goal for the session was to discuss with the students the components of this advocacy domain. Since there had just recently been an election where a ban on gay marriage was passed in the state of California, the class discussed how advocacy efforts on both sides addressed this large scale advocacy effort. The researcher discussed the importance of professional associations and the types of advocacy they provide for issues relating to mental health and counseling. The American Counseling Association website (n.d.) was used in class, and participants were shown how to participate in advocacy initiatives through this association (see Appendix H for discussion points). Groups continued work on the projects, which were well underway by this point in the semester, and some groups who were nearing completion of their projects reported progress to the class.

**Week 12: Overcoming Resistance.** With instruction of the Advocacy Competencies completed, the researcher covered the topic of overcoming resistance with the goal of helping students understand this is a common component of the advocacy and change process (Lee, 1998). The class discussed ten reasons organizations resist change and methods for overcoming such resistance (Schuler, 2003). Advocacy projects were nearing completion by this class period. Groups were asked to complete an evaluation of
the project with the agency contact with whom they had been working (Appendix G). Success of the project was evaluated in terms of the perceived impact, the overall quality of the project as well as the quality of any materials produced as a result of the project. The agencies were given a copy of any materials made in the course of the advocacy project. Groups also kept copies of their work, and one copy was to be given to the researcher.

**Week 13: Final Reflection.** The last content session was spent on reflection with the goal of helping the participants make meaning of their experiences in the Advocacy Project. Reflection is an important component of quality service learning. The researcher posed several questions that were intended to promote reflection and discussion on the experience of engaging in the role of social justice advocate during the semester. Participants shared things that had gone well and things that had not been as positive. They reflected on what they learned during the experience and what they would take with them as they moved into their professional roles (see Appendix H for discussion points). Advocacy Project groups were to have completed Step 5 by this class period and were to have concluded their Advocacy Project.

**Week 14: Advocacy Project Presentations.** The last two class periods consisted of groups presenting their Advocacy Projects with two goals. The first included further reflection and making meaning of the Advocacy Project and advocacy curriculum. The second goal was for the participants and the instructors to be able to recognize and celebrate the work that had been done over the course of the semester through the projects. The researcher invited faculty, administrators, and other students to attend the presentations, although only the students, the instructor, and the researcher were able to
attend. Presentations were to be approximately fifteen minutes in length, with an additional five minutes for questions from the audience. They were to present a general overview of their project, as well as key aspects of the project, including the population targeted and the Advocacy Competencies used and learned during the project. Groups brought copies of the products they developed during the course of the project, and reflected on what they had learned during the experience summatively. The group presentations represented completion of Step 7 of the Advocacy Project. Step 6 of the Advocacy Project was due at this class, which consisted of the evaluation of the project and products developed in the course of the project. Collaborative community partners were to complete an evaluation of the group’s project and each participant was also asked to complete a self-evaluation about the experience that was designed to encourage reflection on the process and learning from the Advocacy Project (Appendix G). In order to celebrate the completion of the projects and the semester, the academic department provided light refreshments of bagels and coffee during the presentations.

Week 15: Advocacy Project Presentations. Presentations continued during this final day of the course. All remaining documents were turned into the researcher. After the presentations had concluded, the participants completed the posttest measures. The academic department again provided refreshments during the class presentations this week.

Data Analysis

The demographic data collected were examined and reported using descriptive statistics and frequencies. The experimental and control groups were not randomly selected, so a series of analyses of variance tests were conducted to determine if any significant
differences existed between the intervention group and comparison groups based on the pretest measures. Levene’s statistics of homogeneity of variance was used in order to establish the type of testing that could be conducted for the remainder of the statistical analyses. Correlations were run between the scores on the three measures used to establish the relationships between them. Repeated measures and univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA) and multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were run to determine whether significant differences existed between the experimental and control groups on posttest measures. Eta squared was used as a measure of effect size. A significance level of $p < .05$ was used to draw conclusions about the results.

### Comparison with Control Groups

In comparing the Internship in Community Counseling course that housed the experimental group and intervention with the Internship courses from the control groups, it is apparent that the broad design and requirements of the courses were very similar. This is not surprising since many of the specific details of Internship are dictated by CACREP (2001). The clinical preparation of student counselors, which occurs in practicum and internship, is considered to be “the most critical experience elements in the program” (2001, p. 15).

All students in CACREP accredited programs, regardless of specialty, are required to complete 600 hours of a supervised internship after successful completion of practicum. During internship, student counselors engage in a variety of activities that a professional counselor is expected to perform while under the supervision of approved clinical personnel. Within the 600 required hours, CACREP specifies the number of hours required for direct client contact, group and individual supervision, and other
counseling related activities. In addition, the types and frequency of student and supervisor evaluation as well as the types of experiences students should have at internship sites is described.

Because of this standardization of general internship requirements across CACREP accredited programs, the courses housing the experimental and control groups are very similar. An examination of the course syllabi confirmed this assertion. Each course syllabus included course objectives, content areas covered by the course, required texts or readings, and methods of instruction, as dictated by CACREP (2001). While each course syllabus broadly included one to two course objectives that were related to issues of multiculturalism, advocacy, and issues related to a plural society, only the syllabus for the experimental group specifically addressed the role of counselor as advocate in course objectives and content areas. In addition, only the experimental course syllabi had any assignments that related specifically to content or projects that related to advocacy. The Internship in Community Counseling that housed the experimental group was the only course that explicitly and intentionally integrated a social justice advocacy component into the course.

Critique

Threats to Internal Validity

In addition to its potential assets, the current study has potential limitations. Threats to the internal validity of the study include non-random selection and issues with instrumentation. One drawback of the quasi-experimental design, used in the current research, is that participants were not randomly selected to participate nor randomly distributed into experimental and control groups. Thus, the generalizability of the results
must be considered with caution. Given that the Advocacy Competency Self-Assessment Questionnaire was recently developed, its reliability and validity are subject to questions and may threaten the study's internal validity. However, despite this limitation the ACSAS was used because it is the only measure of advocacy competency developed for counseling students.

**Threats to External Validity**

In addition, the study had threats to external validity. Response bias, in the form of the Hawthorne effect, was possible since the participants knew that they were involved in a research study. Participants may have responded to the measures in a perceived socially desirable way that may not reflect actual developmental or skill level. The researcher implemented the intervention and interacted with the subjects regularly and only saw the control group members at the times of measurement. This participation of the researcher could have threatened the external validity of the study through the experimenter effect. Since the focus on advocacy and the addition to the Advocacy Project to the Internship course was new and seemed exciting to the students, the novelty of the project might have impacted the way the students completed the research instruments. Completing the pretest measures might have primed the students to complete the posttest measures in a certain way or to engage with the advocacy topics and project in a way that they otherwise would not have. A final potential threat to the external validity of the results is the timing of the posttesting. The intervention and the pre and posttesting occurred over the course of one academic semester. Another testing at the conclusion of the academic year or at one year post-intervention might have given more information about the impact of the intervention.
Conclusion

This chapter has described a study that examined the possible relationships between levels of moral and intellectual development of master's level counseling trainees enrolled in Community Counseling Internship and their perceived advocacy competency, a mandated role for counselors. Project design and procedures were described in detail, including participants, intervention procedures, measurements used, and statistical tests employed. Chapter four will report the statistical results of the measurements and chapter five will discuss the results and draw conclusions about the research project as well as make suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

This chapter describes and summarizes the research analyses and findings. Six hypotheses were presented in Chapter 3 regarding the proposed impact of a service learning intervention on moral and intellectual development, as well as advocacy competency in community counseling interns. First, demographic data are reported for the combined sample, then separately for the experimental group and each of the control groups. Second, the results of correlational tests between the dependent variables are reported. Third, results of a series of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) procedures that examined the differences between the experimental and control groups are summarized.

Participants

Demographics

Demographic data were collected using a Demographic Questionnaire that was completed by participants at the beginning of the study. All participants completed information pertaining to age, race, gender, as well as about their status in the academic program, their previous experience in counseling related work before entering the masters' program, whether they had completed any multicultural counseling courses, and whether they voted in elections. Table 4.1 details the several aspects of the demographic findings.
Table 4.1

Demographic Information for Overall Sample, Experimental, Control 1 and Control 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Age (M)</th>
<th>Race (%)</th>
<th>Gender (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample (N = 45)</td>
<td>29.87</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6.7 Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>4.4 Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (N = 16)</td>
<td>32.38</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0 Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>0 Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control 1 (N = 22)</td>
<td>27.41</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>9.1 Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>4.5 Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control 2 (N = 7)</td>
<td>31.86</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>14.3 Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>14.3 Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in the table, the overall sample consisted of a majority of female students (86.7%, N = 39) with a small number of male students (13.3%, N = 6). While the majority of the sample reported their race as White, Caucasian, or European-American (86.7%, N = 39), a small number of other race categories were also reported by participants. Asian or Asian-American students made up 4.4% (N = 2) of the sample, Black or African-American students comprised 6.7% (N = 3) of the sample, and 2.2% of the sample (N = 1) identified themselves as Latino, Hispanic, or Mexican-American. The original sample consisted of 38 community counseling and seven school counseling students enrolled in their respective Internship courses. Participants’ ages ranged from 22 to 70 years, with an average age of the total sample of 29.87 years. With the exception of two participants who did not report, students in the sample had completed an average 38.5 credits in their respective programs of study at the time of the pretesting. A majority of the sample, (80%), had already completed a Multicultural Counseling course at the beginning of the research process. Seventy three percent of participants reported they had worked in counseling related activities (paid or volunteer) prior to their counseling master’s program. For those who had done so, the average number of years worked was 3.74, with a range of .5 to 10.0 years. A majority of the sample, 62.2%, (N = 28) indicated that they always voted in political elections. Four percent (N = 2) indicated that they never voted, and 33.3% (N = 15) of participants reported they sometimes voted in elections.

The experimental group consisted of 16 community counseling interns. The mean age was 32.4, and ages ranged from 23 to 70 years. A majority of the sample were female students (75%, N = 12), with male students in the clear minority (25%, N = 4). Most of
the experimental group consisted of students identifying as White, Caucasian, or European-American (93.8%, N = 15). One participant identified as Latino, Hispanic, or Mexican-American (6.3%). Participants had completed an average of 38.8 credits in the counseling masters’ program at the time of the pretesting and less than half (43.8%, N = 7) had completed a Multicultural Counseling course at the time of pretesting. Nine participants (56.3%) indicated they had not yet completed the Multicultural Counseling course. A majority of participants in the experimental group (68.8%, N = 11) indicated they had worked doing counseling related activities before the masters’ program, with an average of 3.32 years in the field before entering graduate school. The range in years worked in the field was from 1.0 to 10 years. A majority of students in the experimental group reported that they always voted in political elections (62.5%, N = 10). One participant (6.3%) reported having never voted in political elections, and five participants (31.3%) reported they sometimes did so.

The first control group consisted of 22 counseling interns including students in Community Counseling internship at Virginia Tech, and School Counseling internship at William and Mary. The mean age of the first control group was 27.41 with a range of ages from 22 to 47 years. A large majority of the sample identified as female (90.9%, N = 20) with only two participants being male (9.1%). Eighty six percent of participants indicated they were White, Caucasian, or European-American (N = 19). One participant identified as being Asian or Asian-American (4.5%) and two identified as being Black or African-American (9.1%). Participants in the first control group had completed an average of 34.6 credits in the master’s program. All twenty-two reported they had completed one Multicultural Counseling course by the time of the pretesting. A majority
of the sample (68.2%, N = 15) had worked in counseling related activities prior to entering the masters’ program with an average of 3.8 total years worked in the field. All participants reported that they either always voted in elections (63.6%, N = 14) or sometimes voted in elections (36.4%, N = 8).

The second control group, consisting of seven community counseling interns at Marymount University, had a mean age of 31.86 years, with a range of ages from 27 to 38 years. Female students made up the entire sample (N = 7); there were no male students in this control group. Five members of the group identified as White, Caucasian, or European-American (71.4%). One student each identified as Asian or Asian-American (14.3%) and Black or African-American (14.3%). In this control group, the average number of credits completed in the masters’ program was 51.8. All participants had completed a Multicultural Counseling course at the time of posttesting and all participants had engaged in counseling related work activities before matriculating in the masters’ of counseling program. The mean number of years of counseling related work prior to the master’s program was 4.23 years with a range of 1 to 10 years. A slight majority of the participants in this group indicated they always voted in political elections (57.1%, N = 4). One participant reported never voting (14.3%) and 28.6% of the group reported sometimes voting (N = 2).

Sample Integrity

Sample integrity was maintained throughout the study, as indicated by the fact that all participants taking the pretest battery also completed the posttest battery. The final sample included sixteen members of the experimental group, twenty-two members
of the first control group, and seven members of the second control group (who, by
design, only completed the posttest measures.)

Pre-Existing Differences

Because the experimental and control groups were not randomly selected, it was
necessary to rule out whether pretest differences existed in the groups that could
confound the posttest findings. Six Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were conducted
examining pretest differences between the experimental and first control group on the
DIT-2 (P score, N2 score, and Type Indicator), the LEP (R score and CCI score), and the
ACSAS (total score). The second control group was not included in the analysis of
pretest differences because its members completed the measures only at the posttesting
time frame.

No significant pretest differences were found between the experimental and first
control group on any of the measures. ANOVA results were as follows: DIT-2 P score
(F(1, 36) = .073, p > .05), DIT-2 N2 score (F(1, 35) = 2.33, p > .05), and DIT-2 Type
Indicator (F(1, 36) = .159, p > .05). Additionally, results for the LEP R score (F(1, 36) =
.1.85, p > .05), the CCI score (F(1, 36) = 1.86, p > .05), and the ACSAS total score (F(1,
32) = .34, p > .05) were non-significant. Thus, the experimental and first control group
were determined to be comparable at pretest on the research measures.

Means for the pretest scores on the DIT-2 were as follows: P scores for the
experimental group (M = 47.3); P scores for the first control group (M = 45.91); N2
scores for the experimental group (M = 51.59); N2 scores for the first control group (M =
45.10); Type Indicator scores for the experimental group (M = 6.13), and Type Indicator
scores for the first control group (M = 5.91). Scores for the LEP were: R scores for the
experimental group ($M = 34.34$) and $R$ scores for the first control group ($M = 27.05$), CCI scores for the experimental group ($M = 377.81$) and CCI scores for the first control group ($M = 346.91$). Finally, scores on the ACSAS total scores for the experimental group were ($M = 61.00$) and ($M = 64.89$) for the first control group.

Because there was a difference in numbers of participants between the experimental and first control group (experimental group, $N = 16$, control 1, $N = 22$), Levene’s test of homogeneity of variances was also conducted on the pretest scores between the experimental and the first control group. It revealed homogeneity of variance for all tests. Results for Levene’s test of homogeneity of variance are as follows: DIT-2 $P$ score ($L = .013$, $p > .05$), DIT-2 $N2$ scores ($L = .929$, $p > .05$), DIT-2 Type Indicator Scores ($L = .259$, $p > .05$), the LEP $R$ score ($L = .051$, $p > .05$), the LEP CCI score ($L = .485$, $p > .05$), and the ACSAS Total score ($L = 1.52$, $p > .05$). Means, standard deviations, and sample sizes for all pretest and posttests are summarized in Table 4.2.
Table 4.2

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Sample Sizes by Group on Dependent Measures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control 1</th>
<th>Control 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIT-2 N2 pre</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIT-2 N2 post</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP R pre</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP R post</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP CCI pre</td>
<td>377.8</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEP CCI post</td>
<td>368.2</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACSAS TS pre</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACSAS TS post</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The N2 index on the DIT-2 is interpreted as the extent to which a person prefers Postconventional moral thinking. It was developed to have the same mean and standard deviation as the more familiar P score. Scores for the experimental group showed a slight, but statistically insignificant, increase in the percentage of preference for Postconventional moral thinking from pretest to posttest. This group showed a preference for Postconventional moral thinking slightly more than 53% on average at posttest. The first experimental group also showed a slight, but statistically insignificant increase in N2 scores on average. On average, the first control group showed a preference for Postconventional moral thinking nearly 47% of the time at posttest. For the second
experimental group, the preference for Postconventional moral thinking was about 37% of the time at posttest.

