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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In 2009, seven English Language Learners described their school counselors as never there (Vela-Gude et al., 2009). These students reported that they received insufficient advisement and college preparation information. The participants explained that their counselors were unavailable to discuss personal concerns and maintained low expectations of them (Vela-Gude et al, 2009). Similar sentiments were echoed in an essay written to the Obama administration by Suárez-Orozco and Suarez-Orozco (2009). The scholars argued that school counselors were overburdened and maintained low expectations of English Language Learners (Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2009). The authors recommended that the administration bypass school counselors and use media outlets, churches and trusted community organizations to provide college access information to these students (Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2009). This literature provides a grim view of school counselors and their work with English Language Learners. In recent years however a new vision of the school counseling profession has emerged.

Two national initiatives, the Transforming School Counseling Initiative (TSCI) and the development of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) National Model extended school counselors traditional focus on individual counseling and coordination to include roles or activities associated with educational leadership, teaming and collaboration, advocacy, and assessment (Paisley & Hayes, 2002). Today’s professional school counselors are expected to be instruments of change in schools, and to advocate in individual, school, community, and public
arenas (Paisley & Hayes, 2002). As schools become increasingly diverse, this advocacy requires counselors to be intentional in assuring that they equitably serve all students (Portman, 2009). In order to meet the challenges of these new vision responsibilities, school counselors are summoned to be social justice advocates who are culturally competent (Portman, 2009).

English Language Learners can benefit from school counselors committed to this new, advocacy oriented vision (Portman, 2009; NCTSCI, 2011). Some counselors however do not believe they are equipped to effectively work with English Language Learners (Clemente & Collison, 2000; Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004). Counselors also express the need for additional training to assist in their work with these students (Clemente & Collison, 2000; Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004). This study examines school counselor self-efficacy and training needs with English Language Learners.

**Statement of the Problem**

School counselors are in prime positions to advocate for all students. Their role allows them to assess student needs and identify barriers that inhibit learning and limit academic success. School counselors develop and implement individual, school and community programs that facilitate personal and social growth and foster academic achievement for all students. (National Center for Transforming School Counseling, 2011).

English Language Learners can benefit from today’s advocacy-oriented school counselors. English Language Learners represent the fastest-growing segment of the school age population in the U.S. (Capps et al., 2005; Kindler, 2002; National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition [NCELA], 2011), with their enrollments increasing over the last 20 years. This growth has occurred throughout the U.S., and even states that have not traditionally had large numbers of English Language Learners have experienced an influx of students (NCELA,
Numerous English Language Learners cope with stressors related to English language proficiency, immigration status and differing cultural expectations. Consequently, many English Language Learners are not achieving at the same rates as their native English-speaking counterparts (Gándara & Hopkins, 2010).

McCall-Perez (2000) described school counselors as essential in the success of English Language Learners. Villalba, Akos, Keter and Ames (2007) also described the impact school counselors can have in addressing the academic, personal/social and career needs of English Language Learners. However, some school counselors have reported that they feel ill equipped to meet the needs of English Language Learners (Clemente & Collison, 2000; Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004). School counselors in several studies have reported ineffectual interactions with linguistically diverse students, frustration with language differences and concerns about the appropriate use of translators. Some school counselors have requested additional training to increase their knowledge of the cultural backgrounds of English Language Learners (Clemente & Collison, 2000; Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004).

While the accounts of these counselors are telling and valid, it is difficult to generalize these concerns to the larger school counselor population because they come from a small number of school counselors in a small number of research studies. As more and more school counselors work with and on behalf of English Language Learners, particularly in states with newer, rapidly growing multilingual populations, it is important that scholars understand how school counselors differ in their beliefs and concerns about their work with English Language Learners.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to describe school counselors’ beliefs about their ability to work effectively with English Language Learners. This study aims to identify how factors such
as school level, U.S. region, the size of the English Language Learner population and prior training with English Language Learners impact counselors’ beliefs about their ability to work effectively with this population. The study further aims to identify school counselor training needs with respect to English Language Learners.

**Research Questions**

The questions guiding this study are:

RQ1. How confident are school counselors in their ability to work effectively with English Language Learners?

RQ2: What differences in self-efficacy do school counselors possess when considering the counselor’s school level, race, U.S. region, size of English Language Learner population, language and prior training with English Language Learners?

RQ3: What English Language Learner training opportunities are school counselors most interested in accessing?

**Theoretical Framework**

This study will use the concept of self-efficacy to examine school counselors’ perceived capabilities to perform tasks specific to English Language Learners. Bandura (1994) defined self-efficacy as “beliefs about one’s own ability to perform a given behavior.” Bandura further explained that self-efficacy requires both the possession of skills and a belief in one’s ability to use those skills effectively. Four factors influence an individual’s self-efficacy: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion and emotional states.

Mastery experiences occur when individuals engage in an activity and succeed despite challenging circumstances (Bandura, 1994). Vicarious experiences take place when individuals find others similar to themselves who have been successful. These encounters increase
observers’ beliefs that they can also succeed in similar pursuits (Bandura, 1994). When social persuasion occurs, people are verbally persuaded that they are capable of acquiring success in a particular area. Finally, a positive or negative emotional state can influence an individual’s feelings about their ability to succeed at a task (Bandura, 1994).

Several scholars have explored school counselor self-efficacy and its influence on school counselors thoughts, feelings, motivations and actions (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). Bandura (1986) argued that self-efficacy is domain, task and situation specific. Moreover, if school counselors do not believe they are capable of performing tasks related to English Language Learners, they may avoid or downplay the importance of such tasks (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008). Paredes (2011) developed an instrument to explore school counselors’ self-efficacy with English Language Learners. This instrument will be used in this study to measure school counselor self-efficacy with English Language Learners in areas such as assessment, the counseling process, school atmosphere self-awareness and sensitivity to language.

**Significance of the Study**

This study will contribute to the school counseling literature in a variety of ways. Albers, Hoffman and Lundahl (2009) drew attention to the limited coverage English Language Learners have received in the academic literature. The authors noted that only three percent of the school counseling literature addressed English Language Learner issues primarily, secondarily or indirectly (Albers, Hoffman & Lundahl, 2009). The current study adds to the literature that directly investigates the needs of school counseling practitioners serving English Language Learners.

Several studies have examined English Language Learners’ perceptions of school counselors and their school experiences (Calaff, 2008; Clemente & Collison, 2000; Vela-Gude et
This literature is telling, but provides limited information about school counselors’ points of view. Additional reports have explored school counselors’ needs and perceptions of English Language Learners (Clemente & Collison, 2000; Santamaría, 2009; Schwallie-Gills et al., 2004). These studies have provided rich data from a small number of school counselors about their needs for their work with English Language Learners. Other literature has examined the needs or experiences of larger numbers of school counselors, but these studies solicited participants from a single U.S. region (Cook, 2010; Paredes, 2011).

Albers, Hoffman and Lundahl (2009) recommended that scholars examine the training and professional development needs of school counselors and other student support personnel related to English Language Learners. This study will detail the concerns and experiences of school counseling practitioners throughout the United States, and examine the impact of English Language Learner training on school counselor self-efficacy with English Language Learners.

**Definition of Terms**

This section provides definitions of several key terms used in this study.

*School counselors* are individuals who have obtained a school counseling certification in their state and are currently practicing in elementary, middle or high schools.

*English Language Learners* are defined as students meeting the English Language Learner qualification criteria identified by their particular school district.

*Self-efficacy* in this study refers to school counselors’ beliefs about their ability to perform school counseling-related activities with English Language Learners.

*Personal training* is characterized as professional development sought out by practicing school counselors.
School district training is defined as professional development provided to school counselors by their school districts.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to introduce the study and lay the groundwork for the chapters that follow. This chapter introduced the challenges school counselors perceive in their work with English Language Learners, and the concerns of counselors that they are not equipped to work effectively with this student population. The chapter identified the dearth of literature addressing school counselors and their work with English Language Learners. It also detailed concerns about the limited number of school counselors in existing studies. The study’s purpose, guiding research questions and theoretical framework were presented, and key terms were defined to provide clarity for the sections that follow.
CHAPTER 2
SELECTED REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter provides a selected review of the literature investigating school counselors’ preparation to support improved educational experiences and outcomes for English Language Learners. Specifically, this chapter reviews the literature related to: (a) the evolution of professional school counselor roles in educational reform related to advocacy and multicultural competence; (b) the defining characteristics and current status of English Language Learners; (c) programs supporting English Language Learners; (d) school counselor training for and experience working with English Language Learners; (e) school counselor self-efficacy related to working with English Language Learners. This selected review of the literature provides the foundation for the current study.

Evolution of the Professional School Counselor Role in Educational Reform

The role of the school counselor has evolved throughout the history of the professional specialty (Paisley & Borders, 1995; Paisley & McMahon, 2001). Originating in the social reform movement that followed the Industrial Revolution, and influenced by the priorities of the larger counseling profession, school counseling has varied in focus over time from career development to personal mental health to academic access (Paisley & Hayes, 2002).

Most recently, the role of the school counselor has been shaped by two national initiatives: the Transforming School Counseling Initiative (2003) and the development of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) National Model (2002). These initiatives,
grounded in principles of social justice, identified the unique characteristics of counseling in an educational setting and connected school counseling program development to the broader purposes of schooling (Paisley & Hayes, 2002). As a result, a new vision of school counselors emerged, one in which school counselors were asked to extend their traditional focus on counseling and coordination to include roles or activities associated with educational leadership, collaboration, advocacy and assessment. School counselors were encouraged to become educational leaders who advocated for the academic success, career development, and personal/social well-being of all students, particularly those historically marginalized in educational settings.