Two scores on the Learning Environment Preferences were used. The R score indicates the percentage of relativistic thinking (Position 5). Relativistic thinking refers to understanding that knowledge is contextual and must be supported by reasons. The R was developed to be analogous to the R score on the DIT. The experimental group showed a statistically insignificant decrease in R score. On average, the experimental group preferred relativistic thinking around 29% of the time at posttest. The first control group had a statistically insignificant drop in R score from pretest to posttest and averaged preference for relativistic thinking about 26% of the time at posttest. The second control group preferred relativistic thinking about 32% of the time at posttest. The CCI score is calculated using all of the position preferences to produce a single score ranging from 200 to 500. Moore (2000) reports at breakdown of CCI scores and their corresponding position on the Perry scheme. The experimental group showed a statistically insignificant drop in CCI score from pretest to posttest. At posttest, the average score for the experimental group locates them at a transition point between positions 3 (Early Multiplicity) and 4 (Late Multiplicity). In Early Multiplicity, differing options are allowed, but seen as temporary until the ‘Truth’ is discovered. In Late Multiplicity, uncertainty is understood to be widespread and all opinions are seen as equally valid. The first control group showed a slight, but statistically insignificant increase in CCI score between pretest and posttest. The average CCI score for the group at posttest locates them on the Perry scheme at a transition point between positions 3 and 4. The second control
group average score also locates them at a transition between stages 3 and 4 on the Perry scheme.

The Total Score for the ACSAS was utilized to determine differences between groups at posttest. The Total Score is a summation of scores on the six advocacy competency domain subscales. Total Scores can be assigned to one of three subgroups, although the test authors have not provided justification for the scores to be assigned to the three subgroups. The experimental group showed a small, though statistically insignificant gain in Total Score from pretest to posttest. The average posttest score for the experimental group places them in the middle subgroup of the ACSAS, which states, “You’ve got some of the pieces in place. However, you need to do some work to develop your competence in specific advocacy areas in order to be an effective social change agent” (Ratts & Ford, 2007, p.4). The average score for the first control group also increased from pretest to posttest, although not significantly. The posttest score places the group in the middle subgroup of the ACSAS as well. The second control group’s average at posttest placed them in the lowest subgroup of the ACSAS. The test authors describe this category as needing more training in areas of feminist and multicultural counseling.

Review of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

Participants’ scores on the DIT-2 will be positively correlated with scores on the Advocacy Competency Self-Assessment Survey.

Results. Correlations were conducted between the DIT-2 N2 score and the ACSAS Total score to determine whether the scores on these two measures were significantly correlated (Table 4.3). Results indicated that there was no significant
correlation \((r = -.11)\). For this sample, the two instruments did not have any relationship. Thus, this hypothesis was not supported by the statistical results.

**Hypothesis 2**

Participants' scores on the LEP will be positively correlated with scores on the Advocacy Competency Self-Assessment Survey.

**Results.** To determine whether scores on the LEP and on the ACSAS were related, Pearson \(r\) correlations were conducted between the R score of the LEP and the ACSAS Total score as well as between the CCI score of the LEP and the ACSAS Total score. Results indicated no significant correlation between the LEP measures and the ACSAS. As shown in Table 4.3, the correlation between the LEP R score and the ACSAS Total score was \(r = -.17\), and the correlation between the LEP CCI score and the ACSAS Total score was \(r = -.27\). These results indicate there is no relationship between scores on the ACSAS and the LEP. This is true for the relationship between the ACSAS and both of the scores from the LEP (R score and CCI). Thus, Hypothesis 2 was not supported by the findings.

**Hypothesis 3**

Participants' scores on the DIT-2 and will be positively correlated with scores on the LEP.

**Results.** A Pearson \(r\) correlation was conducted to determine the relationship between the N2 scores from the DIT-2 and the R and CCI scores from the LEP as shown in Table 4.3, no significant correlations were found between either the N2 score and the R score \((r = .30)\), or the N2 score and the CCI score \((r = .30)\). Results indicate there was no relationship between the scores on the DIT-2 and the LEP for this sample. This is true
for the N2 score and the R score, and the N2 score and the CCI score. Thus, Hypothesis 3 was not supported by the statistical findings.

Table 4.3

*Correlations between Dependent Measures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. DIT-2 N2</th>
<th>2. LEP R score</th>
<th>3. LEP CCI</th>
<th>4. ACSAS Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. DIT-2 N2</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LEP R score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.593**</td>
<td>-.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. LEP CCI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ACSAS Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers correspond to dependent measures listed on the left.

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*Hypothesis 4*

Moral development for the experimental group will be significantly greater than that for the control groups as indicated by posttest DIT-2 scores.
Results. To determine which of the three scores produced by the DIT-2 (P, N2, or Type Indicator) should be used in the analysis, a measure of the correlation between them was conducted. The results of the correlation analysis showed that for the current sample, the three scores were highly correlated. Pearson’s correlation between the P score and the N2 score was .943. Pearson’s r between the P score and the Type Indicator was .754. The correlation between the N2 score and the Type Indicator was .713. All of these correlations were significant at the .01 level (Table 4.4). These results indicate that as any of these scores rise, the other scores would be expected to rise also to a significant degree. Because of these significant correlations, it was determined that using only one of the scores in further analyses was indicated for ease in processing. The N2 score was used for the remainder of the statistical analyses because it is reported to be more sensitive (Bebeau & Thoma, 2003).
Table 4.4

*Intercorrelations between DIT-2 Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. DIT-2 N2 Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>2. DIT-2 P score Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>3. DIT-2 Type Pearson Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. DIT-2 N2</td>
<td>.717**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. DIT-2 P score</td>
<td>.754**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. DIT-2 Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at the .01 level

After determining the correlations between scores on the DIT-2, further tests were conducted. The means for the pretest and posttest N2 scores were as follows:

experimental group pretest (M = 51.6), control group 1 pretest (M = 45.1), experimental group posttest (M = 53.1), control group 1 posttest (M = 46.8) and the second control posttest only group, (M = 37.2).

A 2 x 2 repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to test for significant differences in the N2 scores between the experimental and the first control
group. While the posttest means for the experimental group increased more than for those of the first control group, the results of the ANOVA showed no significant effects for time ($F(1, 34) = 2.59, p > .05$), the time by group interaction ($F(1, 34) = .10, p > .05$), or group ($F(1, 34) = 2.30, p > .05$) (Table 4.5). The different tests listed in the table (Pillai's Trace, Wilks' Lambda, Hotelling's Trace, Roy's Largest Root) indicate several methods of testing for significance. As the number of degrees of freedom increases, the values of these tests tend to converge. The results indicate a possible trend in that the scores for the experimental group increased more than for the first control group, but the impact of the intervention was not enough to make significant difference between scores for the experimental and first control group.

Table 4.5

*Group, Time, and Group * Time Effects for Experimental and Control 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>662.238</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>662.238</td>
<td>2.290</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>9832.536</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>289.192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>2.589</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>2.589</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>2.589</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>2.589</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time * Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A univariate ANOVA was conducted to determine whether significant differences existed between the experimental group, the first control group and the second control group on the posttest N2 scores (Figure 4.1). Results showed a significant effect for group, (F(2, 43) = 3.73, p > .05; eta squared = .15) (Table 4.6). A follow-up Tukey post hoc test was conducted to determine the direction of the determined differences in these groups. Results showed there to be no significant differences between the experimental group and the first control group; however the experimental and the second control groups were found to be significantly different from each other. These findings show that while changes between the experimental group and the first control group were not strong enough to reach a level of significance, the intervention created differences between the experimental group and the second control group. The intervention seems to show the ability to change the experimental group.

Table 4.6

*Group Effects for Experimental, Control 1, and Control 2 at Posttest*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1233.477</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>616.739</td>
<td>3.729</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>6781.294</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>165.397</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107173.405</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, Hypothesis 4 was supported in the finding in that although the experimental group and the first control group did not significantly differ, the experimental group and the second control group (who received no intervention), were significantly different from each other on the DIT-2 posttest N2 scores.

*Hypothesis 5*

Intellectual development for the experimental group will be significantly greater than for the control groups as indicated by posttest scores on the LEP.
Results. Frequently reported LEP scores include the R score, or the Relativism score, and the CCI score, a measure of overall cognitive complexity. In order to determine which scores should be used in the analysis, a correlational analysis was conducted. The results of that analysis (Table 4.7) showed that for the current sample, the measures were significantly, but not exceedingly, correlated. Accordingly, it was determined that using both of the scores in further analyses was indicated.

Table 4.7

Correlations between LEP Relativism and Cognitive Complexity Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. R score</th>
<th>2. CCI score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. R score</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.593**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CCI score</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers relate to scores on left.

** Significant at the .01 level

Means for the Relativism scores are as follows: experimental group pretest R score \( M = 34.38 \), first control group pretest R score \( M = 27.05 \), experimental group posttest R score \( M = 29.27 \), first control group posttest R score \( M = 26.10 \), second control group posttest R score \( M = 31.71 \). Means for the Cognitive Complexity scores were: experimental group pretest CCI score \( M = 377.81 \), first control group pretest CCI
score (M = 346.91), experimental group posttest CCI score (M = 368.20), first control group posttest CCI score (M = 354.00), second control group posttest CCI score (M = 366.00). The experimental group, with the inclusion of the intervention into the course, had an even greater degree of challenge during the experiment and was likely experiencing a great degree of disequilibrium. This may have contributed to a small drop in their R scores and CCI scores from pretest to posttest.

Because the two dependent measures of R score and CCI score were correlated, a 2 x 2 repeated measures MANOVA was conducted to determine whether any significant differences existed between the experimental group and the first control group on these scores. Results of the MANOVA indicated that there was no significant effect for group for the R score (F(1, 35) = .89, p > .05), or time (F(1, 34) = .83, p > .05). No significant differences were found on the CCI score for group (F(1, 34) = 1.43, p > .05), or time (F(1, 34) = .001, p > .05). Further, there was no significant interaction of group and time for the R score (F(1, 34) = .21, p > .05) or for the CCI score (F(1, 34) = .48, p > .05). These analyses are presented in Table 4.8. The Internship is a time of high challenge for student counselors. The results indicate that there is a possible trend in the effect of the intervention on the experimental group, although results are not significant.
Table 4.8

*LEP (R score and CCI) Group, Time, and Group * Time Effects for Experimental and Control 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time * Group</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>34.000</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A univariate MANOVA was conducted to determine whether there were differences between the three groups on the R score and the CCI score at posttest (Table 4.9). Results indicated that there were no significant differences between groups on either the R score (F(2, 41) = .43, p > .05), or the CCI score (F(2, 41) = .37, p > .05).

Table 4.9

*LEP (R score and CCI) Group Effects for Experimental, Control 1, and Control 2 at Posttest*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>82.000</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.964</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>80.000</td>
<td>.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>78.000</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>41.000</td>
<td>.641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, due to there being no significant differences between groups on posttest scores, fifth hypothesis was not supported by the statistical results.

Hypothesis 6

Advocacy competency for the experimental group will be significantly greater than for the control groups as indicated by posttest scores on the Advocacy Competency Self-Assessment Survey (ACSAS).

Results. The ACSAS is made up of six subscales, which total together for a final score on the measure. This Total Score was used to determine whether the statistical results supported the Hypothesis 3. The means for the groups on the ACSAS Total Score are as follows: experimental group Total pretest score (M = 61.00), first control group Total pretest score (M = 64.89), experimental group Total posttest score (M = 73.75), first control group Total posttest score (M = 70.90), second control group Total posttest score (M = 67.14). These results show that while the differences between groups were not significant, the experimental group’s posttest scores increased. Scores for the first control group increased between pretest and posttest as well, although not as much as for the experimental group. This trend might indicate there was an impact of the intervention, although it was not strong enough to show significant results.

A 2 x 2 repeated measures ANOVA was conducted to determine whether any significant differences existed on Total Score between the experimental group and the first control group. Results showed there were no significant results by group (F(1, 31) = .001, p > .05), or in the group by time interaction effect (F(1, 31) = .85, p > .05) (Table 4.10). There was, however, a main effect by time (F(1, 31) = 10.32, p < .05). These results indicate that while there was no significant impact of the intervention on the
control group, just being in the internship course causes ACSAS Total Score to significantly increase.

Table 4.10

ACSAS Total Score Group, Time, and Group * Time Effects for Experimental and Control I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>15323.971</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>494.322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>10.315</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>31.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>10.315</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>31.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>10.315</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>31.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>10.315</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>31.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time * Group</td>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>31.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>31.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>31.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>31.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A univariate ANOVA was conducted between the experimental group and the two control groups to determine whether any significant differences existed on Total Score at the posttest (Table 4.11). Results indicated there were no significant differences between any groups on the Total score at posttest (F(2, 42) = .447, p > .05). These findings show that being in the experimental group did not impact the posttest score on the ACSAS in a significant way. Thus, Hypothesis 6 was not supported by the statistical results.
Table 4.11

**ACSAS Group Effects for Experimental, Control 1, and Control 2 at Posttest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>220.110</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110.055</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>9857.657</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>246.441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>228976.000</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supplemental Analyses.** Despite the lack of significant findings for Hypothesis 6, several supplemental analyses were conducted for the purpose of informing future research. The subscales on the ACSAS, they were first analyzed using Pearson’s $r$ correlation to determine if there were any relationships between them. It was found that most of the subscales were significantly positively correlated to each other. Few subscales were not significantly correlated including The Client/Student Empowerment subscale and the Community Collaboration subscale ($r = .051$), the Client/Student Empowerment subscale and the Systems Advocacy subscale ($r = .224$), and the Client/Student Empowerment subscale and the Social/Political Advocacy subscale ($r = .272$). In addition the Client/Student Advocacy subscale and the Social/Political Advocacy scale were not significantly correlated ($r = .299$). All subscales were significantly positively related to the Total Score (Table 4.12). Except for the non-significantly related subscales, the results indicate that when scores on subscales increase or decrease, their related subscales scores will also increase or decrease. In addition, because all of the subscales are positively related to the total score, as the scores on the
subscales increase or decrease, the same directional movement would be expected on the total score.
Table 4.12

*Intercorrelations between Subscales for ACSAS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</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>1. Client/Student Empowerment</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.394**</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.381*</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.503**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Community Collaboration</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.480**</td>
<td>.566**</td>
<td>.732**</td>
<td>.546**</td>
<td>.856**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Public Information</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.647**</td>
<td>.755**</td>
<td>.750**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Client/Student Advocacy</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.646**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Systems Advocacy</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.550**</td>
<td>.818**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social/Political Advocacy</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.792**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Total Score</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In order to determine whether any of the ACSAS subscales showed significant differences between groups on posttest scores, a repeated measures MANOVA was conducted between the experimental group and the first control group on the ACSAS subscales (Table 4.13). Results showed that there was no overall effect for group (F(1, 25) = 2.14, p > .05), or for the interaction between group and time, (F(1, 25) = 1.53, p >
.05). There was, however, a significant main effect for time, \( (F(1, 25) = 3.62, p < .05) \).

These results suggest that the intervention resulted in no significant differences in scores on the subscales between the experimental and first control group. A significant main effect of time shows that just by being in the Internship, scores on the ACSAS subscales will significantly increase.

Table 4.13

ACSAS Subscales Group, Time, and Group * Time Effects for Experimental and Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>2.140a</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>2.140a</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>2.140a</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>2.140a</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>3.623a</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>3.623a</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>3.623a</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>3.623a</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time * Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's Trace</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>1.534a</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>1.534a</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's Trace</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>1.534a</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's Largest Root</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>1.534a</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Univariate follow up tests showed that four of the six subscales had a significant effect for time. These included Client/Student Empowerment, \( (F(1, 25) = 8.04, p < .05) \), Community Collaboration, \( (F(1, 25) = 5.43, p < .05) \), Client/Student Advocacy, \( (F(1, 25) = 9.18, p < .05) \), and Systems Advocacy, \( (F(1, 25) = 18.78, p < .05) \). Two subscales had
no main effects for time including Public Information ($F(1, 25) = 3.91, p > .05$) and Social and Political Advocacy ($F(1, 25) = .18, p > .05$).

Individual subscales were examined to see if any significant differences existed between groups at posttest. One subscale showed a significant interaction between group and time, the Public Information subscale ($F(1, 25) = 8.96, p < .05; \eta^2 = .22$). This indicates that the intervention impacted participants in the experimental group significantly on this subscale. Scores for the experimental group were significantly higher on the Public Information subscale than scores of the control group (Figure 4.2).

Figure 4.2. *Public Information Subscale Group Effects for Experimental and Control.*

A univariate MANOVA was conducted to determine whether significant differences existed between the experimental and two control groups on any individual
ACSAS subscales at posttest. Results are shown in Table 4.14. The results indicated that there was a significant difference between groups on the subscales (F (2, 35) = 3.43, p < .05, Roy’s Largest Root; eta squared .15). The Tukey up post hoc test indicated there was significant difference between the experimental and the first control group at posttest on the Public Information subscale (Figure 4.3). This suggests that the intervention may have had a significant impact on the experimental group on the Public Information subscale. However, this cannot be confirmed in the current investigation because of the absence of a main effect.

Table 4.14

*ACSAS Subscales Group Effects for Experimental, Control 1, and Control 2 at Posttest*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillai’s Trace</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>2.068</td>
<td>14.000</td>
<td>70.000</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks' Lambda</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>2.100a</td>
<td>14.000</td>
<td>68.000</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling’s Trace</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>2.129</td>
<td>14.000</td>
<td>66.000</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy’s Largest Root</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>3.431b</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>35.000</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

This chapter presented the findings from statistical analysis of the research data. Six hypotheses were tested with mixed results. Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3, predicted significant correlations between the dependent measures, the DIT-2, the LEP, and the ACSAS. None of these hypotheses were supported by the statistical analyses, which was surprising and, to some extent, inconsistent with previous research findings. The remainder of the hypotheses focused on whether significant differences existed between the experimental and control groups on the posttest scores. Each of these hypotheses had ANOVAs or MANOVAs conducted to determine results. The first tested differences between the experimental and the first control groups, the second tested posttest scores.
between all three groups. While the experimental group’s posttest scores increased more than the posttest scores for Control group 1 on the DIT-2 N2 score (Hypothesis 4), the increases were not significant. No main effects were found for either time or group, nor was there a significant interaction of group by time. There were significant findings between the experimental group and control group 2 in a univariate ANOVA. Thus, Hypothesis 4 was supported in that the experimental group posttest scores were significantly higher than those of the second control group. When testing the differences between groups on the LEP measure, no significant differences were found by group, by time, or with the interaction between group and time between any groups. Hypothesis 5 was not supported by the statistical analysis. For the third and final measure, a main effect of time was found to be significant for all groups on the ACSAS total score. No differences were found by group or group by time interaction. Thus, Hypothesis 6 was not supported by the statistical results. The final chapter will discuss these reported results in detail and illuminate their meaning.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

The current study sought to examine the impact of a service learning intervention designed to promote moral development, intellectual development, and social justice advocacy skills and knowledge in masters' level counseling students. Students participated in Supervised Internship in Community Counseling specially designed to teach the skills and knowledge related to the mandated role of social justice advocate through the use of a service learning strategy. It was proposed that because of the complexity of social justice topics, students would need a higher level of cognitive development in order to successfully understand and fulfill the role of social justice advocate. While statistical results of the hypotheses were mixed, the research project yielded some positive findings and trends. In this final chapter, results of the research hypotheses will be examined and discussed. Implications of the study and recommendations for future research will be also be presented and explored.

Discussion of Major Research Findings

Service learning is a pedagogical strategy that links academic content with practical experience in the field. While service learning has been used in many other academic disciplines, it has rarely been used to prepare counselors for the tasks they will face in their professional roles. The results of this study suggest that service learning may be a promising model to promote cognitive development as well as social justice skills and knowledge in counselor education students.

Discussion of Hypotheses
Hypothesis 1

It was hypothesized that moral reasoning, as measured by the DIT-2, would be positively correlated with advocacy competency, as measured by the ACSAS. The statistical results did not support this hypothesis; no significant relationship was found between participants' moral reasoning, as measured by the DIT-2 and advocacy competency, as measured by the ACSAS. While these findings may reflect the absence of a relationship between moral developmental level and advocacy competency, it is possible that certain limitations in the study prohibited a significant relationship from being detected.

The first limitation has to do with instrumentation. The ACSAS is the only instrument written specifically to measure advocacy competency in counselors and, thus, was selected for use in the current study. According to one of the authors, the ACSAS is an instrument designed to measure competencies along the six domains articulated by the ACA Advocacy Competencies (Lewis et al., 2003). Although the instrument had been piloted with students in two doctoral programs, no results have been published relating to the reliability or validity of the measure. (M. Ratts, personal communication, July 8, 2008) Thus, it could be that the instrument was insufficient to detect the proposed relationship between moral developmental level and advocacy competencies in this study.

Additionally, structural problems with the instrument may have impacted participant scores. First, page formatting on the questionnaire may have caused some difficulty for the respondents. The instrument consists of two pages of questions, with 30 questions total. Likert scale anchors are listed at the top of the first page, but are not listed
on the second page. This could have made it difficult for participants to accurately indicate their responses on the second page. Second, there are no instructions on the instrument for participants to continue onto the second page. The researcher verbally reminded participants to ensure they completed both of the pages, however some failed to do so. As a result, five scores (22.7%) from the first control group were omitted from the statistical analysis, and this may have confounded the results. Finally, respondents to the ACSAS selected their answers to test questions from a three point Likert scale (almost always, sometimes, and almost never). An initial inspection of the completed responses revealed that some of the checkmarks were written far to the right or left of the response boxes. This could indicate that participants felt that the Likert scale was not broad enough to accurately reflect their skills and abilities. Russell, Pinto, and Bobko (1991) suggest that even 5-point Likert scales can cause information to be lost through the need of respondents to fit their responses to the given Likert scale categories. This can introduce a greater degree of error and result in artificial inflation or deflation of actual scores. The 3-point Likert scale in the ACSAS may be subject to this type of problem.

A review of questions on the ACSAS reveals that response biases may be a potential threat to the instrument’s validity. For example, question 19 reads, “I help clients/students identify external barriers that affect their development.” Students might have been tempted to answer this question as ‘Almost Always’ in an effort to indicate that they do all they can to promote the healthy development of their clients, regardless of whether identifying external barriers is their standard practice. Participants could have responded to instruments questions in socially desirable ways that did not reflect their actual level of competency in advocacy. Three questions have reverse scoring to detect
careless responding, but there were no mechanisms built into the instrument to detect false or meaningless response patterns. A final potential problem with the instrument could be its lack of operational definitions. Because education in advocacy concepts is lacking in counselor education (McWhirter & McWhirter, 2007), respondents may not have used the same definitions for words used in the test as did the test authors. For example, question 4 reads, “I use data to demonstrate urgency for systemic change” Several words in this question including ‘data’, ‘urgency,’ and ‘systemic change’ are open to interpretation by the reader. This variation in definitions leaves participants to answer questions based on their own definitions and could threaten the validity and reliability of the test. Identifying the specific type of data the test authors were referring to would have made the question more precise. In summary, the structural deficiencies described above could have resulted in scores that were not a reflection of participant’s actual perceptions of their advocacy competency and, thus, may have prevented the instrument from yielding the anticipated correlation between social justice advocacy competency and moral developmental levels.

In addition to structural problems with the instrument, there may also be conceptual reasons for the lack of correlation between ACSAS and DIT-2 scores. The DIT-2 (Rest et al., 1999) was developed as a measure of moral reasoning. However, Rest et al. (1999) have asserted that moral development is more expansive than moral reasoning alone. As discussed in Chapter 2, they developed the Four Component Model to include the concepts of moral sensitivity, moral motivation, and moral character along with moral reasoning. Two concepts of this model, moral sensitivity and moral character, seem particularly applicable to the relationships examined in this study. Moral sensitivity
relates to an understanding of how actions would affect others, and suggests an awareness of moral problems when they exist. This corresponds clearly to a skill in the Client/Student Empowerment domain of Advocacy Competencies which reads “Advocacy-oriented counselors recognize the impact of social, political, economic, and cultural factors on human development” (2003, p.1). Moral character relates to having courage in persisting in moral tasks and moral goals (1999) and corresponds to the Advocacy Competency domain of Systems Advocacy in which counselors are expected to “Recognize and deal with resistance” (p.3). In retrospect, the use of an instrument that was more sensitive to these specific components of moral development may have been more successful in detecting a significant correlation between moral development and advocacy competency.

**Hypothesis 2**

The second Hypothesis predicted that participants’ intellectual developmental levels, as measured by the LEP, would be positively correlated with advocacy competency, as measured by the ACSAS. The statistical results did not support this hypothesis. With the current sample, no significant relationship was found between the constructs of intellectual development, as measured by the LEP and advocacy competency, as measured by the ACSAS. As a result, the possibility must be considered that the hypothesized relationship between intellectual development and advocacy competency does not exist; however consideration of other confounding would seem to be warranted.

The same instrumentation issues with the ACSAS that were discussed with the analysis of Hypothesis 1 in this chapter could have impacted the lack of significant
correlation between the ACSAS and the LEP. Structural problems with the instrument may have made it difficult for participants to accurately respond to questions. In addition, the ACSAS has no established reliability and validity statistics, and, thus, the failure to find significance could have been the result of Type II error.

**Hypothesis 3**

In Hypothesis 3, it was predicted that moral reasoning, as measured by participants’ scores on the DIT-2 would be positively correlated with intellectual development as measured by participant’s scores on the LEP. This hypothesis was not supported by the statistical results. According to the analysis of scores in this study, there was no relationship between moral reasoning as measured by the DIT-2 and intellectual development, as measured by the LEP.

One reason for this unexpected finding could be that the constructs are unrelated; however, this seems unlikely in light of substantial previous research that has established a positive correlation between moral and intellectual development. King, Kitchener, Wood, and Davidson (1989) conducted a seven-year longitudinal study to determine correlations between the intellectual, moral, and ego developmental domains. Three groups of individuals each completed a battery of instruments at three points in the seven year study. Research instruments included the Reflective Judgment Interview (Kitchener & King, 1981) and the Concept Mastery Test (Terman, 1973), both measures of intellectual development; the Defining Issues Test (Rest, 1979), a measure of intellectual development; and the Sentence Completion Test (Loevinger, Wessler, & Redmore, 1970), a measure of ego development. Correlations between measures of intellectual and
moral development ranged from .39 to .61, indicating that these developmental domains have a moderate level of correlation.

Another reason for the lack of significant correlation between moral reasoning and intellectual development in the current study could be deficient instrumentation; however that prospect seems unlikely given the validity and reliability that have been established for both instruments in previous research as discussed in Chapter 3. A more plausible explanation for the failure to detect a significant relationship between moral reasoning and intellectual development levels relates to the design problems with the current study. The sample size used was small which resulted in reduced power in the statistical analysis of the hypotheses. Further research that uses larger sample sizes would likely remedy this potential problem and could increase the potential for significant findings.

Hypothesis 4

In Hypothesis 4, it was predicted that moral reasoning for the experimental group would be significantly greater than that of the control groups as indicated by posttest DIT-2 scores. The statistical results partially supported this hypothesis in finding a significant difference between the experimental group and the second control group on N2 scores at posttest. While the amount of variance accounted for by the intervention was small, the experimental group had significantly higher moral reasoning scores than did the second experimental group, as measured by the DIT-2 following the intervention.

A Tukey post hoc analysis was conducted in order to examine the specific nature of the differences found among the groups at posttest. Surprisingly, this analysis found that although the experimental group and the second control group were
significantly different, there was no significant difference between either the experimental group and the first control group or the second control group and the third control group. It may be that, due to limited sample size, there was insufficient statistical power to fully differentiate among the groups on this post hoc test. Adding more power through greater sample sizes may have resulted in greater differentiation and will be a future recommendation. Nonetheless, the positive finding that moral development was positively impacted for students in the intervention group offers promising support for the salience of the service learning intervention, particularly in light of the fact that it was offered over a single semester. As discussed in Chapter 2, it is recommended that interventions to promote cognitive development continue for a minimum of six to nine months.

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 stated that intellectual development for the experimental group would be significantly greater than for the control groups as indicated by posttest R scores and CCI scores on the LEP. The statistical results did not support this hypothesis and found the intervention did not result in significant differences between the experimental group and control group in intellectual developmental levels as measured by the LEP. Despite the lack of significance, a trend showed that the CCI scores and the R scores for the experimental group decreased between pretest and posttest. LEP R scores likewise decreased slightly but not significantly between pretest and posttest for the first control group. While this could mean that the intervention had a negative impact on participants, other contributing factors may have been in play.
The lack of significant development in LEP scores between pretest and posttest for the experimental group was clearly contrary to expectations and may have been related to the concept of décalage. As discussed in Chapter 2, décalage describes asynchronous development across the domains within one individual (Kohlberg, Higgins, & Power, 1991). A person can be at higher levels of moral development and lower levels of intellectual development, or can progress in one domain and not in the other over a given time frame. Kohlberg (1984) accounted for this developmental unevenness as a mismatch between developmental competence and performance. When a challenge is too great for an individual’s current level of development, higher levels will not be obtained until optimal conditions for development present themselves. It was predicted that the experimental group, with the inclusion of the service learning intervention, would develop basic counseling skills as well as advocacy competency. This introduced more tasks for these students to focus on and gain competency in, and thus, may have created a greater degree of challenge and disequilibrium during the semester of internship. Décalage could be an explanation for the results of the study that found significant positive changes in moral development with no attendant changes in intellectual development for the experimental group.