Today’s professional school counselors are expected to be instruments of change in schools and to advocate at multiple levels (e.g., individual, school, community and public arenas). As schools become increasingly diverse, this advocacy requires counselors to be intentional in assuring that they equitably serve all students (Portman, 2009). To meet the challenges of these new responsibilities, school counselors are summoned to be social justice advocates with a high level of cultural competence.

To some degree, advocacy has always been part of counselors’ day-to-day lives. In the second half of the twentieth century, when marginalized groups gained access to public education, unsung heroes within the counseling profession advocated daily to ensure equitable outcomes for poor and minority students (Toporek, Lewis & Crethar, 2009). This advocacy took many forms. Counselors provided services to immigrant youth, discussed urban educational concerns with media and civic leaders, wrote books and articles detailing the challenges facing diverse populations and targeted policy makers whose decisions impacted their students and clients (Kiselica & Robinson, 2001). Despite numerous individual examples of advocacy,
however, only in recent years has such advocacy-oriented work been viewed as the core of counselors’ professional identity (Toporek, Lewis & Crethar, 2009). As the twenty-first century approached, scholars argued that counselors needed to do more than understand the needs of diverse populations; they needed to become agents of change within the systems that oppressed them.

Kiselica and Robinson (2001) encouraged counselors get out of their offices and work with and on behalf of clients to challenge the barriers that impeded personal development. In 2003, Vera and Speight made the case for an expanded definition of multicultural competence. Believing that diverse clients were impacted by systems of oppression, the authors contended that dismantling those systems would produce real change. In 2008, Crethar and Ratts argued that cultural competence and social justice were two sides of the same coin. They explained, “Culturally competent counselors have the awareness, knowledge and skills with which they empower and advocate . . . Culturally competent counselors approach clients as cultural beings who exist within systems and context” (Crethar & Ratts, 2008, p. 1).

Today, many students still face challenges in their communities and school systems. Members of marginalized groups often have lower achievement test performance, high school completion and college graduation rates than their white or more affluent counterparts (Kucsera & Flaxman, 2012; Siegel-Hawley & Frankenberg, 2012). Based on group membership, students may also experience inequitable learning environments and may not receive the academic support required to help them achieve at the same rates as their peers. The new vision of school counseling requires counselors to advocate with and on behalf of students who have not had equitable learning environments or achieved equitable outcomes in schools (Toporek, Lewis & Crethar, 2009). Professional school counselors are able to bring about change in a number of
ways: (a) at the individual level, counselors can engage in student empowerment and student advocacy; (b) at the school level, counselors can bring about change via community collaboration and systems advocacy; and (c) in the public arena, counselors can inform a broader population through public information and social/political advocacy.

At each of these levels, school counselors are in prime positions to advocate for students. School counselors can assess student needs and identify differences in student backgrounds. They can assess barriers that inhibit learning and hinder academic success, and set high aspirations for all students. Counselors can also serve as liaisons between students and staff and coordinate school and community resources for students, families and staff to improve academic achievement. School counselors can encourage school officials to view data through an equity lens (National Center for Transforming School Counseling, 2011). “The vision of today’s school counselor is as a school leader who advocates for the academic, career, social, and personal success of every student. In so doing, the new-vision school counselor demonstrates a fundamental belief in the capacity of all students to achieve at high levels on rigorous and challenging academic course content when provided with the necessary encouragement and supports to ensure their success” (Paisley & Hayes, 2002, p. 4).

English Language Learners represent one such marginalized group of students who could benefit from today’s advocacy-oriented school counselor. This advocacy will require that school counselors receive specialized pre-service and in-service preparation, to become knowledgeable about the issues and contexts associated with this population as well as the current programs impacting their educational experiences. Turning this knowledge into action will require counselor commitment and confidence in their ability to make a difference for this particular group of students.
English Language Learners

English Language Learners represent the fastest growing segment of the school age population in the U.S. (Capps et al., 2005; Gandara & Hopkins, 2010; Kindler, 2002). The U.S. Department of Education (2012) reported that during the 2007-2008 school year approximately 49.9 million students were enrolled in grades pre-K through 12. Of those students, 5.3 million were English Language Learners. The percentage of English Language Learners in schools varies from state to state. Traditionally California, Florida, Texas, New York, Illinois and Arizona have been among the states with the largest English Language Learner populations; however, in recent years English Language Learners have been increasingly present in all U.S. states (National Council of Teachers of English, 2008; Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco & Todorova, 2008). In the last decade, states with traditionally small English Language Learner populations in the Southeast, Midwest and Interior West have experienced the greatest growth. South Carolina, for example, experienced an 800 percent increase in English Language Learners from 1998 to 2008 (Capps et al., 2005; Migration Policy Institute, 2010a).

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Title III of No Child Left Behind) coined the term “Limited English Proficient” to describe English Language Learners. Currently the U.S. Department of Education defines a Limited English Proficient as an individual:

(A) who is aged 3 through 21;
(B) who is enrolled or preparing to enroll in an elementary school or secondary school;
(C) who was not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English…
(D) whose difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language may be sufficient to deny the individual… the ability to successfully achieve in classrooms where the language of instruction is English… (U.S. Department of Education, 2012)

While the federal government uses the term “Limited English Proficient,” some argue that this label implies deficiency in non-native English speakers. The National Council of Teachers of English (2008) defined English Language Learners as “active learners of the English Language who may benefit from various types of language support programs” (NCTE, 2008, p. 2). The term *English Language Learner* has increasingly been adopted because it highlights learning.

**Factors That Impact English Language Learners’ School Experiences**

English Language Learners are a heterogeneous and complex group of students. Ninety percent of these students are Spanish speaking (Migration Policy Institute, 2010c). The other 10 percent speak approximately 400 different languages (Crouch, 2012; Migration Policy Institute, 2010c). English Language Learners’ experiences in school are influenced by a number of factors including U.S. region, size of English Language Learner population, socioeconomic status, immigration status, family expectations, English language proficiency, and cultural differences (Ballantyne, Sanderman & McLaughlin, 2008; Callahan, Wilkinson & Muller, 2008; Gándara & Hopkins, 2010; Migration Policy Institute, 2010a; National Council of Teachers of English, 2008; Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco & Todorova, 2008).

**U.S. region.** In the last decade, states that have not traditionally had large English Language Learner populations have seen increases in rates of immigrants. In recent years there has been a shift in the communities to which new immigrants have migrated (Suárez-Orozco,
Suárez-Orozco & Todorova, 2008), with resulting changes in the number of English Language Learners in states across the U.S. The U.S. Department of Education reported a 63.54% increase in the number of English Language Learners during the 15 year period from 1994 to 2010 (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2011). These changes varied from state to state. States such as California, Florida, New York and Texas maintained large English Language Learner populations (NCELA, 2011). While other states did not have the same number of these students, many of them experienced significant increases in the number of English Language Learners enrolled in their schools over the last decade.

The most rapid growth of English learners has occurred in Southern states. For example, North Carolina and South Carolina each saw increases of over 200 percent in English Language Learner populations from 1999-2000 to 2009-2010 (NCELA, 2011). In Georgia, Alabama, Arkansas and Tennessee, poultry processing, furniture and carpet manufacturing, housing construction and service-sector jobs have drawn immigrant families to these states for work opportunities (Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco & Todorova, 2008).

The Migration Policy Institute, which identifies these trends, refers to such states as “new-destination states” (Migration Policy Institute, 2010a). These states saw foreign-born population rates grow at twice or more the national rate from 2000 to 2009. Seven of these new-destination states were in the South, including South Carolina, Alabama, Tennessee, Arkansas, Georgia, North Carolina and Mississippi (Migration Policy Institute, 2010a, 2010b). Each of these states had increases of 50 percent or more. In contrast, states such as New York and Texas saw decreases in the number of English Language Learners enrolled in their schools. The size of the English Language Learner population may significantly impact students’ experiences in school.
The U.S. region English Language Learners live in, may impact the type of school experiences they have. Twenty-six states and the District of Columbia are members of the World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) consortium (WIDA, 2012). These states use guidelines from the World-class Instructional Design and Assessment in their screening and assessment of English Language Learners. Consortium members also incorporate WIDA based standards in their curriculum and encourage the use of tools such as CAN DO descriptors to help differentiate instruction (WIDA, 2012). States such as California, Florida and Texas, with historically large English Language Learner populations, are not part of the consortium and develop, implement, instruct and assess students in their own way. Some states incorporate policies such as California’s Proposition 227 or Arizona’s Proposition 203 that restrict the use of a student’s native language in instruction (Gándara & Hopkins, 2010). Varying policies and politics within a state or region can impact the schooling experiences of English Language Learners. The number of English Language Learners attending a school can also influence schooling.

**Size of English Language Learner population.** The majority of English Language Learners are Latino (Migration Policy Institute, 2010a). In 2009 approximately 75 percent of Latino students attended schools with 50 to 100 percent minority populations. Approximately 40 percent of Latino students attended schools with 90 to 100 percent minority student populations. In many cases these students were also English Language Learners (Migration Policy Institute, 2010a).