Another reason for the unexpected findings with regard to this hypothesis relates to counselor developmental levels. Students in internship are early in the counselor developmental process. According to Stoltenberg (1981), the first stage of counselor development is a time of high challenge and anxiety; students lack of confidence in their counseling abilities. Counselors at this stage look to instructors and supervisors for answers about the ‘right’ ways to conduct counseling. The Internship course is designed
to provide feedback to student counselors from instructors and other classmates regarding their clinical work. Beginning counseling students often seek concrete answers to assuage their anxiety, but instead, tend to receive multiple perspectives in feedback from classmates and supervisors during the Supervised Internship in Community Counseling course. The normal anxiety associated with early counselor developmental stages (1981) paired with the somewhat unstructured academic environment of the internship course could lead students to want more structure, guidance, and answers in order to decrease anxiety about the new role and unfamiliar counseling role. These circumstances could have been overwhelming and miseducative for the novice counselors who had need for more structure, guidance, and concrete answers (Perry, 1999). Consequently, an excessive mismatch between the learners and their learning environment may have impacted the findings on Hypothesis 5.

The strongest indication that the findings of the current study with regard to Hypothesis 5 may have been subject to extraneous confounding factors is that they are in direct conflict with previous research conducted on the impact of service learning with a social justice focus on intellectual development of undergraduate and graduate students. Referring back to Chapter 2, Wang and Rogers (2006) examined the impact of service learning courses with and without a social justice focus on intellectual development, as measured by the Measure of Epistemological Reflection (MER, Baxter Magolda & Porterfield, 1985). They found that participation in service learning significantly increased intellectual development for the their sample. Participants in the service learning courses with an emphasis on social justice had significantly higher intellectual developmental levels after the experience than the control group. Revisiting the Wang
and Rogers study more specifically, it becomes evident that there were some aspects of that study that differed from the present study and which could have influenced the contrasting results. First, the MER consists of trained raters interviewing participants with a series of structured questions about various aspects of the learning environment. As a result, it may be more sensitive than the LEP to developmental changes. Second, the differences may be a result of an inadequate emphasis on underlying causes of social injustice in the current study. In Chapter 2 it was established that a social justice approach to service learning emphasizes three foci: the underlying causes of injustice, knowledge of how to address issues of social justice, and actions to combat injustice (Wang & Rogers, 2006). The curriculum used in the current intervention followed the Advocacy Competencies (2003), which emphasize two of these three foci. There was little discussion in the curriculum about underlying causes of injustice. Assuming that this component is necessary for the promotion of intellectual development, its absence in the current study could potentially explain the failure of the current findings to support Hypothesis 5.

Hypothesis 6

The final hypothesis predicted that the advocacy competency for the experimental group would be significantly greater than for the control groups as indicated by posttest Total Scores on the ACSAS. Results indicated that while there was a main effect for time for the whole sample, there were no significant differences between groups on the ACSAS Total Scores. Thus, completing the first semester of internship with no additional intervention was sufficient to promote growth in advocacy competency across both the experimental and control groups. However, it is worthy of note that increases in ACSAS
Total Scores for the experimental group were greater (though not significantly greater) than those for the first control group from pretest to posttest. Thus, Hypothesis 6 was not supported by the statistical results. The non-significant findings may reflect the ineffectiveness of the intervention on the experimental group; however, other confounding variables could also have impacted their outcomes. Given that the promotion of social justice advocacy was a primary interest of this research, these confounding variables will be examined in considerable detail.

Two reasons for the lack of significant findings may be the respective results of instrumentation and insufficient statistical power. As discussed with Hypothesis 1 of this chapter, there are many potential problems with the ACSAS instrument that may have impacted the Total Scores for the experimental group. Due to its lack of reliability and validity statistics, the instrument may not have detected differences that did exist between groups at posttest. In addition, the relatively small samples sizes may have decreased statistical power to a degree that made posttest differences impossible to detect. A third reason may relate to the differences between the experimental and control groups in the amount of multicultural training they had received prior to the intervention. Chapter 1 established that social justice advocacy requires a complex set of skills that builds on multicultural competence. It was noted there that by several authors that training for multicultural competence in counselor education is a prerequisite for social justice advocacy (Herlihy & Watson, 2007; Helms, 2003). While all students in the control groups had completed at least one Multicultural Counseling course at the time of posttest, less than half of the participants in the experimental group had done so. Having completed a multicultural counseling class may be an important precursor to the
development of advocacy skills and abilities. The information presented in a Multicultural Counseling course may provide necessary scaffolding upon which advocacy skills and knowledge are built. Statistical tests showed that the experimental and the first control group had equivalent pretest scores on the ACSAS. However, the experimental group may have lacked important tools for growth in advocacy competency that the control groups may have had.

A fourth reason for the lack of significant findings in the ACASA Total score is the length of the intervention. Research has suggested growth in advocacy skills and knowledge and professional identity as an advocate is a developmental process (Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005, Kiselica & Robinson, 2001). As discussed in Chapter 2, cognitive development requires adequate amounts of time to unfold with the correct conditions present. The suggested minimum length of time to promote significant development is six to nine months (Sprinthall & Thies-Sprinthall, 1983). It is possible development in advocacy competency requires a similar timeline. As noted previously, the intervention in this study was carried out in the context of Supervised Internship in Community Counseling, a course that has a specific set of goals and objectives that must be met if students are to graduate. Thus, there was a limited amount of time afforded to delivering the intervention. Each week in class, approximately 30 minutes were allotted to the intervention, yielding 6½ total hours of the advocacy curriculum over the course of the semester. In addition to the curriculum delivered by the researcher, students engaged in projects in the community during the intervention. Students were able to use 1½ hours a week of internship time for work on their Advocacy Projects, which gave them an additional 24 hours during a four-month semester. In all, students were actively engaged
as advocates for a total of 30 1/2 hours during the intervention. It is possible that this one-semester intervention did not provide enough continuity for development in advocacy competency to occur. However, there was significant development in one competency domain, Public Information. This may indicate the intervention set a developmental process in advocacy competency in motion. Development in advocacy competency may continue to unfold over time; re-testing participants one year after graduation may yield more information about the process of development in advocacy competency and is recommended.

Weaknesses in the curriculum used in the intervention may present yet another reason for the findings with regard to Hypothesis 6. As described in Chapter 3, the researcher developed the curriculum used in the current study based on the ACA Advocacy Competencies and structured using the service learning components of guided reflection, student voice, and working with community partners. In the absence of other, evidenced based curricula to which the content and effectiveness of the experimental curricula can be compared, its adequacy in promoting development in social justice advocacy competency remains subject to question. Its inadequacy could relate to the provision of insufficient time for reflection. Schmidt and McAdams (in press) found that reflection might be a critical element in promoting cognitive development. Students in the current study had opportunity for guided reflection through class discussion; however no reflective journals were used during the intervention because of the limited time requirements. This may not have allowed for sufficient reflection on the curriculum, project, and experiences in order to consolidate student learning and facilitate growth in
advocacy competency. Future research on developing an effective advocacy curriculum that includes more emphasis on guided reflection is warranted.

A final possible explanation for lack of significant growth in advocacy competency relates to the final Advocacy Projects. Chapter 2 suggested that in effective service learning, students select their own projects in collaboration with community partners (Warter & Grossman, 2002). Students in the current study were encouraged to select projects that matched their personal interests, and while the researcher approved student projects, she did not control what projects the students selected. One of the drawbacks of this model is that the researcher could not directly control the amount of challenge associated with each project. It is possible that the challenges presented to students through their projects were either too great or too insufficient to promote growth in advocacy competency. For example, one group developed a group counseling training session for a local adolescent residential treatment center. They created a PowerPoint presentation that consisted of 85 slides and directed two four-hour training sessions with paraprofessional, supervisors, and administrators at the organization. Conversely, another group’s Advocacy Project culminated in teaching a 50-minute sociology undergraduate class about social justice advocacy. The research participants developed and taught the lesson at a local community college. While these were both worthwhile projects, they required very different levels of time investment and background research to successful carry out. The differing levels of challenge presented to students in their selected Advocacy Projects could have impacted the social justice advocacy development in students differently and confounded the results.
In summary, the significant findings with regard to the research were in the area of Hypothesis 4, promoting moral reasoning. While the findings for the remaining hypotheses were not as expected, they are nonetheless potentially informative and beneficial in their implications for counseling and counselor education. Those implications will be discussed in the Implications section.

**Supplemental Analyses**

Statistical analysis was conducted on ACSAS subscale scores to ascertain whether significant differences between groups existed at the subscale level. Results indicated that scores on the Public Information subscale for the experimental group were significantly higher than for both of the control groups at posttest. The intervention appears to have had a significant impact on growth in the Public Information advocacy competency domain for the experimental group. This suggests that through their participation in the intervention, students emerged with greater ability to “awaken the general public to macro-systemic issues regarding human dignity” (Lewis et al., 2003, p. 3). However, this supplemental finding must be viewed with caution, given that no main effect was found, and, thus, there is a strong likelihood that it could be the result of statistical error.

**Implications**

The findings of this study would seem to offer a possible approach for promoting moral development, as well as social justice advocacy competency through the use of service learning in counselor education. Despite the call for counselors to act as social justice advocates (Kiselica & Robinson, 2003), little empirical research has previously explored this area. The current study, while limited in scope, provides information about how counselor education programs may attempt to prepare students for the profession.
The intervention used in this research begins to fill the void in curriculum and protocol for preparing students for the mandate for advocacy in counseling practice. The current study offers several implications for counselor education, the field of service learning, student counselors, and the local community.

First, are two implications for counselor education: (a) the usefulness of cognitive developmental theory and short term DPE for social justice advocacy training and (b) the new option of service learning for use in social justice advocacy training. The cognitive developmental framework and its attendant educational strategy, Deliberate Psychological Education, may have utility in promoting moral development and the Public Information domain of social justice advocacy competency in counseling students. As discussed in Chapter 2, the literature discussing the need to prepare students as social justice advocates lacks consideration of their ability to engage with the complex topics of social justice. The educational intervention applied in the current study resulted in significant moral growth that could potentially enable counseling students to navigate that complexity more effectively. In addition the short-term intervention used in the study, while lasting only four months, resulted in significant findings. As discussed in Chapter 1, DPE guidelines state growth promoting interventions must last six to nine months (Reinman & Peace, 2002). The results of the current study indicate that a shorter intervention, with minimal classroom disruption, is sufficient to promote development. These findings could be encouraging to counselor educators who desire to apply developmental interventions but are limited to applications in a single semester. In view of the findings, counselor educators may appropriately consider the use of cognitive
developmental theory and the DPE model to frame the process through which they prepare students for the role of social justice advocate.

The current study has another important implication for counselor education: it potentially begins the process of moving social justice concepts from theory to practice. Counselor education has historically prepared student-counselors through the use of practical clinical experiences. CACREP (2001) has identified practicum and internship as critical components to the counselor training experience in which basic counseling theory and skills are practiced in schools and community organizations. The mandated role of social justice advocate has not received the same time or attention in counselor preparation programs. As the role of advocate is one of four central roles conceptualized for community counselors (Lewis et al., 1998), programs may be remiss in failing to prepare students in this area. As discussed in Chapter 2, Constantine et al. (2007) have called for new approaches that can adequately prepare counseling students for engaging with issues of social justice and for the role of advocacy. The results of this study may illustrate that service learning with a social justice focus promotes moral development. In short, service learning may show promise in answering the call for new approaches in preparing students for working with issues of social justice and deserves consideration by counselor educators.

Along with implications for counselor education, the research also has implications for theory and practice of service learning. The current study connected the two literature bases of cognitive developmental theory and service learning. As reported in Chapter 2 several studies have reported the impact of service learning on various domains of development (Eyler, Giles, & Braxton, 1997; Strage, 2000). However, the
literature has not described the proposed relationship between service learning and Deliberate Psychological Education as educational strategies. In fact, these two educational approaches overlap significantly, and service learning might be conceptualized enhancing the DPE model to provide benefit to both its participants and the community. Because many empirical studies support the significant impact of DPE on development (Foster & McAdams, 1998; Morgan, Morgan, Foster, & Kolbert, 2000), the apparent relationship between service learning and DPE illustrated through this study may offer empirical support for service learning as well. The current study began to connect these two strategies, and additional studies in this area are warranted. In addition, service learning researchers have called for studies that provide support for the use of theory to guide service learning practice (Exley, 2004; Kahne et al, 2000). Use of cognitive developmental theory may provide a way to conceptualize and articulate the goals and practice of service learning. This study’s results may offer service learning practitioners and researchers justification for use of the cognitive developmental framework as a foundation upon which to base their practice and research.

The study also has implications for counseling students. While the results of the hypotheses were mixed, the intervention provided an opportunity for students to learn about and practice the role of social justice advocate. If not for the intervention, students would have graduated with little training in this area. Most of the students who participated in the intervention enthusiastically embraced the experience and were extremely passionate about their projects. They seemed to welcome the opportunity to work at a systemic level to reduce environmental barriers for their selected populations.
In completing a qualitative description of the Advocacy Project experience, one student responded with the following:

I learned many things during this project and it is hard from me to identify any single-most valued lesson. From working with my partner, to delivering the training to understanding the challenges individuals face when learning new ways to perform familiar duties, this project gave me invaluable exposure to the world of advocacy, training, and evaluation.

Another student reported:

The project helped me to better understand to role of counselor as advocate. (In the class) we all had such diverse interests, and with so many interests and the desire to bring about change, the class as a whole covered a lot of ground in our community. By harnessing the interests of counselors and empowering them to believe that they can effect change, many different populations can be served.

As discussed in Chapter 3, at the beginning of the intervention, the researcher provided participants with community contacts that they could collaborate with on the Advocacy Projects. None of the Advocacy Project groups used the contacts provided, and instead quickly established their own connections to community organizations. This indicates that students had already had a sense of their community’s felt needs and passion for seeking to meet those needs. What they lacked were the necessary skills to do so. Their enthusiastic response convinced both the researcher and the course instructor that the experience offered by the intervention had filled a gap in the counselor education curriculum. Accordingly, counselor education programs are encouraged to examine their curriculum in order to determine whether it adequately prepares students for the all the
tasks of the profession, including the role of social justice advocate. The intervention
developed in the course of this research could provide an initial framework counselor
education programs can use in preparing students for this role.

Finally, the study had implications for the local community through the products
developed by the students who planned and carried out Advocacy Projects. As a
requirement of the project, students developed a product they left with the organization.
For example, one group developed a directory of services for the local GLBT
community. Upon completion, they gave the directory to several organizations serving
this community for distribution. This Advocacy Project helped to identify resources for a
marginalized population and to distribute the information in a useful way. The
participants' Advocacy Projects were able to fulfill organizational and community needs
that may have been previously unmet. Community partners reported they felt very
satisfied with the efforts of the students, as indicated by their responses to the evaluation
tool. One community partner stated “Excellent experience. Students were well prepared
and gave a great presentation. Activities incorporated were also good.” Another partner
reported, “They were able to understand our needs and have taken the project much
further than we have been able to due to work demands.” Through the use of service
learning to prepare students as social justice advocates, counselor education programs can
take the opportunity to educate their students and provide benefit to the local community.

Limitations

The current study begins to fill a void in counselor education curriculum and research
related to preparing students as social justice advocates. While the study may offer some
interesting findings, there were some limitations that require consideration. First,
sampling issues were present that may have impacted the results. The first control group
was made up of two independent classes of students from different institutions, including
school counseling students enrolled in Supervised Internship in Community Counseling
at The College of William and Mary and students enrolled in the Supervised Internship in
Community Counseling course at Virginia Tech. The school counseling students receive
much of the same core counseling education as all counseling students (CACAREP,
2001), however, they also take classes specific to the role of school counselors.
Introducing members to the control group who were possibly systematically different
from the experimental group is problematic and could have confounded the results.
Secondly, the faculty members teaching both the experimental and control groups were
affiliated with The College of William and Mary counselor education program. The
experimental group was lead by Dr. Rip McAdams, an associate professor in the
counselor education department, while the instructors of the control group at Virginia
Tech and the school counseling control group at William and Mary were both graduates
of the William and Mary counselor education doctoral program. Because cognitive
developmental theory is the primary theoretical orientation taught in the doctoral program
at William and Mary, it is possible that the instructors in the control groups may have
structured courses in ways that implicitly promoted development, even if this was not
intentional. For example, a central concept of the Deliberate Psychological Education
model is that a balance of support and challenge is needed to promote growth (Reiman &
Peace, 2002). The instructors of the control groups may have instructed the courses in a
way that provided this balance and thus, promoted the growth of their students. Initial
reviews of the course syllabi and instructional approaches indicated that the courses were
similar except for the intervention. However, if the control group courses were
developmental in their intent, it could clearly have impacted the results.

Cognitive development is a process that unfolds over time (Sprinthall and Thies-Sprinthall, 1983). In the Deliberate Psychological Education model, interventions should last a minimum of six to nine months (Reiman & Peace, 2002). The short-term nature of this intervention may have led to some of the non-significant findings. The developmental process that began during the study, as evidenced by the significant gains in moral reasoning in the experimental group, may continue after the intervention is over. The full impact of the intervention may require more time to be detected by the measurements (2002).

Students in the experimental group knew they were participating in a research study that involved advocacy training in internship. This knowledge may have impacted their responses to the research instruments through the Hawthorne Effect. The Hawthorne Effect is an observed change in participants’ behavior based on their awareness of participating in a research study (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). For example, participants may have responded to the ACSAS at posttest to indicate they developed more competencies than they actually had. Since the ACSAS had no mechanism for detecting false responding, there was no way to verify this potential confounding variable. An additional issue may have been the timing of posttesting. Students in all groups completed the posttest measures on the last day of their respective semesters. Due to the significant fatigue most students feel at this point of the semester, participants may not have devoted their full attention to completing the measurements. If this was the case, posttest scores may not have accurately represented true levels of moral reasoning,
intellectual development, and advocacy competency. Additionally, because the researcher was an integral part of the course, it is possible that an experimenter effect impacted the participants. The researcher also served as a clinical supervisor for the internship experience and worked closely with the participants in that role. As a result of the dual relationships between the researcher and the participants, they may have been tempted to respond to the research instruments in a way that would show positive results in the study. Thus, scores on the instruments may not accurately reflect true scores. Finally, a large majority of the research participants in all groups identified as White/Caucasian. Because of the lack of diversity in the study, caution should be used in generalizing the study results beyond White/Caucasian counseling student interns.

Beyond the limitations to the study’s internal and external validity, a further drawback warrants discussion. The curriculum portion of the intervention took place within the first thirty minutes of weekly course time. While some students reported they felt the curriculum and project added significant value to the internship experience, some students reported they felt the time would have been better spent addressing clinical issues. The course instructor and the researcher offered opportunities for students to schedule supplementary individual supervision meetings in addition to weekly group supervision. Few students scheduled these meetings. With such a short period of time allowed for group supervision every week, adding an advocacy curriculum to the course risks sacrificing time for discussing students’ clinical experiences.

Recommendations for Future Research

Despite these limitations, the current research begins a needed process of filling the gaps in the literature relating to how best to prepare students for the role of social
justice advocate. More research is needed in order to best prepare students with the skills and abilities that can serve to reduce systemic barriers to healthy development and wellness for marginalized populations. Based on the results of the current study, several potential research directions are warranted. First, there is a need of inquiry into how counselors at various levels (students, new professionals, mid-career, and seasoned counselors) and various specialties (mental health, school, and community) engage in social justice advocacy. This could be beneficial in understanding the current status of counselor advocacy behavior. It could also inform educational interventions designed to promote advocacy behavior. Second, valid and reliable instruments that measure these skills must be developed. Specifically, research that establishes the validity and reliability of the ACSAS is recommended, since it is based on advocacy skills that have been accepted by the ACA. Third, additional outcome studies are needed that lend support for the best way to teach advocacy skills and knowledge. Developing an outcome-based curriculum that could be used to prepare students as advocates was the focus of this project and continues to be an important recommendation for the future. As discussed in Chapter 2, social justice advocacy is linked with multiculturalism. Because of this tie, it may be best to present advocacy curriculum to students after completion of the required Multicultural Counseling course. Studies that examine the most effective timing for social justice advocacy preparation in counselor education programs would be informative. While in the current study, the social justice advocacy intervention was conducted in the context of Supervised Internship in Community Counseling, the material may be better suited for inclusion in another course such as Multicultural Counseling or Introduction to Community Counseling. The development of an entire course may also be
warranted. Research that explains the best way to situate social justice advocacy training within counseling graduate education is recommended. Forth, providing more time for advocacy skills and knowledge to develop may be a fruitful follow up study. Measuring participants on the research instruments again after one year of working in the field may provide further information about the impact of the intervention. In addition, studies that extend the intervention over the course of an academic year would be useful in order to see the impact of a longer time frame for the students to engage with the concepts of social justice advocacy. Fifth, studies that have greater emphasis on determining a community’s felt need through community members themselves are recommended. In the current study, participants connected with community agencies that served the selected populations. The need areas for the advocacy projects were determined by these agencies. It is unclear whether community members would have identified these same needs. This is an important area for follow up studies. A sixth potential area for future research relates to the developmental models used to determine growth in participants. The current study used moral development and intellectual development as frameworks. As articulated by Rest et al., (1994) moral development encompasses four components. The current study examined one of these, moral reasoning. As the participants in the current study already had high scores on moral reasoning at pretest (Rest et al., 1999), focusing on other areas of moral development is suggested. Fruitful follow up studies may include measuring changes in moral motivation, moral sensitivity, and moral character as a result of a similar intervention. Intellectual development was used because of the higher educational context. However, the intervention was not focused on challenging participants’ ideas about truth, knowledge, and authority and no significant growth was seen for the
experimental group in intellectual development. Future studies could employ other developmental models, such as ego development (Loevinger, 1966).

**Conclusion**

Nearly 20 years ago, counselors were charged with a mandate to act as advocates and to work to defeat the systemic injustices that stifle wellness and development among marginalized groups in society (Kiselica & Robinson, 2001). Counselor education programs play a key role in preparing student counselors to effectively and completely take on this role. The current study examined the question of whether a service learning intervention designed to promote cognitive development and social justice advocacy skills and knowledge in master’s level counseling students lead to that development. The use of service learning as a pedagogical strategy promoted significant gains in moral development as well as one area of social justice advocacy for the experimental group. Service learning is a promising educational strategy that appears to warrant consideration from counselor educators in preparing students for the role of social justice advocate. This study provides a starting point for future research that can further establish best practices in preparing students for the task of social justice advocacy that they will undoubtedly face as professional counselors.
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Appendix A

Informed Consent

I, (please print name) , agree to participate in a research study examining the impact of advocacy training in Community Counseling Internship. The purpose of this study is to determine whether specific training and experiences in advocacy promote counselor development as well as advocacy competency. I understand that Kristi Lee Wyatt, a doctoral candidate in Counselor Education at The College of William and Mary, is conducting this research.

As a participant, I understand that I will be asked to complete a variety of forms at three points in the academic year; specifically, at the beginning and at the conclusion of Fall Semester 2008 and again at the conclusion of Spring Semester 2009. The measures I will complete are the Defining Issues Test II, the Measure of Epistemological Reflection, and the XX measure of advocacy, as well as a demographic information questionnaire.

I understand that my participation is voluntary and I can withdraw from participation in the study at any time with no consequence to my class grade or progress in the program. Additionally, I understand that my responses on the measurements will be kept secure and confidential and that my name will not be attached to any results. I will select a code with which the researcher will identify me. The results will be reported as class averages and no single scores will be announced.

The results of the study will be emailed to me upon my request. I understand that I may report any problems or dissatisfaction to Dr. Thomas Ward, chair of the School of Education Internal Review Committee at 757-221-2358 or tjward@wm.edu or Dr. Michael Deschenes, chair of the Protection of Human Subjects Committee at the College of William and Mary at 757-221-2778 or mrdesc@wm.edu.

By selecting to participate in this study, I acknowledge that there are no risks to my physical or psychological health.

My signature below signifies that I fully understand that above agreement, that I have received a copy of this consent form, and that I willingly agree to participate in the described study.

Date ___________________________ Participant ___________________________

Date ___________________________ Investigator ___________________________

THIS PROJECT WAS FOUND TO COMPLY WITH APPROPRIATE ETHICAL STANDARDS AND WAS EXEMPTED FROM THE NEED FOR FORMAL REVIEW BY THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECT COMMITTEE (PHONE: 757 221-3901) ON ___________________ AND EXPIRES ON ___________________.
Appendix B

Demographic Information Questionnaire

Gender: _____ Female _____ Male

Race: ________ Asian, Asian American
_______ African, Black, African American
_______ Latino, Hispanic, Mexican American
_______ Native American, American Indian
_______ White, Caucasian, European American
_______ Other, please specify

Age: _______ (in years)

Number of credit hours **completed** in your program: _____

Have you take a multicultural counseling course?

______ Yes, I have completed a multicultural counseling course.
______ No, I have not yet completed a multicultural counseling course.
______ I am currently enrolled in a multicultural counseling course.

Have you taken more than one multicultural counseling course? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes, how many? ____

Before beginning your masters of counseling program, were you involved in any counseling related activities, either through volunteer work, internships, or employment? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes, for how long? ______ (in years)

Do you vote in public elections? _____ Yes, always _____ No, never _____ Sometimes
Appendix C
Examples from Defining Issues Test-II

Famine— (Story #1)

The small village in northern India has experienced shortages of food before, but this year's famine is worse than ever. Some families are even trying to feed themselves by making soup from tree bark. Mustaq Singh's family is near starvation. He has heard that a rich man in his village has supplies of food stored away and is hoarding food while its price goes higher so that he can sell the food later at a huge profit. Mustaq is desperate and thinks about stealing some food from the rich man's warehouse. The small amount of food that he needs for his family probably wouldn't even be missed.

[If at any time you would like to reread a story or the instructions, feel free to do so. Now turn to the Answer Sheet, go to the 12 issues and rate and rank them in terms of how important each issue seems to you.]

Reporter— (Story #2)

Molly Dayton has been a news reporter for the Gazette newspaper for over a decade. Almost by accident, she learned that one of the candidates for Lieutenant Governor for her state, Grover Thompson, had been arrested for shop-lifting 20 years earlier. Reporter Dayton found out that early in his life, Candidate Thompson had undergone a confused period and done things he later regretted, actions which would be very out-of-character now. His shop-lifting had been a minor offense and charges had been dropped by the department store. Thompson has not only straightened himself out since then, but built a distinguished record in helping many people and in leading constructive community projects. Now, Reporter Dayton regards Thompson as the best candidate in the field and likely to go on to important leadership positions in the state. Reporter Dayton wonders whether or not she should write the story about Thompson's earlier troubles because in the upcoming close and heated election, she fears that such a news story could wreck Thompson's chance to win.

[Now turn to the Answer Sheet, go to the 12 issues for this story, rate and rank them in terms of how important each issue seems to you.]
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Please read story #1 in the INSTRUCTIONS booklet.

Famine -- (Story #1)

What should Mustaq Singh do? Do you favor the action of taking the food? (Mark one.)

1. Should take the food  2. Can't decide  3. Should not take the food

Rate the following 12 issues in terms of importance (1-5)

1. Is Mustaq Singh courageous enough to risk getting caught for stealing?
2. Isn't it only natural for a loving father to care so much for his family that he would steal?
3. Shouldn't the community's laws be upheld?
4. Does Mustaq Singh know a good recipe for preparing soup from tree bark?
5. Does the rich man have any legal right to store food when other people are starving?
6. Is the motive of Mustaq Singh to steal for himself or to steal for his family?
7. What values are going to be the basis for social cooperation?
8. Shouldn't the community's laws be upheld?
9. Does the rich man deserve to be robbed for being so greedy?
10. Isn't private property an institution to enable the rich to exploit the poor?
11. How can it be wrong to report it?
12. Are laws getting in the way of the most basic claim of any member of a society?

Rank which issue is the most important (item number).

Most Important (item number)  1 2 3 4 5
Second most important  1 2 3 4 5
Third most important  1 2 3 4 5
Fourth most important  1 2 3 4 5

Now please return to the Instructions booklet for the next story.

Reporter -- (Story #2)

Do you favor the action of reporting the story? (Mark one.)

1. Should report the story  2. Can't decide  3. Should not report the story

Rate the following 12 issues in terms of importance (1-5)

1. Doesn't the public have a right to know all the facts about all the candidates for office?
2. Would publishing the story help Reporter Dayton's reputation for investigative reporting?
3. If Dayton doesn't publish the story wouldn't another reporter get the story anyway and get the credit for investigative reporting?
4. Since voting is such a joke anyway, does it make any difference what reporter Dayton does?
5. Hasn't Thompson shown in the past 20 years that he is a better person than his earlier days as a shop-lifter?
6. What would best serve society?
7. If the story is true, how can it be wrong to report it?
8. How could reporter Dayton be so cruel and heartless as to report the damaging story about candidate Thompson?
9. Does the right of "habeas corpus" apply in this case?
10. Would the election process be more fair with or without reporting the story?
11. Should reporter Dayton treat all candidates for office in the same way by reporting everything she learns about them, good and bad?
12. Isn't it a reporter's duty to report all the news regardless of the circumstances?

Rank which issue is the most important (item number).

Most Important (item number)  1 2 3 4 5
Second most important  1 2 3 4 5
Third most important  1 2 3 4 5
Fourth most important  1 2 3 4 5
Appendix D

Learning Environment Preferences (LEP):

* Survey by the Center for the Study of Intellectual Development

Rate each item using the following scale:

1= Not at all significant  2=Somewhat significant  
3= Moderately significant 4=Very significant

Course Content/View of Learning

1. Emphasize basic facts and definitions.
2. Focus more on having the right answers than on discussing methods or how to solve problems.
3. Insure that I get all the course knowledge from the professor.
4. Provide me with an opportunity to learn methods and solve problems.
5. Allow me a chance to think and reason, applying facts to support my opinions.
6. Emphasize learning simply for the sake of learning or gaining new expertise.
7. Let me decide for myself whether issues discussed in class are right or wrong, based on my and ideas.
8. Stress the practical applications of the material.
10. Serve primarily as a catalyst for research and learning on my own, integrating the knowledge gained into my thinking.
11. Stress learning and thinking on my own, not being spoon fed learning by the instructor.
12. Provide me with appropriate learning situations for thinking about and seeking personal truths.
13. Emphasize a good positive relationship among the students and between the students and teacher.

Role of Instructor

14. Teach me all the facts and information I am supposed to learn.
15. Use up-to-date textbooks and materials and teach from them, not ignore them.
16. Give clear directions and guidance for all course activities and assignments.
17. Have only a minimal role in the class, turning much of the control of course content and class discussions over to the students.
18. Be not just an instructor, but more an explainer, entertainer and friend.
19. Recognize that learning is mutual---individual class members contribute fully to the teaching and learning in the class.
20. Provide a model for conceptualizing living and learning rather than solving problems.
21. Utilize his/her expertise to provide me with a critique of my work.
22. Demonstrate a way to think about the subject matter and then help me explore the issues and come to my own conclusions.
23. Offer extensive comments and reactions about my class performance (papers, exams, etc.).
24. Challenge students to present their own ideas, argue with positions taken, and demand evidence for their beliefs.
25. Put a lot of effort into the class, making it interesting and worthwhile.
26. Present arguments on course issues based on this/her expertise to stimulate active debate among class members.