Callahan, Wilkinson Muller and Frisco (2009) argued that schools with large immigrant or English Language Learner populations tend to evolve to meet the needs of their students. The researchers found that in low immigrant-concentration English Language Learner schools,
immigrant students placed in English as a Second Language (ESL) courses performed at significantly lower levels than their mainstream peers. The authors also determined that second-generation students benefitted the most from ESL courses when they attended schools with many immigrant students. Callahan, Wilkinson, Muller and Frisco (2009) suggested that this might be due to students’ experiences with co-ethnic peers and access to recent immigrant information networks. The authors also suggested that in schools with large ESL populations, placement in ESL courses may ensure access to instruction by qualified educators. Students in these schools may also be placed in positions of respect and authority in classrooms and in the academic mainstream.

Some scholars, however, argue that this intense school segregation can be detrimental for minority students (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Hawley & Frankenberg, 2012). Darling-Hammond (2010) observed that school resources are frequently linked to predominately white or wealthy students, leaving minority students without the same access to resources and opportunities as their white peers (Darling-Hammond, 2010). Issues of socioeconomic status can thus significantly influence English Language Learners’ experiences in schools.

**Socioeconomic status.** The majority of English Language Learners live in poverty (Capps et al., 2005; Siegel-Hawley & Frankenberg, 2012). In 2000, 68 percent of English Language Learners at the elementary level and 60 percent of ELL students at the middle and secondary school levels came from families with low incomes. Students with fewer economic resources may be less prepared for school. They may not participate in early childhood education programs, leaving them without school experiences during fundamental, early developmental periods (Ballantyne, Sanderman & McLoughlin, 2008).
Kucsera and Flaxman (2012) found that the typical Latino student attended a school in which two out of three students in the school population were poor. The authors argued that schools with a large percentage of students in poverty may lack educational opportunities and the morale found in other school settings (Kucsera & Flaxman, 2012). Behnke, Gonzalez and Cox (2010) also explained that socioeconomic status may lead to school dropout. Some English Language Learners leave school in order to obtain work and support their families (Behnke, Gonzalez & Cox, 2010). Socioeconomic status can also impact the psychosocial needs of English Language Learners, as families with low incomes are more likely to lack adequate food, health care and housing (Dotson-Blake, Foster & Gressard, 2009). Children who live in poverty may also encounter more violence and substance abuse in their homes and communities. Each of these factors may hinder academic success.

**Immigration status.** The U.S. is an immigrant nation and the majority of individuals who live in the U.S. are descendents of men and women from other parts of the world (Gándara & Hopkins, 2010). Yet contrary to popular stereotypes, over half of the English Language Learners enrolled in public schools were born and raised in the U.S., and many have U.S. born parents (Capps, 2005). Others were born into mixed-status families with undocumented family members (Capps, 2005; Gándara & Hopkins, 2010). If families enter the U.S. without documentation, they face the constant threat of deportation. Thus immigration status can cause a great deal of emotional stress for some English Language Learners (Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco & Todorova, 2008).

Undocumented students or students with undocumented family members often have anxiety about the future (National Women’s Law Center & Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, 2009). Students may experience sadness, depression or anxiety related to family
separation (Dotson-Blake, Foster & Gressard, 2009; Behnke, Gonzalez & Cox, 2010). These feelings may be amplified by long separation and the potential for additional separation may loom and cause additional worry. Immigration status may also hinder access to higher education (National Women’s Law Center & Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, 2009). Undocumented students do not qualify for federal financial aid and cannot legally be hired upon graduation (National Women’s Law Center & Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, 2009). This may lead to feelings of defeat and hopelessness.

**Family expectations.** The families of English Language Learners have high expectations for their children. However, parents and other family members may not engage in school activities due to limited familiarity with school systems, limited formal education and feeling unwelcome in schools (National Women’s Law Center & Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, 2009). Parents may lack the cultural capital (knowledge of how the system works) or social capital (access to important networks) needed to navigate the U.S. school system (National Women’s Law Center & Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, 2009). Despite these challenges, English Language Learners identified parents and parental involvement as vital to their academic success (Behnke, Gonzalez & Cox, 2010).

Language barriers may also make it difficult to offer academic encouragement or assistance with homework. Spalding, Carolino and Amen (2004) found that parents cited language as the biggest barrier to their participation in schools. The authors made several recommendations for supporting the parents of English Language Learners (Spalding, Carolino & Amen, 2004). Schools can improve English Language Learners’ chances of success by providing parents with an orientation to U.S. academic opportunities, communicating with parents in their native language, encouraging continued use of the native language at home and
meeting parents’ schedules for school-based activities. Schools should also send communications home in the native language and use qualified translators, bilingual home-school liaisons or multilingual hotlines to help them communicate with parents.

**School level.** English Language Learners benefit from quality education at all school levels. Factors such as student age, development and school expectations can impact English Language Learners’ experiences in school at varying school levels. In recommendations made to the Obama administration in 2009, Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco noted that English Language Learners often do not have access to first-rate education. The authors stressed that English proficiency is the key to student growth at all levels of education. English Language Learners also benefit from high quality preschool programs (Crouch, 2012). Unfortunately, students with fewer economic resources may not participate in early childhood education programs, leaving them without school experiences during fundamental early developmental periods (Ballantyne, Sanderman & McLoughlin, 2008; National Women’s Law Center & Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, 2009).

Spalding, Carolino and Amen (2004) noted that school completion is difficult for newly arrived, under-schooled English Language Learners, particularly in middle and high school. The authors argued that interventions such as flexible scheduling to correspond with student work schedules, teacher collaboration across departments and educator training in the immigrant student experience could each contribute to better outcomes for English Language Learners (Spalding, Carolino & Amen, 2004). English Language Learners also benefit from college information while in high school. In their 2009 recommendations to the Obama administration, Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco observed that English Language Learners still need more information from school counselors and other educators regarding access to college.
**English language proficiency.** Wong Fillmore and Snow (2000) argued that English Language Learners face two challenges: they must learn English as a second language and deal with school successfully, and they must hold on to their first language as they learn English. Accomplishing both tasks can be difficult.

Williams and Butler (2003) found that linguistically diverse students were concerned about academic success, and they realized that this success hinged on their ability to learn the English language. Students believed their English skills would help them better understand course material and influence their ability to excel academically. English Language Learners in North Carolina cited struggles with written and academic English in school work and homework as one reason for dropout (Behnke, Gonzalez & Cox, 2010). In 2010, English Language Learners identified rigorous English as a Second language courses as a preventive factor to youth dropout (Behnke, Gonzalez & Cox, 2010). Wong Fillmore and Snow (2000) explained that English provided students with access to American society.

Students enter U.S. schools with two tasks at hand: to learn English and to learn English subject matter (Nieto, 2002). Cummins (1984) developed a conceptualization of English Language acquisition. The author argued that English Language Learners acquire Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) after one to two years of English exposure (Cummins, 1984). Students are able to engage in “playground talk” at this level. Students understand the second language, particularly in interpersonal communication, due to use of gestures and contextual cues. After five to seven years of English learning, students acquire Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), which enables them to understand de-contextualized language (Cummins, 1984). To thrive academically, students must acquire CALP so they can read, write about, discuss and comprehend diverse types of literature.
Callahan (2005) identified three types of English Language Learners. *Long-term English learners* typically attain oral proficiency but have poor reading and writing skills. They also have limited control of academic English. *Recent immigrants with high levels of previous schooling* have typically mastered grade-level academic content (Callahan, 2005). These students need additional instruction in English literacy skills. *Recent immigrants with low levels of previous schooling* need literacy skill development and content area instruction in order to successfully learn school curricula (Callahan, 2005).

Learning English is more difficult for students who live in linguistically isolated households. In these homes, individuals who are 14 years of age or older speak English at early emerging levels (Crouch, 2012). Mastering academic English is crucial to English Language Learner academic achievement (Ballyntyne et al., 2005). As students acquire English, however, they may lose some or all of their native tongue. This loss of language makes it difficult for parents and children to share their experiences, thoughts and feelings (Rodriguez, 1982). This may also produce divisive feelings within families, in which the target language becomes a wedge between parents and children. Wong Fillmore and Snow (2001) explained that the curriculum of the home is taught by word and example. English Language Learners may adopt the new language and culture while parents continue using their native language and observe the traditions of their country of origin. Children may thereby lose knowledge of who they are and where they come from, knowledge traditionally passed from generation to generation through the spoken and written word.

Wong Fillmore (1991) explained that “when parents are unable to talk to their children, they cannot easily convey to them their values, beliefs, understanding or wisdom about how to cope with their experiences” (p. 343). Educators should learn about the sociocultural, academic
and cognitive benefits of native language maintenance (Nieto, 2002). Children often choose to let go of their native tongue in order to acquire the societal language, a decision their monolingual peers do not have to make. Students may use English exclusively at home English Language Learners must also adjust to cultural differences in schools (Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco & Todorova, 2008).

**Cultural differences.** When individuals leave a familiar community and culture they must make a number of emotional and cognitive adjustments. James (1997) explained that these adjustments place some English Language Learners at increased risk for psychosocial problems. English Language Learners who immigrate to the U.S. often leave behind a familiar language, culture, community and social system (Goh, Wahl, McDonald, Brissett & Yoon, 2007; James, 1997; National Women’s Law Center & Mexican American Legal Defense Fund, 2009). In leaving their home countries, families may suffer trauma from the loss of a home, the harsh conditions of travel or the possibility of losing relatives, suffering that can result in Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (Williams & Butler, 2003). Yet despite these challenges, when linguistically diverse students enter U.S. schools they are expected to acculturate (Dotson-Blake, Foster & Gressard, 2009; James, 1997; Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco & Todorova, 2008).