1=Not at all significant  
3=Somewhat significant  
2=Moderately significant  
4=Very significant

Role of Student/Peers

27. Study and memorize the subject matter—the teacher is there to teach it.
28. Take good notes on what’s presented in class and reproduce that information on the tests.
29. Enjoy having my friends in the class, but other than that classmates don’t add much to what I would get from a class.
30. Hope to develop my ability to reason and judge based on standards defined by the subject.
31. Prefer to do independent research allowing me to produce my own ideas and arguments.
32. Expect to be challenged to work hard in the class.
33. Prefer that my classmates be concerned with increasing their awareness of themselves to others in relation to the world.
34. Anticipate that my classmates would contribute significantly to the course learning through their own expertise in the content.
35. Want opportunities to think on my own, making connections between the issues discussed in class and other areas I’m studying.
36. Take some leadership, along with my classmates, in deciding how the class will be run.
37. Participate actively with my peers in class discussions and ask as many questions as necessary to fully understand the topic.
38. Expect to take learning seriously and be personally motivated to learn the subject.
39. Want to learn methods and procedures related to the subject—learn how to learn.

Classroom Atmosphere/Activities

40. Be very organized and well-structured—clear expectations should be set (i.e. the class should carefully follow a detailed and structured syllabus).
41. Consist of lectures, (with a chance to ask questions) because I can get all the facts I need to know more efficiently that way.
42. Include specific, detailed instructions for all activities and assignments.
43. Focus on step-by-step procedures so that if you did the procedure correctly each time, your answer would be correct.
44. Provide opportunities for me to pull together connections among various subject areas and then construct an adequate argument.
45. Be only loosely structured, with the students themselves taking most of the responsibility for what structure there is.
46. Include research papers, since they demand that I consult sources and then offer my own interpretation and thinking.
47. Have enough variety in content areas and learning experiences to keep me interested.
48. Be practiced and internalized but be balanced by group experimentation, intuition, comprehension, and imagination.
49. Consist of a seminar format, providing an exchange of ideas so that I can critique my own perspectives on the subject matter.
50. Emphasize discussions of personal answers based on relevant evidence rather than just right and wrong answers.
51. Be an intellectual dialogue and debate among a small group of peers motivated to learn for the sake of learning.
52. Include lots of projects and assignments with practical, everyday applications.

1=Not at all significant   2=Somewhat significant
3=Moderately significant  4=Very significant

-----------------------------------------------

Evaluation Procedures

53. Include straightforward, not tricky tests, covering only what has been taught and nothing else.
54. Be up to the teacher, since she/he knows the material best.
55. Consist of objective-style test because they have clear-cut right or wrong answers.
56. Be based on how much students have improved in the class and on how hard they have worked in class.
57. Provide an opportunity for me to judge my own work along with the teacher and learn from the critique at the same time.
58. Not include grades, since there aren’t really any objective standards teachers can use to evaluate students’ thinking.
59. Include grading by a prearranged point system (homework, participation, test, etc.), since I think this is fairest.
60. Represent a synthesis of internal and external opportunities for judgement and learning enhancing the quality of the class.
61. Consist of thoughtful criticism of my work by someone with appropriate expertise.
62. Emphasize essay exams, papers, etc. rather than objective-style tests so that I can show how much I’ve learned.
63. Allow students to demonstrate that they can think on their own and make connections not made in class.
64. Include judgments of the quality of my oral and written work as a way to enhance my learning in the class.
65. Emphasize independent thinking by each student, but include some focus on the quality of one’s arguments and evidence.
Appendix E

Advocacy Competencies Self-Assessment (ACSA) Survey©

**Directions:** To assess your own competence and effectiveness as a social justice change agent, respond to the following statements as honestly and accurately as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>ALMOST ALWAYS</th>
<th>SOMETIMES</th>
<th>ALMOST NEVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I tend to focus on problems within the client/student less so than their strengths and resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am comfortable with negotiating for relevant services on behalf of client/students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I alert community or school groups with concerns that I become aware of through my work with clients/students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I use data to demonstrate urgency for systemic change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I prepare written and multi-media materials that demonstrate how environmental barriers contribute to client/student development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I distinguish when problems need to be resolved through social advocacy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is difficult for me to identify whether social, political and economic conditions affect client/student development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am skilled at helping clients/students gain access to needed resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I develop alliances with groups working for social change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am able to analyze the sources of political power and social systems that influence client/student development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am able to communicate in ways that are ethical and appropriate when taking on issues of oppression public.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I seek out and join with potential allies to confront oppression.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I find it difficult to recognize when client/student concerns reflect responses to systemic or internalized oppression.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I am able to identify barriers that impede the well being of individuals and vulnerable groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I identify strengths and resources that community members bring to the process of systems change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I am comfortable developing an action plan to make systems changes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I disseminate information about oppression to media outlets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I support existing alliances and movements for social change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I help clients/students identify external barriers that affect their development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I am comfortable with developing a plan of action to confront barriers that impact clients/students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I assess my effectiveness when interacting with community and school groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I am able to recognize and deal with resistance when involved with systems advocacy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I am able to identify and collaborate with other professionals who are involved with disseminating public information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I collaborate with allies in using data to promote social change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I assist clients/students with developing self-advocacy skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I am able to identify allies who can help confront barriers that impact client/student development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I am comfortable collaborating with groups of varying size and backgrounds to make systems change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I assess the effectiveness of my advocacy efforts on systems and its constituents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I assess the influence of my efforts to awaken the general public about oppressive barriers that impact clients/students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I lobby legislators and policy makers to create social change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Directions for scoring:**

Score numbers 1, 7, and 13 first, and then record the score next to the corresponding number below:

- Almost Never = 4 points
- Sometimes = 2 points
- Almost Always = 0 points

Then score the remaining items by recording the score next to the appropriate number.

- Almost Always = 4 points
- Sometimes = 2 points
- Almost Never = 0 points

Total the number of points earned for each domain. Then, add the total scored earned for the 6 domains to find out your advocacy rating scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client/Student Empowerment</th>
<th>Community Collaboration</th>
<th>Public Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. __________</td>
<td>3. __________</td>
<td>5. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. __________</td>
<td>9. __________</td>
<td>11. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. __________</td>
<td>15. __________</td>
<td>17. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. __________</td>
<td>21. __________</td>
<td>23. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. __________</td>
<td>27. __________</td>
<td>29. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: ______________</td>
<td>Total: ______________</td>
<td>Total: __________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client/Student Advocacy</th>
<th>Systems Advocacy</th>
<th>Social/Political Advocacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. __________</td>
<td>4. __________</td>
<td>6. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. __________</td>
<td>10. __________</td>
<td>12. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. __________</td>
<td>16. __________</td>
<td>18. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. __________</td>
<td>22. __________</td>
<td>24. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. __________</td>
<td>28. __________</td>
<td>30. __________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: ______________</td>
<td>Total: __________</td>
<td>Total: ______________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Advocacy Rating Scale:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100-120</td>
<td>You’re on the way to becoming a strong and effective social change agent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-99</td>
<td>You’ve got some of the pieces in place. However, you need to do some work to develop your competence in specific advocacy areas in order to be an effective social change agent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 &amp; Below</td>
<td>If you earn low scores in certain advocacy domains (e.g., client/student empowerment, systems advocacy), obtaining training in these areas can greatly improve your effectiveness as a social justice counseling advocate. If being an advocate at the client/student level is a low area, you can expand your repertoire by familiarizing yourself with feminist counseling principles and multicultural counseling competencies. If however, low scores are in a majority of domains you may want to reconsider your commitment to being a social justice advocate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Supervised Internship in Community Counseling Syllabus

The Internship in Community Counseling is designed to give advanced students in counseling the opportunity to put into practice the skills and knowledge they have developed throughout their counseling program. Over two semesters, students complete 600 hours of professional counseling experience in an agency or university setting under supervision by both William & Mary faculty and a field supervisor.

The major goal of the internship is to provide students the opportunity to apply their theoretical knowledge and practical skills to specific client cases and other counseling activities within a professional counseling setting. A weekly group supervision session, individual supervisory meetings and assigned activities are designed to give students and faculty the opportunity to assess each student's counseling performance in relation to client goals and to the counselor's professional development across a variety of counselor roles.

A fundamental premise of the course is that professional counselor education requires both skill development and "self-knowledge". Thus, in addition basic skill proficiency, students must demonstrate effort to increase their self-knowledge through openness to feedback during group supervision sessions. They must likewise demonstrate a willingness to assist others in this task by providing them with constructive feedback about their clinical work.

Specific learning objectives.
1. Gain competence in a field assignment, including the application of a variety of counseling, psychological and educational theories and strategies appropriate to specific client situations.

2. Engage effectively in a variety of professional activities relevant to effective community counseling practice including intake, record keeping, supervision, information and referral, in-service training, and staff meetings, and advocacy in addition to direct client service.

3. Demonstrate a willingness and capacity to examine their own personal and professional development in relation to work with clients and colleagues.

4. Demonstrate competence in organizational development, evaluation, consultation, team-building, and advocacy skills as appropriate to the Internship setting. (CACREP Community C.2)

5. Gain experience in the use of current professional resources in use by community counselors (e.g., assessment instruments, technologies, professional literature, etc.) (CACREP Community C.3)

6. Recognize the importance of contextual and cultural factors in working with clients of diverse backgrounds or referent groups through opportunities for direct exposure to the ethnic and demographic diversity of their community (CACREP Community A.5, C.1).

7. Demonstrate active and effective participation in peer and faculty supervision that includes the integration of theory and practice in written and/or oral presentations and discussions of active cases presented on video or audio-tape.
8. Demonstrate applied knowledge of ethical, legal and professional guidelines (ACA) regarding confidentiality, the counselor-client relationship, professional relationships and responsibilities, testing and research (CACREP Community A.4).

9. Identify and articulate key aspects of their clinical orientation identity as a professional counselor (CACREP Community A.2).

10. Demonstrate the ability to comply with all Professional Performance standards in professional counseling practice.

11. Develop understanding of counselors' roles in social justice and advocacy and demonstrate advocacy knowledge and skills (CACREP K.2.d.).

**Developing advocacy competency.**

One of the key roles of community counselors is the role of social justice advocate (Lewis, Lewis, Daniels, & D’Andrea, 1998; Kiselica & Robinson, 2001). Counselors who are competent advocates are able to work across a variety of levels both with and on behalf of clients to solve environmental barriers to the healthy growth and development of clients, particularly those from marginalized groups (ACA, 2003). A goal of this course is for students to learn about the role of social justice advocate, develop advocacy skills, and engage in advocacy activities during the course of the semester.

**Course format and requirements.**

The Internship will be a PASS/FAIL course. In order to receive a grade of PASS, students must satisfy the following requirements:
1. Hours: Accrue a total of 600 hours equally over two semesters in accordance with the schedule found in Section 1 of the Internship Student Agreement.

2. Supervision:
   a. Field Supervision: Receive a minimum of one hour of individual supervision per week with the designated Field Supervisor.
   b. University Supervision:
      (1) Receive two and one-half hours of group supervision per week with the Faculty Supervisor.
      (2) Receive two hours of individual supervision with the Faculty Supervisor each semester.

3. Case Presentations: Complete the assigned number of Case presentations as determined by the course instructor. Case presentations shall be defined as formal presentations to the Internship Supervision Class of client cases being worked with by students at their field placements. Students should expect and be prepared to present from three to five case presentations for group review, discussion and feedback during the semester. Each case presentation shall include: (a) a concise (10-15 minute) summary of the case according the format defined in the "Case Presentation Worksheet" (a copy to be presented to all supervision group members), (b) a 10-minute video (or audio in some cases) taped segment of a counseling session, and (c) sufficient time (15-20 minutes) for group review and feedback.

4. Advocacy Project: Students, in small groups, will develop an advocacy project over the course of the semester aimed at meeting a "felt need" of a specific
population/agency. The purpose of the project is for students to learn about the role of counselor-advocate and gain experience in conducting advocacy work. Student can count 1 1/2 hours a week spent on the advocacy project toward their total internship hours. Projects should follow these steps:

1. Students formulate small groups of 2-4 with others who have similar interests.

2. Groups identify a population and an agency serving the population targeted for the project. A list of possible agencies who have already expressed interest in collaborating with student groups will be provided to groups.

3. Groups meet with agency or community leaders to collaboratively identify a “felt need” that students can meet with an advocacy project. Students should follow the lead of community/agency leaders in developing how this felt need could best be met by student projects.

4. Groups work to develop a solution to the felt need while remaining in close contact with the agency/population with whom they are collaborating.

5. Groups develop and turn in a project proposal.

6. Groups work to develop their project plan.

7. Groups carry out the project.
8. Groups give copies of any curriculum materials developed to the collaborative partners.

9. Groups and community/agency leaders evaluate the work done by students, using a provided format.

10. Groups present their projects the final class of the semester.

11. Information about the advocacy project will be included in the student portfolio and students can add the experience to their resumes.

5. Counseling Portfolio: Submit a satisfactory Counseling Portfolio. Each student is to develop the Counseling Portfolio, which formally summarizes his/her counseling and related experiences during each semester of the Internship. The Counseling Portfolio is to be compiled in a 3-ring binder with all sections separated by dividers and labeled. Each Portfolio should include the following sections:

   a. A description of the field placement and your Internship-specific duties there;

   b. A description of your goals for professional development during the current semester of the Internship;

   c. A qualitative summary of all course work taken prior to and during the current semester that you consider particularly relevant to your work during the Internship;

   d. A qualitative summary of all professional training received prior to and during the current semester that you consider particularly relevant to your work during the Internship;
e. A quantitative summary of counseling and counseling-related activity conducted during the semester (Can be extracted directly from the Weekly Activity Records);

f. A qualitative summary of interactions with other professional agencies and individuals in support of your counseling work this semester;

g. A qualitative summary of the Advocacy Project, along with any developed materials;

h. Samples of your work including (but not limited to):
   
   (1) Copies of all presentation outlines
   
   (2) One or more samples of assessments that you have done
   
   (3) One or more samples of treatment plans that you have developed
   
   (4) One or more samples of termination summaries completed
   
   (5) Selected samples of your counseling notes
   
   (6) Any other documents that you think reflect the nature and quality of your counseling activity

i. A qualitative assessment of your professional development during the semester, including evaluations of: (a) progress toward your stated goals, (b) current strengths as a counselor and (c) directions needed or desired for continued growth as a counselor and (d) your development as a culturally competent counselor.
6. Field Site Supervisor Evaluation: Receive a satisfactory performance evaluation from the placement field site supervisor according to the criteria listed in the Field Site Supervisor Evaluation form.

7. Focused Discussions: Participate actively and consistently in focused discussions. At the start of each class, there will be a 30-45 minute discussion of a topic relevant to the current professional counseling experience. Brief preparatory readings may be assigned for some topics. Students will be assessed on their success at completing preparatory homework assignments participation in class discussion.

**Tentative Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic/Activity</th>
<th>Presenters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9/2</td>
<td>Course introduction &amp; organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9/9</td>
<td>Focused Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Case presentation protocol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small group assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Giving and receiving feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goal setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9/16</td>
<td>Focused Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation schedule setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of interactions training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Case presentations (or demonstrations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Advocacy Project: Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9/23</td>
<td>Focused Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Case presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Advocacy Project: Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9/30</td>
<td>Focused Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Case presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10/7</td>
<td>Focused Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Case presentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Advocacy Project: Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14</td>
<td>Fall Break, NO CLASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21</td>
<td>Focused Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Case presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Advocacy Project: Step 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28</td>
<td>Focused Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Case presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/4</td>
<td>Focused Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Case presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/11</td>
<td>Focused Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Case presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18</td>
<td>Focused Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Case presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/25</td>
<td>Focused Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Case presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2</td>
<td>Focused Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Case presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Advocacy Project: Step 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/9</td>
<td>Focused Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Advocacy Project: Step 6 – Project evaluation due</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Advocacy Project: Step 7 – Project presentations (4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16</td>
<td>Semester Wrap-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portfolios due</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Advocacy Project: Step 7 – Project presentations (3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Note: The schedule includes activities such as focused discussions, case presentations, and project step evaluations. The dates range from October 14 to December 16. The Advocacy Project steps are marked with specific assignments and due dates.*
Attachment A: Advocacy Project

Small groups of students will complete an advocacy project over the course of the semester aimed at meeting a “felt need” for advocacy on behalf of a specific social need. The purpose of the project is for students to learn about the role of counselor as advocate and to gain experience in conducting advocacy work. Students can count 1 and 1/2 hours a week spent on the advocacy project toward their total internship hours.

The Advocacy Project includes the following:

1. Students will form small groups of 2-4 members based, to the degree possible, on shared interests in advocacy on behalf of a particular client population.

2. Groups will identify a community agency serving that population with whom to collaborate in the advocacy project. A list of possible agencies who have expressed advance interest in participating in the project will be provided; however, groups can identify other agencies with instructor approval.

2. Groups will meet with agency representatives to collaboratively identify a “felt need” for social justice advocacy to serve as the focus of their project and to determine a specific advocacy initiative aimed at addressing that need.

3. Groups will submit their proposed initiative for instructor approval.

4. Upon approval, groups will work with the agency to implement the proposed initiative.

5. Upon completion, groups will collaborate with the agency in evaluating the initiative and sharing with the agency any products or materials (e.g., pamphlets, curricula, etc.) that have been developed.

6. Groups present their projects the final class of the semester.
Attachment B: Counseling Portfolio

The Counseling Portfolio is to be compiled in a 3-ring binder with all sections separated by dividers and labeled.

Each Portfolio should include the following sections:

1. A description of the field placement and your Internship-specific duties there;
2. A description of your goals for professional development during the current semester of the Internship;
3. A qualitative summary of all course work taken prior to and during the current semester that you consider particularly relevant to your work during the Internship;
4. A qualitative summary of the Advocacy Project, along with any developed materials;
5. A qualitative summary of all professional training received prior to and during the current semester that you consider particularly relevant to your work during the Internship;
6. A quantitative summary of counseling and counseling-related activity conducted during the semester (Can be extracted directly from the Weekly Activity Records);
7. A qualitative summary of interactions with other professional agencies and individuals in support of your counseling work this semester;
8. Samples of your work including (but not limited to):
   a. Copies of all presentation outlines
   b. One or more samples of assessments that you have done
c. One or more samples of treatment plans that you have developed

d. One or more samples of termination summaries completed

e. Selected samples of your counseling notes

f. Any other documents that you think reflect the nature and quality of your counseling activity

g. A qualitative assessment of your professional development during the semester, including evaluations of: (a) progress toward your stated goals, (b) current strengths as a counselor and (c) directions needed or desired for continued growth as a counselor and (d) your development as a culturally competent counselor.
Appendix G

Advocacy Project Documents

*Supplemental Information Form*

The following agencies have been contacted and are interested in working with student groups on advocacy projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Population/programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Action Agency</td>
<td>Reba Bolden 229-9332</td>
<td>Variety of different programming, including with at-risk teens, leadership training with teens, preparation for post-secondary education, community development organizations, and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James City County Parks &amp; Rec.</td>
<td>Megan White 259-5354</td>
<td>Kids, adults with special needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kelly Herbert 259-5356</td>
<td>Programming with at-risk youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Connections</td>
<td>Tressel Carter 259-5423</td>
<td>Community building to improve quality of life in low SES neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT Cooperative Extension</td>
<td>Doris Heath 564-2173</td>
<td>Medical advocacy for self and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossroads Group Homes</td>
<td>Ron Wallace 258-5106</td>
<td>Group living for adolescent boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>258-5022</td>
<td>Victims of domestic violence and their families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacon Street</td>
<td>253-0111</td>
<td>Teens and families with SA issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Project Parameters:**
1. The project should extend the length of the semester.
2. The project should result in the development of some tangible product for the agency (brochure, curriculum, etc.).
3. The project should fulfill a ‘felt need’ (a need identified by members of the population served by the agency).
4. The project will require face-to-face collaboration with the agency and members of the population.
5. All group members equally involved in the project.

**Potential Projects:**
- Development and distribution of brochure to make a population aware of services available.
- Development of a particular curriculum for a population (financial literacy for at-risk youth, etc.).
- Public awareness campaign about a mental health/SA issue (making parents aware of the dangers of the pass-out game, etc.).
- Petition campaign for an issue (more affordable housing, or public transportation, etc.).
- Public Comment to city council with supporting research and in collaboration with agency.
- Directory of service for a specific population (individuals in wheel-chairs).
Project Proposal

- Advocacy Project Proposal

Names:

Project name and description:

Need—What is the community/population felt need you are trying to meet?

Purpose—How will this project meet that need?

Participation—Who will participate, and what they will do?

  Student:
  Role:

  Student:
  Role:

  Student:
  Role:

  Student:
  Role:

Community Partners (agencies, client groups, etc.):

  Community Partner contact person and contact information:

ACA Advocacy Competency Area—In which area(s) of the Competencies will you be working?

Competency Skills Needed—What are the Competency skills you will use?

Outcomes—What is the desired impact of your Advocacy Project?

How we will check outcomes—What tangible evidence of the desired impact will be used to assess project effectiveness (curriculum, directory, brochure, etc.)?

Resources—What will you need to get the job done, such as supplies, etc.?
Student Self-Evaluation

Name:

Advocacy Project Title:

Advocacy

• What was the need for your advocacy effort?
• What contribution did you make?
• How did your advocacy affect the community?

Process

• How did you and your peers and community partners plan the project?
• In what ways did you make decisions and solve problems?
• Were there any differences between the initial project plans and what you actually did? Why?
• What ideas do you have for improving this process in the future for other students?

Learning

• Through this advocacy project, what did you learn about:
  – Yourself?
  – Working with others, including people in your class?
  – Your community?
• What skills did you develop through the advocacy project?
• Did this project help you to better understand the role of advocate for counselors? How?
• What did you learn about the counseling role of advocate?
• How will you use what you learned in this experience in your work as a counselor?
Community Partner Evaluation

Community Partner Assessment of Advocacy Project

Advocacy Project:

Student Names:

• To what degree did students show initiative in connecting with your organization/agency and in developing the Advocacy Project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little to none</td>
<td>Small Amount</td>
<td>Moderate Amount</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

• To what degree were students able to understand and respond to the community/agency need around which the Advocacy Project was designed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little to none</td>
<td>Small Amount</td>
<td>Moderate Amount</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

• To what degree were planned service programs, activities, or products completed to your satisfaction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little to none</td>
<td>Small Amount</td>
<td>Moderate Amount</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

• How effective was planning for the Advocacy Project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• How effective were the student in carrying out the Advocacy Project?

Not Effective  Somewhat Effective  Moderately Effective  Highly Effective

Comments:

• To what degree did the Advocacy Project contribute positively to the efforts of your agency/organization?

Little to none  Small Amount  Moderate Amount  High Amount

Comments:

• How satisfied are you, as a community partner, with the interaction between your agency/organization and the students regarding the Advocacy Project?

Little to none  Small Amount  Moderate Amount  High Amount

Comments:

• In your opinion, how can the process of conducting Advocacy Projects be improved?

• From your perspective, how can partnerships between your agency/organization and the counseling program be improved or strengthened?
Presentation Parameters

Content:

1. Overview of the project.

2. What was the need you were filling for what target population?

3. Who were your community partners?

4. What advocacy competency domains were you working in?

5. What was the product outcome of the project?
   Bring copies so all can see.

6. How was your project received by target population/community partners?

7. What were the obstacles you faced?

8. What did you learn about advocacy?

9. Recommendations for future advocacy work in this area?

Presentation:

- Cover the above areas.

- Provide class members with copies of the final product.

- Divide oral presentation equally among group members.

- Presentation are to be 15 minutes in length.

- 5 minute for follow up questions and discussion.

Other notes:

- Other faculty members, students, community partners may be in attendance.

- Given the short time frame of the presentations, visual aids are encouraged (Powerpoint, etc.).
Appendix H

Classroom Curriculum

Week 3: Introduction

Discussion points for *Bringing Advocacy Counseling to Life: The History, Issues, and Human Dramas of Social Justice Work in Counseling*

1. According to this article, what is advocacy in the context of the counseling world?
   a. Counselors work as advocates when they plead on behalf of a client or some social cause
   b. Advocacy is a form of social action, which is action that takes place in the social context in which client problems occur. Purpose is to reduce or eliminate social problems which adversely affect clients
   c. Helping clients challenge institutional and social barriers that impede academic, career, or personal-social development

2. Why is advocacy a needed counselor activity?
   a. Some complex social problems can't be solved by individual interventions alone
   b. A multi-systemic approach is often needed that works with the individual but also works with the systems surrounding the individual including family, employment, culture, educational
   c. Environmental factors can impinge on a client's well-being and intensify or create personal problems

3. What were some of the advocacy examples that surprised you or caught your attention?
a. You don’t have to save a small country from an oppressive regime in order to be an advocate. Advocacy has many faces, small and large scale.

4. Did the skill described seem like they made sense to you as needed skills for advocacy?
   a. The capacity for commitment and an appreciation of human suffering
   b. Nonverbal and verbal communication skills
   c. Maintaining a multi-systemic perspective
   d. Individual, Group, and Organizational Interventions
   e. Knowledge and use of the media, technology, and the internet
   f. Assessment and Research skills

5. How prepared do you feel with these skills?

6. What did you think about the discussion of the costs and pitfalls of advocacy?
   a. What are some of the barriers you can see to advocacy counseling?
   b. Have you ever experienced any barriers or seen any in your work?
   c. How do you think you might be able to avoid barriers?
   d. How do you think you can overcome them when they arise?

Curriculum Week 4: ACA Advocacy Competencies

1. What was your overall impression of this document that describes the counselor Advocacy Competencies?

2. An important point to understand is how advocacy lies on two intersecting continua. We can act with or on behalf of the client we are working with.
   a. How does working with a client and working on behalf of a client look different?
b. Is there one that feels more comfortable to you at this point?

3. We can work on a micro level to a macro level.
   a. What are the differences between working at each of these levels?
   b. Give some specific examples of what each of these levels might be/look like.

4. Now that you have read this, can you identify times when you might have engaged in advocacy without really knowing what you were doing?
   a. Example: client who was sexually assaulted who wanted to live alone.

5. As you think about your advocacy projects, which segments of this grid will you be working in?

_Curriculum Week 5: Client/Student Empowerment_

1. What is empowerment? McWhirter & McWhirter, 2007
   a. Refers to increased assertiveness or other self-management skills on the part of the person being helped.
   b. Has the base word of POWER in it. Empowerment is also about helping clients become aware of the power dynamics at work win their lives and the impact on them and their families.

2. What is the counselor's role in empowerment?
   a. Patricia Arrondondo, a past president of the ACA has said that all counseling is political. That you can’t be neutral on a moving train.
   b. Counseling can be a liberatory force that can help people gain more power in their lives.
c. Counselor’s role is to identify the social, political, economic and cultural factors that affect clients and help clients develop self-advocacy skills and plans.

3. How does a counselor empower a client?
   a. Assertiveness training
   b. Education about how systems work: domestic violence, diagnosis, fair hiring and employment policies, political systems, school IEP and other programs.
   c. Help them develop plans to advocate for themselves.

4. What are self-advocacy skills?
   a. Assertiveness, knowledge, self-awareness (what the client’s needs actually are as defined by the client), education about the way things work and the power systems in play, ability to make informed decisions for yourself, finding supportive people and bringing them around you.

5. What are self-advocacy plans?
   a. Plans that help the client put into action the skills they have in order to improve their lives.

6. How do you know when client empowerment is called for?

\textit{Curriculum Week 5: Case Study}

Rose is a 42 year old divorced single mother who comes to you at the CSB for counseling. She was referred by the counselor from the school her three children attend for depression and anxiety. One of her kids, Scott Jr., 11, has been having a lot of disciplinary problems at school and has been suspended twice.
Rose describes her struggles with trying to get by on her $8 an hour salary with three children. Her ex-husband, an engineer, had an affair five years ago, divorced Rose, and married the woman he was having an affair with. Now he lives across town with her children and rarely sees Rose’s kids. He paid child support the first few months after the divorce, but then stopped.

When you ask Rose about her work, she tells you she is a clerk at a local grocery store and has worked there since the divorce. She always planned to be a stay-at-home mother and didn’t have a lot of job skills when she divorced and had to find work. She reports that she doesn’t particularly like her job and doesn’t feel very comfortable there. When you probe about this, she reluctantly tell you that one of the store managers is giving her problems. He often calls her into his office and sits very close to her on the couch. At times he has seems to be “making passes” at her. When she has tried to tell him she was uncomfortable, he has indicated that she should be careful so he doesn’t fire her. From her description, you begin to think that he may be sexually harassing her. She tells you she really needs that job.

1. What could you do to empower this client?
2. What kinds of self-advocacy skills does this client need?
3. What would a self-advocacy plan for this client entail?

Curriculum Week 6: Client/Student Advocacy

1. What kinds of situations would require/call for advocacy on behalf of clients?
2. How do you know when it may be time to move into your role as counselor-advocate?
3. When do you know it is time to advocate on behalf of the client instead of working with them to help develop a plan to advocate for themselves (empowerment, what we talked about last week).

4. One of the competencies in this section is “Identify barriers to the well-being of individuals and vulnerable groups.” Have you been able to identify any of these at your internship sites or populations?

5. One of the things you will need to be able to do when engaging in this kind of advocacy is to know what resources are available in the communities where you are working.

6. Making connections at these resources/agencies is important too.
   a. Call around to local agencies and see what people do so you have knowledge about where and who to call when you need something.
   b. Call the local United Way to get a list of agencies and groups who serve different populations in your area—find a directory for different populations.

7. Have you engaged in this type of advocacy? Tell us about it.

Curriculum Week 6: Case Study

You work in a college counseling center and are asked to see a client who is coming in ‘in crisis.’ She is a sophomore who is a member of various non-dominant groups—she has cerebral palsy, and identifies as a lesbian. She came into the center in crisis after having been sexually assaulted by a male and is suicidal. When you ask, she does not know if she will be safe by herself after she leaves your office tonight. It is after 6 pm. Do you feel this client needs your advocacy skills? What would you do?
You continue seeing this client as the crisis abates. You begin to work through the sexual assault and it becomes clear the client is exhibiting symptoms of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder. Her school work is beginning to be negatively impacted. She feels very uncomfortable in her dorm room, as her roommate’s boyfriend frequently stays the night. Do you feel this client needs your advocacy skills? What would you do?