Culture clashes can impact student learning experiences. U.S. school culture may be very different from English Language Learners’ prior learning environments. Initially students may feel stigmatized by other pupils due to differences in language and dress, as well as by cultural misunderstandings and prejudice (Chamberlain, 2005). As a result, English Language Learners may try to fit in by disregarding familial cultural norms.

Clemente and Collison (2000) found that in focus groups, 24 European American students shared that they did not interact with English Language Learners because they viewed
them as hostile. Similarly, 24 English Language Learners reported feeling misunderstood by their European American peers (Clemente & Collison, 2004). In a survey of 524 English Language Learners in North Carolina, participants reported experiencing discrimination from their peers (Behnke, Gonzalez & Cox, 2010). These student perspectives demonstrate the cultural misunderstandings that may occur in school settings.

English Language Learners new to U.S. schools must also adjust to unfamiliar experiences in the classroom. Teacher communication and behavioral expectations may conflict with student expectations (Chamberlain, 2005). U.S. teachers, for example, might expect direct and explicit communication with students. An English Language Learner from another culture, however, may believe it is disrespectful to directly address an authority figure, and find the request to do so uncomfortable. Without an awareness of such contradictory cultural expectations, educators may develop low expectations for English Language Learners (Calaff, 2008; Chamberlain, 2005; Ochoa & Rhodes, 2005).

Teaching methods also vary from country to country. U.S. schools rely heavily on multiple choice tests and student interaction in the classroom, which may be very different from more lecture-based methods in other countries that place teachers in an expert role (Williams & Butler, 2003; Chamberlain, 2005). English Language Learners might also have to adapt to changing classes, earning academic credits, having several teachers throughout the day and attending school for a different number of hours. Each of these adjustments can pose distinct challenges for students (Chamberlain, 2005; Ochoa & Rhodes, 2005).
Academic Programs for English Language Learners

Many English Language Learners are served academically in schools. Due to the heterogeneity of the population, English language programs are diverse and vary throughout the United States. After conducting a five-year longitudinal study, Thomas and Collier (2002) described the differences among English Language Learner programs. Ochoa and Rhodes (2005) also defined the various programs available to English Language Learners.

English focused programs. Several English Language programs focus primarily on the acquisition of English for English Language Learners. English-only programs conduct all instruction in English. In these programs English Language Learners attend general education courses with English-speaking students. Some parents and school personnel believe that students will acquire the English language more quickly if they are immersed in general education courses with their English-speaking peers (Chamberlain, 2005; Ochoa & Rhodes, 2005).

Some school systems offer structured immersion programs. In these programs there is no use of native language, but students receive specialized English as a Second Language instruction (Ochoa & Rhodes, 2005; Thomas & Collier, 2002). In structured immersion programs, students are pulled out of courses with the general student population during a portion of the day for more focused English language development. Some structured immersion programs are content based. In these programs, instruction is structured around academic content rather than just English language skills.

The amount of time English Language Learners spend in structured immersion courses fluctuates. Students may participate for 30 minutes a week or see an ESL instructor daily. Some
schools house stand-alone programs in which English Language Learners receive ESL instruction throughout the day. ESL offerings vary depending on the English Language Learner population and school district resources (Ochoa & Rhodes, 2005).

Ovando, Combs and Collier (2006) explained that other schools offer partial immersion programs. This curriculum provides ESL instruction while also supplying a small amount of native language support (approximately an hour each day) for a temporary period of time. The goal of partial immersion programs, however, is still to move students to English instruction as quickly as possible (Ovando, Combs & Collier, 2006).

**Bilingual programs.** Some school systems house bilingual education programs. These programs are based on the concept that educational equity is achieved by providing instruction in a student’s native language and in English. There are three main types of bilingual programs: transitional, maintenance and two-way bilingual.

Transitional bilingual education curricula provide instruction in both English and students’ native tongue, but only for a short period of time. Typically this instruction occurs for two to three years at the elementary school level. As students proceed through the program, the amount of English instruction increases and the native language instruction decreases (Ochoa & Rhodes, 2005; Thomas & Collier, 2002).

Maintenance bilingual programs utilize English and the native language for five to six years. When students enter kindergarten, 80 to 90 percent of instruction is received in their native tongue (Thomas & Collier, 2002). As students proceed through elementary school, the amount of English instruction they receive increases. Proponents of this program argue that
allowing students to learn English while maintaining their first language promotes educational equity (Ochoa & Rhodes, 2005). Students are more likely to maintain their native tongue, and continue communication with family members.

English Language Learners may also be served via two-way bilingual programs. These programs are similar to maintenance programs; however, classes are comprised of both English Language Learners and native English speakers. English Language Learners acquire English and native English speakers acquire new languages. These programs are thought to promote educational equity because multilingualism is viewed favorably (Ochoa & Rhodes, 2005). The parents of English Language Learners appreciate the valuing of their native language and culture. They also like that their children are not segregated from their English-speaking peers. English language parents also see the benefit of their children learning a second language (Ochoa & Rhodes, 2005; Thomas & Collier, 2002).

**Program outcomes.** Scholars have noted that while diverse English language programs are offered, they do not always produce equitable outcomes (Thomas & Collier, 2002). After collaboratively collecting qualitative and quantitative data from English language programs in five regionally diverse U.S. school districts, Thomas and Collier (2002) found that maintenance and two-way programs produced more effective results than traditional immersion programs. Students in maintenance and two-way programs were able to meet or even surpass the achievement levels of their monolingual peers. It is important to note that while these programs are viewed as the most effective, there is very emotionally charged debate around bilingual education (Ochoa & Rhodes, 2005).

The parents of English Language Learners may have mixed views about their native languages due to the stigma that surrounds them. They may want their children to learn English
as quickly as possible and view English-focused immersion programs as the quickest way to that goal. Other parents appreciate the cultural and linguistic valuing offered by bilingual education programs. Similarly, some educators also have mixed views about bilingual education programs. Providing effective curricula may prove daunting, particularly if educators do not have the necessary cultural, linguistic or academic knowledge to contribute to the program (Ochoa & Rhodes, 2005; Thomas & Collier, 2002). Such differing views, along with varying student populations and school system resources, have created the diverse academic programs offered to English Language Learners.

**Challenges within Academic Programs for English Language Learners**

There is an undeniable linguistic achievement gap in U.S. schools (Callahan, 2005). Callahan described this gap as a difference in academic performance between English proficient students and English Language Learners (Callahan, 2005). Gándara, Rumberger, Maxwell-Jolly and Callahan (2003) described structural barriers that prevent English Language Learners from accessing rigorous curricula. Many schools focus on English oral fluency, yet such fluency does not ensure that students can successfully complete grade level work. The authors also reported lack of access to academic content. Students who were pulled out of classes for English instruction often went without traditional academic instruction. Some of the ESOL curriculum was nonacademic in nature, which translated to less academically rigorous instruction received by English Language Learners than by those receiving mainstream instruction (Callahan, 2005). Students placed in the English Language Learner track often did not engage in the academically rigorous courses required for college admission. Students also reported insufficient time to complete the tasks required for high school graduation.
Calaff (2008) found that a number of factors contribute to the academic achievement of English Language Learners. The author conducted an ethnographic study in which she followed nine successful immigrant students over the course of one school year (Calaff, 2008). She examined the practices of educators and the school resources that contributed to student success. Based on the interviews and focus groups held with students, Calaff found that students viewed the high expectations within the school environment, academic rigor with flexible course offerings, and access to quality facilities as essential to their academic success. The students also reported that a school environment that embraced diversity, authentically supportive teachers and counselors and collaboration with school and community stakeholders contributed to their overall school success (Calaff, 2008).

In 2003, Gándara et al. noted that 70 percent of teachers who worked with three or more English Language Learners did not have a specific teaching credential. Those who had received professional development acquired approximately four hours over a five-year period (Gandára et al., 2003; Karathanos, 2010; Reeves, 2006). This limited preparation led to limited instruction in academic literacy. Programs that focused on English acquisition often did not focus on literacy skills.

Nieto (2002) suggested several steps all educators could take to more effectively educate language minority students. Nieto emphasized the importance of having positive attitudes toward language minority students and their languages, cultures and communities. Nieto also encouraged all teachers to understand how language is learned. Teachers need to develop an additive perspective toward bilingualism, encouraging and fostering native literacy (Nieto, 2002).
Freeman (2004) argued that teaching English Language Learners has become less of a specialized responsibility and that all educators must understand how to engage English Language Learners effectively.

**School Counselor Experience and Training Related to English Language Learners**

School counselors can potentially be powerful brokers for English Language Learners. However, some school counselors possess a lack of knowledge or experience to effectively serve this population (Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004). Others report limited interaction with English Language Learners and lack of cultural background knowledge (Clemente & Collison, 2000).

McCall-Perez (2000) stressed that English Language Learners are dependent on counselors for school success. Often counselors give English Language Learners access to the social and cultural capital needed for successful school completion and college entry. The Transforming School Counselor Initiative stressed that school counselors can support students through leadership, advocacy and collaboration (The Education Trust, 2009). Studies have shown that when counselors and school staff learn about English Language Learners’ needs, they can work collaboratively to ensure student success (McCall-Perez, 2000). Schools around the U.S. have implemented activities that benefit English Language Learners and their families (McCall-Perez, 2000).

School counselors can support English Language Learners through their work as advocates, cultural mediators and collaborators. Counselors gain many of these skills in their counseling training programs or through professional development opportunities.