Curriculum Week 7: Reflection

1. What was your experience like as you tried to figure out a project?
2. How did you figure out whom to contact and collaborate with?
3. Was that a difficult task or an easy one? Why?
4. Did you find that person/those people to be receptive to what you were doing, or not? Why do you think that was?
5. How did you go about looking for a “felt need” for the population you wanted to serve?
6. Was your perception of a “felt need” different from your contact’s perception? Why or why not?
7. How do you know what a “felt need” for a group or population is?
   a. Do you think agencies serving the population can define it or do populations/communities have to define it for themselves?
8. What do you see as the counselor’s role in meeting “felt needs” of communities/populations?
9. At this point, what do you think of the advocacy process?
Curriculum Week 8: Community Collaboration

1. The first skill in this area is to notice trends or patterns that are causing difficulties for your client population.
   a. Examples:
      i. The beginning level math course in a college is punishingly difficult, even for really good students
      ii. A particular teacher in school exhibits unfair grading practices to one group, like female or African American students
      iii. The sub-standard housing that many clients live is a chronic stressor for your clients
      iv. Incarcerated clients can’t get access to doctors to prescribe medications for their diagnosed mental illnesses

2. Get in small groups and think and talk about what trends you might be seeing in your current clients, or maybe trends you have seen in places you have worked in the past
   a. Share with the large group

3. Next step is to connect with an organization who works with this topic.

4. Look closely at numbers 16-19 of this domain
   a. I thought it was really interesting that they specified these things
   b. It is conveying that we can’t just call an organization and make suggestions. We need to build relationships through listening and seeking to understand the way the organization works.
c. Get to know them, learn about the services they offer that you can help your clients get connected to
d. Offer your own talents and abilities to help
   i. Develop a lesson about the processes students can go through to complain about treatment by a teacher, or the processes clients can go through in prison to make sure they can see doctors and get the correct medication.
   ii. This is also a way to market yourself within a certain group. If you connect with an organization and build a good relationship with them, they are more likely to send clients to you and to want to work with you in the future!

_Curriculum Week 9: Systems Advocacy_

1. Look at number 25: Analyze the sources of political power and social influence within the system.
   a. Do you think it is important to understand the power structure in an organization you are working in?
   b. Why?
   c. How do you know where the power lies in your organization?
   d. How do you know who is powerful and has influence in an organization or group?
   e. Is it always the identified leaders (the boss, supervisor, etc.)?
   f. How do you know what your organization values? Don’t focus on _what_ your organization values, but _how you know_ what it values.
2. The Change Process

a. So when you know there is barrier impeding your clients healthy development, and you understand the power structures in your organization, what do you do next? Some of the pieces are alluded to in this section here.

b. This handout explicates the change process more in detail and I thought it was a very helpful model.

c. Walk through it.

d. The thing that is very striking to me is the intentionality of this process. It is something that requires planning, thought, research, putting together a team of people. It is not a one time event, as some of the advocacy on the micro level might be.

e. What are people’s reactions to this? Do you find this helpful?

f. Training for advocacy ideally is interdisciplinary. We should take successful components from other fields who specialize in other areas (ie. Marketing and public information campaigns).

Curriculum Week 9: Handout, The 8-Step Process of Successful Change

SET THE STAGE

1. Create a Sense of Urgency.

Help others see the need for change and the importance of acting immediately.

2. Pull Together the Guiding Team.

Make sure there is a powerful group guiding the change—one with leadership
skills, bias for action, credibility, communications ability, authority, analytical skills.

DECIDE WHAT TO DO

3. Develop the Change Vision and Strategy.

Clarify how the future will be different from the past, and how you can make that future a reality.

MAKE IT HAPPEN

4. Communicate for Understanding and Buy-in.

Make sure as many others as possible understand and accept the vision and the strategy.

5. Empower Others to Act.

Remove as many barriers as possible so that those who want to make the vision a reality can do so.

6. Produce Short-Term Wins.

Create some visible, unambiguous successes as soon as possible.


Press harder and faster after the first successes. Be relentless with instituting change after change until the vision becomes a reality.

MAKE IT STICK

8. Create a New Culture.

Hold on to the new ways of behaving, and make sure they succeed, until they become a part of the very culture of the group.

Source: *Our Iceberg is Melting* by Kotter & Rathgeber (2005)
Curriculum Week 10: Public Information

1. Watch public information videos
   a. Citation
   b. Citation

2. Group discussion
   a. What do you think is particularly effective about each of these?
   b. Why?
   c. In your site right now, do you see a need for any kind of public information campaign? What is the need?
   d. If you had the time and resources to do it, what do you think would be the best avenue? Brochures? Mini-lectures seminars? Commercials?

Curriculum Week 11: Social and Political Advocacy

1. Can you think of any recent examples of advocacy work that has seen results, either a bill was passed to create changes for counselors/people?
   a. Bill passed that requires most insurance to establish parity for mental health and SA services—they have to be paid at the same rate as other illnesses. This will likely have the result of making our services more accessible to clients
   b. TRICARE, the insurance for the military, has been told by a bill to establish regulations that would specify what credentials LPCs need to be able to practice independently and bill tricare.

2. Was there anything in this last election cycle that reminds you of this?
a. The ban on gay marriage in CA. Many people lobbied for and against it, and ultimately it passed.

3. At this level, no one is acting alone to create these levels of changes. As counselors and as people we have to band together to get our voices heard.

4. This is an important role of our professional associations. These associations serve as a gathering place of like-minded people who can get things done through working together.

5. Go through what is on the ACA website, whether students are a members or not, so that they can use the information to join into social and political advocacy.

Curriculum Week 12: Overcoming Resistance to Change

1. In work on the Advocacy Project, have you encountered any resistance?
   a. What type?
   b. How do you account for the presence of the resistance?
   c. How have you dealt with it?

2. Discussion of resistance
   a. Go over handout and discuss

Curriculum Week 12 Handout: Overcoming Resistance to Change: Top Ten Reasons for Change Resistance

1. THE RISK OF CHANGE IS SEEN AS GREATER THAN THE RISK OF STANDING STILL
   - Change requires a leap of faith and is about managing risk
   - The case you make for change must be truthful, stark reasons why the need for change is greater than the need for standing still
- **Solution:** Use research and numbers to make your case and get the attention of stakeholders

2. **PEOPLE FEEL CONNECTED TO OTHER PEOPLE WHO ARE IDENTIFIED WITH THE OLD WAY**

   - People feel loyal to those who taught and mentored them, change might feel like disrespect to those who came before

   - **Solution:** As you talk about the need for change, honor and respect the contributions of those who have come before

3. **PEOPLE HAVE NO ROLE MODELS FOR THE NEW ACTIVITY**

   - Many people need concrete demonstration of how the change will work instead of being able to conceptualize big ideas

   - **Solution:** Set up an effective and smaller scale pilot program of the changes you want to make, then bring your evidence back to stakeholders.

4. **PEOPLE FEAR THEY LACK THE COMPETENCE TO CHANGE**

   - Change usually requires new skills, or at least deployment of skills in a new way

   - Some might not think they have or can gain the new skills

   - **Solution:** include any new training programs, information events, be open and approachable to help people make the change

5. **PEOPLE FEEL OVERLOADED AND OVERWHELMED**
-If people have too much going on, they often don’t have the time or the energy to invest in change.

**Solution:** reemphasize the need for change with research and statistics, look for the right timing, provide lots of encouragement to individuals in the change process.

6. **PEOPLE HAVE A HEALTHY SKEPTICISM AND WANT TO BE SURE NEW**

- Few ideas come out in their final, best form the first time around.
- Your critics have important things to tell you about your ideas and can improve on your idea.

**Solution:** Listen to your skeptics because you might get ideas on how to improve your plan, even if their criticism is based on fear or anger.

7. **PEOPLE FEAR HIDDEN AGENDAS AMONG WOULD-BE REFORMERS**

- People might fear your underlying motives and agenda; are you trying to move up in rank, gain more power or prestige, etc.

**Solution:** Be as open with communication and information as possible, be transparent with the process, get information out there as soon as possible to reduce the gossip mill and speculation, have positive intentions.

8. **PEOPLE FEEL THE PROPOSED CHANGE THREATENS THEIR NOTIONS OF THEMSELVES**

- What people do is central to the concepts of who they are.
Their current way of doing things likely brings a sense of satisfaction and intrinsic reward and they fear that in change, they may lose what brought them to the line of work in the first place.

**Solution:** Help people see and understand that new rewards that will come from the change or how the underlying values and mission is still being carried out in the new change.

9. **PEOPLE ANTICIPATE A LOSS OF STATUS OR QUALITY OF LIFE**

Change does not always offer the same benefits and burdens to everyone and people may fear loss of their own status or privilege.

**Solution:** Again, make your case with research and numbers, try to show the need and the inevitability that change is needed given the changing landscape.

10. **PEOPLE GENUINELY BELIEVE THAT THE PROPOSED CHANGE IS A BAD IDEA**

Sometimes people just don’t disagree with you or feel that the plan is not well enough informed or developed.

**Solution:** Recognize that your idea can be improved by people who disagree, listen to them and figure out how to develop common ground with their position.

Source: A.J. Schuler, Psy.D.

http://www.schulersolutions.com/resistance_to_change.html
Curriculum Week 13: Final Reflection

1. I was going to do a last segment today on ethics as it relates to advocacy, but we decided you are all probably maxed in terms of absorbing new information. I will post an article on BB for you to read in your spare time.

2. This is our last week to talk about advocacy. Next semester, we will move into focusing more on your clinical work and traditional counseling skill development. Not that this is less important, but we have heard you that you feel you need more time to process issues from your sites.

3. This has been a new addition to this important clinical class and you guys have been the pioneers of this new era in this counseling program.

4. Now it is never easy to be the first group to do anything, and I want you to know how much Rip and I have valued the way you have embraced the projects and have engaged with the advocacy material.

5. In fact, this has been a bragging point for us. In talking to people about this new addition to the curriculum, we have shared with people how enthusiastic and engaged you have been, and about what great things you are out doing in the community.

6. We want to spend a little time today reflecting on the experience with you and hear your thoughts and feedback about the experience.

7. As you consider the whole experience with the advocacy project and curriculum, what has been helpful?

8. What hasn’t been helpful?

9. What do you think you will take with you from this experience?
10. How do you think you will use what you have learned as you move into your professional role?

11. What suggestions do you have about how we could improve this experience for next year’s students. Your feedback here will help us make this process better, so we really want to hear your thoughts.
ADVOCACY COMPETENCIES: Lewis, Arnold, House & Toporek

Endorsed by the ACA Governing Council March 20-22, 2003

Client/Student Empowerment

• An advocacy orientation involves not only systems change interventions but also the implementation of empowerment strategies in direct counseling.

• Advocacy-oriented counselors recognize the impact of social, political, economic, and cultural factors on human development.

• They also help their clients and students understand their own lives in context. This lays the groundwork for self-advocacy.

Empowerment Counselor Competencies

In direct interventions, the counselor is able to:

1. Identify strengths and resources of clients and students.

2. Identify the social, political, economic, and cultural factors that affect the client/student.
3. Recognize the signs indicating that an individual's behaviors and concerns reflect responses to systemic or internalized oppression.

4. At an appropriate development level, help the individual identify the external barriers that affect his or her development.

5. Train students and clients in self-advocacy skills.

6. Help students and clients develop self-advocacy action plans.

7. Assist students and clients in carrying out action plans.

**Client/Student Advocacy**

- When counselors become aware of external factors that act as barriers to an individual's development, they may choose to respond through advocacy.

- The client/student advocate role is especially significant when individuals or vulnerable groups lack access to needed services.

**Client/Student Advocacy Counselor Competencies**

In environmental interventions on behalf of clients and students, the counselor is able to:

8. Negotiate relevant services and education systems on behalf of clients and students.

9. Help clients and students gain access to needed resources.

10. Identify barriers to the well-being of individuals and vulnerable groups.

11. Develop an initial plan of action for confronting these barriers.

12. Identify potential allies for confronting the barriers.

13. Carry out the plan of action.

**Community Collaboration**

- Their ongoing work with people gives counselors a unique awareness of recurring themes. Counselors are often among the first to become aware of specific difficulties in the environment.

- Advocacy-oriented counselors often choose to respond to such challenges by alerting existing organizations that are already working for change and that might have an interest in the issue at hand.
In these situations, the counselor’s primary role is as an ally. Counselors can also be helpful to organizations by making available to them our particular skills: interpersonal relations, communications, training, and research.

**Community Collaboration Counselor Competencies**

14. Identify environmental factors that impinge upon students’ and clients’ development.

15. Alert community or school groups with common concerns related to the issue.

16. Develop alliances with groups working for change.

17. Use effective listening skills to gain understanding of the group’s goals.

18. Identify the strengths and resources that the group members bring to the process of systemic change.

19. Communicate recognition of and respect for these strengths and resources.

20. Identify and offer the skills that the counselor can bring to the collaboration.

21. Assess the effect of counselor’s interaction with the community.

**Systems Advocacy**

- When counselors identify systemic factors that act as barriers to their students’ or clients’ development, they often wish that they could change the environment and prevent some of the problems that they see every day.

- Regardless of the specific target of change, the processes for altering the status quo have common qualities. Change is a process that requires vision, persistence, leadership, collaboration, systems analysis, and strong data. In many situations, a counselor is the right person to take leadership.

**Systems Advocacy Counselor Competencies**

In exerting systems-change leadership at the school or community level, the advocacy-oriented counselor is able to:

22. Identify environmental factors impinging on students’ or clients’ development

23. Provide and interpret data to show the urgency for change.

24. In collaboration with other stakeholders, develop a vision to guide change.
25. Analyze the sources of political power and social influence within the system.


27. Develop a plan for dealing with probable responses to change.

28. Recognize and deal with resistance.

29. Assess the effect of counselor’s advocacy efforts on the system and constituents.

**Public Information**

- Across settings, specialties, and theoretical perspectives, professional counselors share knowledge of human development and expertise in communication.

- These qualities make it possible for advocacy-oriented counselors to awaken the general public to macro-systemic issues regarding human dignity

**Public Information Counselor Competencies**

In informing the public about the role of environmental factors in human development, the advocacy oriented counselor is able to:

30. Recognize the impact of oppression and other barriers to healthy development.

31. Identify environmental factors that are protective of healthy development.

32. Prepare written and multi-media materials that provide clear explanations of the role of specific environmental factors in human development.

33. Communicate information in ways that are ethical and appropriate for the target population.

34. Disseminate information through a variety of media.

35. Identify and collaborate with other professionals who are involved in disseminating public information.

36. Assess the influence of public information efforts undertaken by the counselor.

**Social/Political Advocacy**

- Counselors regularly act as change agents in the systems that affect their own students and clients most directly. This experience often leads toward the recognition that some of the concerns they have addressed affected people in a much larger arena.
• When this happens, counselors use their skills to carry out social/political advocacy.

Social/Political Advocacy Counselor Competencies

In influencing public policy in a large, public arena, the advocacy-oriented counselor is able to:

37. Distinguish those problems that can best be resolved through social/political action.

38. Identify the appropriate mechanisms and avenues for addressing these problems.

39. Seek out and join with potential allies.

40. Support existing alliances for change.

41. With allies, prepare convincing data and rationales for change.

42. With allies, lobby legislators and other policy makers.

43. Maintain open dialogue with communities and clients to ensure that the social/political advocacy is consistent with the initial goals.
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