**School Counselor Experiences with English Language Learners**

Clemente and Collison (2000) found that school counselors reported minimal involvement with English Language Learners and staff. After conducting in-depth interviews
with five school counselors, they found that counselors viewed English Language Learner programs as independent parts of the school. The counselors expressed this view because English Language Learners’ academic performance and schedule preparation were handled by ESOL staff. Counselors also reported that many of their interactions with English Language Learners were for behavioral or remedial purposes, and not preventive activities (Clemente & Collison, 2000). After conducting corresponding student focus groups, Clemente and Collison (2000) found that English Language Learners reported having limited contact with school counselors. Students did not seek counselor assistance because they felt counselors had a lack of cultural understanding (Clemente & Collison, 2004). In a more recent study seven English Language Learners believed that their counselors were never available (Vela-Gude et al., 2009). These students reported insufficient advisement and college preparation information. Counselors were only available at the start of the school year to discuss scheduling and were unavailable to discuss personal concerns. The participants also believed that their school counselors maintained low expectations and did not encourage them to take rigorous courses or apply to more prestigious universities (Vela-Gude et al., 2009). Each of these studies highlights English Language Learners difficult experiences with school counselors. Fortunately, some counselors seek professional development or training to increase their skill set.

**School Counselor Multicultural Training**

Portman (2009) argued that the future will demand that school counselors consider all activities of the school embedded within the cultural context of the school and community. She explained that the continual increase of English Language Learners in school settings will require school counselors to serve as leaders in creating and supporting a culturally diverse
community. Calaff (2007) found that students attributed their school success to a culturally supportive environment. English Language Learners indicated that school counselors and other staff could help them feel more like a part of the school (Behnke, Gonzalez & Cox, 2010). School counselors can influence school climate by promoting diversity among students and staff (Goh et al., 2007).

Williams and Butler (2003) called for counselor education programs to do more to help counselors address the needs of English Language Learners. They encouraged the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP) to push counselor education programs to offer more than a single course in multiculturalism and diversity. They also noted CACREP’s influence in adequately preparing English Language Learners. First (1988) suggested that course offerings be expanded to include the study of demography, cultural nuances and the history of countries from which English Language Learners come.

In the 1990’s, Sue, Arredondo and McDavis (1992) called for the counseling profession to develop a multicultural perspective. Multicultural competencies were then developed and incorporated into counseling programs. CACREP now requires counseling training programs to address multicultural competencies within their programs (CACREP, 2009).

Schwallie-Giddis, Anstrom, Sanchez, Sardi and Granato (2004) sought to determine the challenges school counselors perceived when working with English Language Learners and to identify the kinds of professional development counselors felt would best prepare them to assist those students. After conducting in-depth interviews with 13 school counselors, Schwallie-Giddis et al. (2004) reported that counselors desired further multicultural training in working with the parents and families of English Language Learners. The counselors participated in multicultural counselor professional development activities and specifically wanted help
explaining the American school system to parents, engaging parents in the educational process and assessing parent needs (Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004). Similarly, Clemente and Collison (2000) reported that finding ways to effectively communicate with the parents of English Language Learners in the face of language barriers was a key counselor concern.

Recognizing the need to better serve English Language Learners, school counselors also reported a need to increase their knowledge of the specific cultures of the English Language Learners with whom they worked (Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004). They wanted more culturally based strategies and more opportunities to interact with culturally diverse individuals (Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004). Such efforts to expand counselors’ knowledge base are valuable because English Language Learners benefit immensely from school counselor services (Chamberlain, 2005). As school counselors develop greater understanding and awareness, they will have a greater impact on the academic success of English Language Learners.

Goh et al. (2007) highlighted the school counselor’s role in building cross-cultural bridges in schools. These scholars contended that by providing experiential activities for students, school staff and families, school counselors could build culturally supportive environments. Activities such as mediation lessons, identity development discussions and diversity awareness weeks may contribute to more positive school climates (Goh et al., 2007). Counselors can also serve as cultural mediators via their work with school staff.

Once counselors understand the needs of English Language Learners, they can share this knowledge with school staff to create a more culturally accepting environment (Goh et al., 2007; Perusse & Colbert, 2007; Portman, 2009). Chamberlain (2005) described the potential for cultural misinterpretation in the classroom. Counselors can serve as cultural mediators by exposing school staff to potential misconstructions, and implementing strategies to curb those
views (Goh et al., 2007). Counselors can also help ensure that school curricula fairly and accurately reflect the contributions of many cultures (Lee, 2001; Portman, 2009).

Implementing culturally effective practices can positively contribute to the overall school environment. School counselors should recognize that the families of English Language Learners may not be comfortable in school settings due to differing educational backgrounds and experiences with authority figures (Chamberlain, 2005). Culturally responsive school counselors should consider students’ varying needs and help-seeking behaviors in implementing school services (Chamberlain, 2005). James (1997) explained that providing information in various mediums and in diverse settings can help counselors reach more English Language Learners and families. Carolino, Spalding and Amen (2004) also proposed that schools send communications home in the native language and use qualified translators, bilingual home-school liaisons or multilingual hotlines to help communicate with parents. The authors suggested that school personnel communicate with parents in their native languages, encourage continued use of native language at home and consider parents’ schedules when planning school based activities (Carolino, Spalding & Amen, 2004). Culturally responsive counselors can build cultural bridges by going into the community to offer services and share pertinent school information (James, 1997).

**School Counselor Academic Training**

McCall-Perez (2000) found that counselors who understood the relationship between subject area content, teacher instructional style, student linguistic skills and academic background were most effective in advocating for English Language Learners. McCall-Perez (2000) assisted in implementing The California Tomorrow research project, a three-and-a-half
year study developed to increase English Language Learners’ English literacy, improve mastery of academic content and help English Language Learners advance steadily through high school to graduation (McCall-Perez, 2000). After operating for several years, the project coordinators recognized how essential school counselors were to the process and invited counselors to participate in the study.

Counselors learned about English Language Learner needs and then collected data from students, parents and the community. Counselors who then understood student linguistic needs were able to advocate for new flexible scheduling (McCall-Perez, 2000). This scheduling placed English Language Learners in English courses each semester, resulting in increased student language acquisition and improved chances for college access. Similarly, Calaff (2007) found that when counselors placed English Language Learners in college preparation courses in conjunction with reading support courses, these efforts produced academic growth and increased college aspirations among English Language Learners.

While counselors do not have large amounts of time to spend in scheduling activities, these examples demonstrate how understanding the complexity of English Language Learners’ academic needs allows counselors to effectively advocate on behalf of these students and develop programs that enhance their academic development (Calaff, 2007; McCall-Perez, 2000). Counselor awareness, however, is the first step to responsible advocacy for English Language Learners. This awareness helps counselors put student needs at the center of school planning (McCall-Perez, 2001; Jimenez-Silva, Olson & Hernandez, 2012). Counselors who understand the academic and linguistic needs of English Language Learners can influence school policies, resulting in equitable outcomes for students. In a more recent study with pre-service teachers preparing to work with English Language Learners, Jimenez-Silva, Olson & Hernandez (2012)
found that the most effective training included exposure to relevant literature about theoretical principles and policies impacting English Language Learners, relevant classroom discussion, modeling effective English Language Learner strategies within course lectures, student opportunities to participate in those strategies, and meaningful interaction with English Language Learners. Pre-service teachers also benefitted from opportunities to dialogue and reflect on those experiences with peers. These findings suggest that school counselors need more than just knowledge about English Language Learners to advocate for them appropriately (Jimenez-Silva, Olson & Hernandez, 2012).

**School Counselor Experiential Training**

Some scholars argue that in addition to awareness, counselors benefit from actual experience with English Language Learners (Burnham, Mantero & Hooper, 2009). Some counselors engage in experiential training during their counselor preparation programs. Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines & Johnston (2008) found similar results when measuring school counselor Multicultural Self Efficacy. The authors argued that culturally diverse school counselors may have rated themselves higher due to “in vivo” or real life experiences that make them more aware and willing to address issues of diversity. The scholars also explicated that diverse counseling students often pursued more multicultural training courses than their Caucasian counterparts (Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines & Johnston, 2008). The authors also cited Pope-Davis et al (1998) who explained that diverse school counselors tend to serve more diverse student caseloads.

Counselors from all backgrounds engage in experiential training during their counselor preparation programs. Burnham, Mantero and Hooper (2009) described an experiential training
program for school counselor trainees. The authors of this exploratory study examined the potential benefits of placing school counselor trainees in a classroom field experience with English as a Second Language teachers and students. The authors wanted to determine whether the school counselor trainees believed the experience increased their multicultural sensitivity and awareness (Burnham et al., 2009).

The school counselor trainees were paired with English as a Second Language teachers during a summer program for English Language Learners. The counselor trainees used the opportunity to develop classroom guidance lessons and practice their collaboration skills. The trainees found the experiential training to be beneficial. After working with ESL students firsthand, the counselor trainees reported a greater awareness of the challenges and strengths English Language Learners brought to the classroom. Counselor trainees also better understood how to collaborate with ESL teachers and recognized the importance of such collaboration (Burnham et al., 2009).

Roysircar, Gard, Hubbell and Ortega (2005) obtained similar results after pairing counseling trainees with English Language Learners as mentors. The counseling participants reported better understanding the challenges English Language Learners face after working with them one-on-one (Roysircar et al., 2005). These studies highlight the potential benefits of school counselor trainees working one-on-one with English Language Learners during their preparation. Future counselors may become more aware of English Language Learners’ needs and be more equipped to develop solutions once they begin work as school counselors (Burnham et al., 2009).

While these results are promising, however, some scholars call for the development of specific competencies within counseling programs to address English Language Learner needs.
In addition, as previously mentioned, acting on this increased knowledge will require school counselors’ commitment to and confidence in their ability to make a difference in the educational experiences and outcomes for these students.

**Self-Efficacy**

This study will use self-efficacy theory to examine school counselors’ perceived capabilities to perform tasks specific to English Language Learners. Bandura (1994) defined self-efficacy as beliefs about one’s own ability to perform a given behavior. Bandura further explicated that self-efficacy requires possession of skills and belief in the ability to use those skills effectively (Bandura, 1994). Self-efficacy beliefs influence how people think, feel, motivate themselves, and act (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005).

Individuals with a strong sense of self-efficacy choose to engage in challenging tasks. They recover quickly from setbacks and attribute failure to inadequate effort or limited knowledge and skills, which can be acquired (Bandura, 1994). Individuals who doubt their abilities view challenges as personal threats. They tend to have low aspirations and are not committed to goals. Individuals acquire self-efficacy in four ways: mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, social persuasion and emotional states (Bandura, 1994). Bandura indicated that the most effective way to acquire self-efficacy is through mastery experiences. Mastery experiences occur when individuals succeed despite challenging circumstances (Bandura, 1994).

Vicarious experiences occur when individuals find others similar to themselves who have been successful (Bandura, 1994). These encounters raise observers’ beliefs that they can also succeed in similar pursuits. For social modeling to be most effective, observers must view
themselves as similar to their models (Bandura, 1994). Competent models also teach their observers the skills and strategies needed to manage environmental demands.

Individuals also acquire self-efficacy via social persuasion. Social or verbal persuasion occurs when people are verbally persuaded that they are capable of acquiring success in a particular area (Bandura, 1994). Bandura (1997) argued that if individuals are told they possess the potential to master given circumstances, they are more likely to persevere if self-doubts occur. Bandura warned, however, that it is easy to undermine social persuasion, particularly if the verbal encouragement is insincere and an individual does not have the ability to perform required tasks (Bandura, 1997).

Finally, people acquire self-efficacy through emotional states (Bandura, 1997). A positive mood enhances one’s self-efficacy; a negative or anxious mood depletes it. When individuals can reduce their negative stress reactions to a particular task, they may improve their sense of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1994). In general people avoid tasks in which they have low self-efficacy and perform tasks when self-efficacy is high (Bandura, 1997).

Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) conducted an extensive review of teacher self-efficacy literature. The scholars found that teacher self-efficacy impacted the amount of exertion teachers put into their teaching and influenced how willing they were to try new methods in their classrooms (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). The researchers also found that teachers with higher levels of self-efficacy were not as critical of students and worked with students having difficulties for more sustained amounts of time (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Jimenez-Silva, Olson and Hernandez (2012) argued that teachers who do not feel prepared to work with English Language Learners may avoid these students.
Several scholars have explored counselor self-efficacy and developed instruments to measure it (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005; Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008; Larson et al., 1992). In 1992, Larson et al. developed the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory (COSE). This 37-item instrument was created to measure counselor trainee confidence. The instrument measured five areas: microskills, process, difficult client behaviors, cultural competence and awareness of values (Larson et al., 1992). This instrument was used widely to measure counselors’ self-efficacy; however, it did not measure all areas of practice related to school counseling (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005).

In 2005, Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) created the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSE) to more accurately measure the self-efficacy of counselors working in school settings. This instrument assessed school counselor confidence in five areas: personal and social development, leadership and assessment, career and academic development, collaboration and cultural acceptance (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). The instrument incorporated traditional school counseling roles in conjunction with newer recommended roles encouraged by the Education Trust and the American School Counselor Association (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). While the SCSE was a strong school counselor self-efficacy instrument, however, it did not measure issues of diversity (Paredes, 2011).

In 2008, Holcomb-McCoy et al. created the School Counselor Multicultural Self-Efficacy Scale (SCMES). Six subscales were identified in this instrument: knowledge of multicultural counseling concepts, using data and understanding systemic change, developing cross-cultural relationships, multicultural awareness, multicultural assessment and applying racial concepts to practice (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008). This instrument was an important addition to the literature, as it specifically measured school counselors’ beliefs about their ability
to work with diverse populations. The instrument, however, did not specifically address school counselor self-efficacy with linguistically diverse students (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008).

Paredes (2011) created the School Counselor Self-Efficacy with English Language Learners (SC-SELL) scale to measure counselors’ self-efficacy with linguistically diverse students. This 87-item instrument measured school counselor self-efficacy in eight domains: communication and interaction with home, assessment, relationship with students, counseling process, school atmosphere, self-awareness, sensitivity to language, and consultation/collaboration.

The scholarship on school counselor self-efficacy has yielded results about the impact of self-efficacy on school counselor practice. Findings support Bandura’s (1994) argument that self-efficacy requires both possession of skills and belief in one’s ability to use those skills effectively (Bandura, 1994). Scholars have found that school counselor skills in particular domains yield higher measures of self-efficacy (Bodenhorn, Wolfe & Airen, 2010; Bryan & Griffin, 2010; Holcomb-McCoy, Gonzalez & Johnston, 2009).

Bodenhorn, Wolfe and Airen (2010) found that school counselors who were aware of achievement gap data and who implemented parts of a comprehensive counseling program had higher self-efficacy. Holcomb-McCoy, Gonzalez and Johnston (2009) found that school counselors who used data to inform their school counseling programs had higher levels of self-efficacy than counselors who did not use data. Bryan and Griffin (2010) found that school counselors who engaged in partnerships with families had higher self-efficacy and were more likely to engage in school-home and school-community collaboration.

Other studies examined how self-efficacy changed in response to particular variables. Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) examined relationships between school counselor multicultural
self-efficacy and school counselor characteristics such as educational background, years of experience and multicultural courses taken. School counselors who took five to seven multicultural courses rated themselves higher than school counselors who completed one or two multicultural courses. Paredes (2011) found that school counselors who took part in simulation experiences related to English Language Learners improved their self-efficacy scores in their work with these students. These findings suggest that if school counselors do not believe they are capable of performing tasks related to English Language Learners, they may avoid those tasks or downplay the importance of such tasks (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2008).

Summary

This chapter provided a selected review of the literature supporting the need for professional school counselors to improve the educational experiences and outcomes for English Language Learners. The school experiences of English Language Learners are impacted by a number of factors. School counselors are essential in helping these students navigate the education system in the U.S. Some school counselors believe that additional training is needed to effectively assist English Language Learners. School counselor self-efficacy can measure counselors’ belief in their own ability to serve this growing student population. Without high levels of self efficacy with English Language Learners, school counselors may avoid the tasks needed by English Language Learners.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

A limited knowledge about how school counselors perceive their ability to work with English Language Learners provided the background for this study. This chapter presents the research design, participants, instruments, procedures and data analysis used in this study. The first section describes the research design. The second section explains how the participant pool was identified for this study. The third section describes the instruments used in this study. The instruments were used to obtain demographic data about participants, identify the composition of school populations and elicit counselors’ beliefs about service delivery implemented with English Language Learners. The questionnaire also solicited feedback about training needs for school counselors in their work with English Language Learners. The final sections explain the procedures and data analysis employed in this study.

Research Design

Babbie (1990) explained that survey research designs are implemented to describe, explain or explore phenomena. Survey research is conducted to make descriptive assertions about a particular population (Babbie, 1990). Survey designs are implemented to explain behaviors, attitudes or relationships among populations. Finally, survey methods can be used as “search devices” to explore a particular topic (Babbie, 1990).

This study utilized a cross-sectional survey design. Cross-sectional or descriptive survey designs result in a description, “portrait” or “snapshot” of a group at a particular point in time. (Fink, 2003; Steinberg, 2004). Cross-sectional survey designs also allow researchers to make
general inferences about a population (Steinberg, 2004). Currently, the school counseling literature includes in-depth descriptions from a small number of counselors about their work with English Language Learners (Clemente & Collison, 2000; Santamaría, 2009; Schwallie-Gills et al., 2004). While these descriptions are valuable, they may not be representative of the larger school counselor population. The goal of this study was to generate a description of school counselors’ beliefs about their ability to work with English Language Learners. The study also aimed to identify the training needs of practicing school counselors.

Participants

Professional school counselors working in schools with English Language Learners were the target population for this study. School counselors are defined as individuals who have obtained a school counseling certification in their state and are currently practicing in elementary, middle or high school settings. Schools had an English Language Learner population if at least one student at the counselor’s school of employment met the school district’s criteria for an English Language Learner.

The target population for this study was practicing professional school counselors. The researcher therefore worked with the professional organization for school counselors, the American School Counselor Association (ASCA), in identifying participants. ASCA aims to educate, serve and support individuals involved in the school counseling profession. The participant pool for this study consisted of current ASCA members. As of September 2012, ASCA had approximately 25,300 members registered in its membership directory. ASCA offers membership to counseling students, counseling supervisors, retired school counselors and
members in related professions such as administrators, school psychologists and counselors in mental health settings. Demographic questions were included in the survey to ensure that participants met the criteria to take part in the study.

At the outset, it was difficult to determine whether participants had English Language Learner populations at their schools. Oversampling was implemented to yield a representative population (Johnson & Christensen, 2008). Stratified sampling was also used to “organize the population into homogenous subsets and then select appropriate numbers from each subset” (Babbie, 1990, p. 86). To ensure equal representation from counselors throughout the U.S., counselors were stratified by region. The ASCA is divided into four regions: Southern, Midwestern, North Atlantic and Western. A random number generator was used to select 250 members from each region, yielding a pool of 1,000 potential participants for the online questionnaire.

Participants were also solicited at the 2012 ASCA conference. In an effort to increase sample size, the researcher sought permission from the Assistant Director of the ASCA to request participation from school counselors at the Association’s June, 2012 conference in Minneapolis, Minnesota. The researcher set up a booth at the conference and sought participants. Approximately 1,700 individuals attended the conference and 80 percent of those participants were school counselors, making the potential pool of participants from the conference 1,360.

**Instruments**

Two instruments were used in this study to assess school counselor beliefs and concerns involving English Language Learners. A comprehensive review of the literature produced an instrument designed to measure the self-efficacy of school counselors with English Language
Learners. The School Counselor Self-Efficacy with English Language Learners instrument (Paredes, 2010) was used to obtain information regarding school counselors’ beliefs about their ability to work with English Language Learners.

The review of the literature also produced an instrument developed for speech language pathologists. The Serving English Language Learners with Speech-Language Disorders in the Schools survey instrument was adapted to solicit demographic, caseload and training needs information from participants. The following sections describe each instrument.

**School Counselor Self-Efficacy with ELLs (SC-SELL)**

The School Counselor Self-Efficacy with ELLs (Paredes, 2009a) instrument was developed in response to a lack of instruments that specifically assessed school counselors’ self-efficacy with English Language Learners (Paredes, 2011). The author conducted a review of the literature and identified eight domains related to school counselors’ work with English Language Learners. The eight domains were: communication with interaction at home, assessment, relationship with students, counseling process, school atmosphere, self-awareness, sensitivity to language, and consultation/collaboration.

As a result of this search, response items were created or adapted from other instruments. Paredes (2011) then met with four experts in the field of school counseling and English Language Learners. Each expert sorted the items and discussed with Paredes the relevance of the questions for the instrument. As a result of this process, three items were deleted and 17 items were added to better reflect the activities of counselors in schools (Paredes, 2011). This resulted in an 87-item instrument. Respondents were asked to rate statements on a Likert scale (1=not confident at all, 2=somewhat confident, 3=confident, 4=very confident).
A pilot of the SC-SELL was conducted with counselors from across the U.S., with 601 respondents completing the survey. In the overall statistics an alpha reliability coefficient of .98 was calculated. The reliability coefficient for the overall scale was consistent with the results from the item-analysis, with a Cronbach's alpha of .98, a mean of 244.05, and a standard deviation of 44.06 found for this instrument.

**Serving English Language Learners with Speech-Language Disorders in the Schools**

The Serving English Language Learners with Speech-Language Disorders in the Schools survey instrument was developed to gather information from practicing speech language pathologists about their backgrounds, caseloads, problems encountered when providing services to English Language Learners and assessments used when working with English Language Learners (Roseberry-McKibbin, Brice & O’Hanlon, 2005).

In 1990, the instrument was created and used with 1,145 public school speech language pathologists across the U.S. to assess the conditions of service delivery to English Language Learners and determine respondents’ needs in their work with these students (Roseberry-McKibbin, Brice & O’Hanlon, 2005). In 2001, the instrument was sent to 1,736 school-based speech language pathologists to acquire more updated information about practitioner conditions and needs. The questions in this survey were piloted in 1988, 1990 and 2001.

In November 2011, the author of the present study solicited permission to adapt the Serving English Language Learners with Speech-Language Disorders in the Schools instrument for use with school counselors. The creator of the Speech-Language Disorders instrument indicated that validity information was no longer available for the instrument (personal contact, November 2011).
The creator of the Speech-Language Disorders instrument granted permission for the author of this study to adapt the instrument for use in this study. The author of this study used the Speech-Language Disorders instrument as a model. The majority of the questions from the original instrument were not used; however, eight questions and four response items were either used verbatim or adapted to meet the needs of the current study. Questions 1 and 13 of the Speech-Language Disorders instrument were used verbatim in the questionnaire completed by participants in this study. The author also used responses b, d, e and h from question 17 on the Speech-Language Disorders instrument.

Six questions on the Speech-Language Disorders questionnaire were adapted to meet the needs of this study. The words “who are learning English as a second or third language?” were removed from Question 5. The corresponding question in this study reads, “What percentage of these students are English Language Learners?” The words “three” and “ELL students” were removed from Question 6. The corresponding question reads, “What are the most common ethnic groups among your English Language Learners?”

The words “with enough proficiency to conduct assessment and/or treatment in that language?” were removed from Question 8 on the Speech-Language Disorders questionnaire. The corresponding question reads, “Do you speak a language other than English?” The words “if you do not speak a language other than English . . . speech-language pathologist” were removed from Question 9. The corresponding question reads, “Do you use the services of a bilingual counselor?”

The words “use an interpreter” in Question 13 were replaced with “use interpreters” in the corresponding question. In Question 17 the words “students with communication disorders . . . in terms of your interest level by circling the appropriate numbers” were replaced with the
words, “Given the opportunity to participate in continuing education training that addressed services for English Language Learners, please rate the following items.” The Likert scale responses in Question 17 were changed from the five responses “extremely interested,” “quite interested,” “moderately interested,” “mildly interested” and “not interested” to three responses: “definitely attend,” “might attend” and “would not attend.”

No questions specifically related to speech language pathologists and their work with students and communication disorders were included. Questions 2, 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 20 on the Speech-Language Disorders instrument were not used in this study. While many of the questions on the Serving English Language Learners with Speech-Language Disorders in the Schools differed from the questions posed in this study, the instrument did provide the author with a format for the questionnaire. The Speech-Language Disorders questionnaire also provided a framework for areas to include in this study within the practice of school counseling. The detailed changes in this instrument can be seen in Appendix C.

**Procedures**

A self-administered, web-based questionnaire was used to generate responses for this study. Fowler (2009) described the potential benefits of self-administered instruments, noting that such instruments allow participants to answer more freely. Fowler (2009) also explained several advantages of using Internet questionnaires, which are low cost and can provide instantaneous responses.

One thousand members from the American School Counselor Association membership directory were emailed as potential participants in this study. An equal number of members from each geographic region, 250, received an invitation to participate in the research study examining school counselors and English Language Learners. The invitation included the purpose and
potential benefits of the study for the school counseling profession; an informed consent statement detailing measures to safeguard data collected by the researcher; the approximate length of the questionnaire and the time needed to complete it; the intent that no harm would come to participants in the study and a request for the recipient’s participation in the study. A copy of this invitation can be found in Appendix D.

After the initial email invitation to participate in the study, two email reminders were sent to potential participants before the conclusion of the data collection period. Data was collected for four weeks. Individuals who did not wish to be contacted again or who were not interested in participating in the study could indicate this in an email reply and were removed from the participant pool. This was noted in an email log. If an email was returned as undeliverable, the researcher checked the email address. If the researcher was unable to correct the address, this was noted in an email log. This log was used to monitor the questionnaire response rate. Undeliverable email addresses were summed and subtracted from the initial sample, in order to calculate the appropriate response rate.

At the completion of the four-week survey window, the researcher consulted with research committee members about means of obtaining a larger sample of participants. In an effort to increase sample size, the researcher sought permission from the Assistant Director of the ASCA to solicit participation from school counselors at the 2012 ASCA conference in Minneapolis, Minnesota. The researcher set up a booth at the conference and read a recruitment script to attendees, explaining the purpose and procedure for the study. If attendees were interested in participating, they were given a consent form and a paper version of the questionnaire. This consent form can be found in Appendix E.
Participants were asked to complete the questionnaire at the table or to return it before the end of the conference. As an incentive to participate in the study, all conference participants were offered the opportunity to enter a drawing for one of three $50 Visa gift cards. Individuals were asked to write their email address on an index card that was placed in a large container. One drawing occurred each day of the conference. Winners of the drawing received the gift card at the conference or had the gift card mailed to them.

Approximately 1,700 individuals attended the conference and 80 percent of those participants were school counselors. Participation was encouraged from school counselors from all 50 U.S. states currently practicing with English Language Learner populations in their schools.

**Data Analysis**

The first research question, “How confident are school counselors in their ability to work effectively with English Language Learners?” was examined by conducting a frequency distribution. Frequency distributions illustrate how often scores occur (Salkind, 2007). In this report, school counselors completed the School Counselor Self-Efficacy with English Language Learners instrument. Participants answered questions using a Likert scale from one to four. An answer of “one” on the scale indicated that a school counselor was “not at all confident” in his or her ability to engage in a given task. A response of “two” denoted that a participant was “somewhat confident.” A response of “three” indicated that a school counselor was “confident” in his or her ability to complete the activity described and a score of “four” signified that a participant was “very confident.” The researcher calculated an overall score for each participant, and the scores were then entered into a frequency distribution. This distribution was computed
to gauge school counselors’ self-efficacy with English Language Learners. The researcher also identified the questions in which participants obtained the highest and lowest SC-SELL scores.

The second research question, “What differences in self-efficacy do school counselors possess when considering school counselor’s school level, race, U.S. region, size of English Language Learner population, language and prior training with English Language Learners?” was examined by conducting a one-way analysis of variance and a $t$-test.

A one-way analysis of variance is used to examine differences between two or more means of an independent variable (Salkind, 2007). Specifically, mean scores are compared between different levels of an independent variable (Salkind, 2007). In this study, the author used a one-way analysis of variance to ascertain differences in the self-efficacy scores of school counselors. Specifically the author measured any variance of scores between counselors in elementary, middle and high schools; between African American, Asian, Caucasian, Latino and Native American school counselors; between counselors in the Southern, Midwestern, North Atlantic and Western regions of the U.S.; between school counselors with small English Language Learner populations (one to 30 percent), medium English Language Learner populations (31 to 60 percent), and large English Language Learner populations (61 to 100 percent); and between school counselors with different self-identified levels of training. Throughout the analysis, when significance at the .05 level was found, additional post-hoc testing using a Tukey HSD was done to determine where differences in groups lay.

The author also conducted a $t$-test for independent samples. This statistic compares differences in the mean scores of two groups (Salkind, 2007). A $t$-test was carried out to measure variations in the self-efficacy scores between school counselors who spoke one language and school counselors who spoke more than one language. A $t$-test was also conducted
to measure differences in self-efficacy between school counselors with personal training with English Language Learners and school counselors without personal training with English Language Learners. Additionally, a $t$-test was performed to measure divergences in self-efficacy scores between school counselors who received English Language Learner training from their school districts and counselors who did not receive training.

The third research question, “What English Language Learner training opportunities are school counselors most interested in accessing?” was determined by creating a frequency distribution. Frequency distributions illustrate how often scores occur (Salkind, 2007). In this report, school counselors identified the training options they believed were most relevant to their practice. The author created a frequency distribution of the training selection scores to reveal which training options participants were most interested in accessing.

**Position of the Researcher**

The author of this study is an African American, monolingual individual who has worked as a school counselor for six years. Four years were spent at schools with English Language Learner populations of 50 percent or higher. During her first experience as a school counselor in a setting with English Language Learners, the author did not feel as effective with her English Language Learning students. Initially, the author did not know how to ensure that her classroom guidance and individual and group counseling services were equally accessible to all students. Differences in language and limited resources in her school made it challenging for the author to connect with the families of English Language Learners.

Consequently, the author consulted with English as Second Language teachers for ideas and strategies. The author also reached out to other school counselors serving English Language Learner populations. These experiences helped her to incorporate culturally appropriate teaching
and communication strategies into her counseling and guidance sessions. The researcher also learned about community resources that provided her with more information about the students and families she served. Even with these experiences, the researcher desired more formal training about English Language Learners. The author pursued additional coursework related to English Language Learners and took part in a study abroad opportunity. The author believes that each of these formal and informal training opportunities increased her self-efficacy regarding her work with English Language Learners. These experiences informed the researcher’s decision to carry out the current study.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to describe school counselors’ beliefs about their ability to work with English Language Learners. The research questions guiding this study were:

RQ1. How confident are school counselors in their ability to work effectively with English Language Learners?

RQ2: What differences in self-efficacy do school counselors possess when considering school counselor’s school level, race, U.S. region, size of English Language Learner population, language and prior training with English Language Learners?

RQ3: What English Language Learner training opportunities are school counselors most interested in accessing?

The quantitative findings of the data analyses are outlined in this chapter.

Data Collection

Initially, 1,000 potential participants were invited to complete the online questionnaire. Twenty-two could not be contacted via the email address provided. Eight indicated that they were not interested in participating in the study by email. Of the 970 remaining participants, 56 individuals submitted a response via Survey Monkey. Eighteen of these participants were excluded. Ten of these participants did not currently work as school counselors and were automatically exited from the questionnaire. Seven did not have English Language Learner populations in their schools and were automatically exited from the survey. One individual
opened the survey and did not complete it, resulting in 38 questionnaires. Of the remaining questionnaires, six were only partially completed, leaving 32 completed online questionnaires for analysis, yielding a response rate of 3.30%. The online questionnaire results were downloaded from Survey Monkey and stored in a Microsoft Excel file.

The researcher solicited participation from 219 school counselors at the American School Counselor Association conference, and 177 of these counselors completed paper-and-pencil versions of the online questionnaire. Of those participants, six were not currently working with English Language Learners in U.S. schools. One participant only partially completed the questionnaire. This left 170 paper-and-pencil questionnaires for analysis, resulting in a conference participant response rate of 77.6%. The questionnaire data was transferred into a Microsoft Excel file by the researcher.

In all, 202 questionnaires were completed by school counselors currently working with English Language Learners. The 202 completed questionnaires resulted in an overall response rate of 17%. The downloaded data was reviewed for missing items, then analyzed in IBM SPSS Statistics 19. One-way analysis of variance, Tukey HSD post-hoc test, t-test for independent means and frequency distribution statistical tests were calculated to answer the research questions guiding this study.

**Description of the Sample**

The 202 (N = 202) school counselors in this study included 86.1% females (n = 174) and 13.9% males (n = 28). The participants racially identified themselves as 3.0% (n = 6) Asian; 26.7% (n = 54) Black; 6.4% (n = 13) Hispanic; 0.99% (n = 2) Multiracial; 3.0% (n = 6) Native American and 59.9% (n = 121) White.
The practicing school counselors had a wide range of years of experience. The majority of participants had worked as school counselors for 10 years or fewer. Specifically, 39.6% \((n = 80)\) had one to five years of experience and 22.2% \((n = 45)\) had six to 10 years of experience as school counselors. The remaining participants indicated that they were counselors in schools for 11 to 15 years \((18.8\%; n = 38)\); 16 to 20 years \((8.9\%; n = 18)\); 21 to 25 years \((6.4\%; n = 13)\) and 26 or more years \((4.0\%; n = 8)\).

Participants in this study currently practice school counseling in 41 states and the District of Columbia. Each region of the U.S. is represented in this sample; however, the majority of participants, 44.5% \((n = 90)\) practice in the Midwestern region of the United States. Most counselors in this study, 60.4% \((n = 122)\) practice in WIDA states, i.e., states that use guidelines from the Word-class Instructional Design and Assessment in their screening and assessment of English Language Learners (World-class Instructional Design and Assessment, 2012). There are 27 WIDA states and 23 of those states were represented in this sample. A smaller percentage of counselors in this study, 15.3% \((n = 31)\), work in the states of California, Florida, New York and Texas. Historically these states had higher rates of immigration, resulting in large numbers of English Language Learners. The remaining participants 24.3% \((n = 49)\) work in states that do not fit either of these categories.

The majority of school counselors in this study, 69.8% \((n = 141)\), indicated that they did not speak a language other than English. Some participants, 27.2% \((n = 55)\), spoke additional languages that included American Sign Language, Arabic, French, German, Hmong, Japanese, Khmer, Korean, Mitchif, Tagalog, Thai, Somali and Spanish. The remaining respondents \((n = 6)\) did not respond to this question. While a large number of participants did not speak a language other than English, most counselors in this study, 82.2% \((n = 166)\), had access to an interpreter
for communication with the parents of English Language Learners. Of the remaining respondents, 13.9\% (n = 28) did not use an interpreter and (3.9\%; n = 8) did not select a response. Some counselors, 31.1\% (n = 63) indicated that they used the services of bilingual counselors in their work with English Language Learners. Most participants (63.8\%; n = 129) did not have access to bilingual counselors. Ten participants (5.0\%) did not answer this question.

Slightly over half the school counselors in this study (53.5\%; n = 108) identified themselves as having some prior training to assist them in their work with English Language Learners. Participants identified these experiences as language courses, ESL courses, experiences abroad, school district training and participation in conferences and workshops. Some counselors cited their own experiences on the job or as English Language Learners themselves as knowledge that helped them in their work with English Language Learners. Other participants (42.6\%; n = 86) selected “none” when asked about prior training for their work with English Language Learners, and 4.0\% (n = 8) did not respond.

Participants also indicated whether they received training through their school districts. Most counselors in this study (66.8\%; n = 135), reported that they did not receive training with English Language Learners from their school districts. Approximately 30 percent (n = 60) of school counselors took part in training about English Language Learners offered through their school districts.

A complete description of the sample is shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Size (n)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as School Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;26 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training with English Language Learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwestern</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Atlantic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Description**

The school environments described by school counselors were diverse. Participants’ school districts varied in size, with school counselors identifying their school districts as rural (26.2%; \( n = 53 \)), suburban (36.1%; \( n = 73 \)) or urban (37.1%; \( n = 75 \)). One participant (0.5%) did not report the size of his or her school district. The majority of the school counselors, 77.2% (\( n = 156 \)) indicated that the populations of their school districts had changed in the last 10 years.

Participants worked at all school levels, with 26.2% (\( n = 53 \)) working at the elementary level, 23.3% (\( n = 47 \)) at the middle school level and 41.1% (\( n = 83 \)) at the high school level. The remaining counselors (8.9%; \( n = 18 \)) indicated that they worked in a K-12 setting. The caseloads reported in this study ranged from fewer than 100 students to over 500 students. The majority of counselors in the sample, 75.7% (\( n = 153 \)), reported caseloads of 500 students or
less. Approximately 20% \((n = 40)\) of counselors reported student caseloads of 501 or more. The remaining 9 participants did not indicate the size of their caseloads. Most participants, 66.3% \((n = 134)\) reported that the student populations within their schools changed in the last 10 years.

A large majority of school counselors, 78.2% \((n = 158)\) reported English Language Learner populations in their schools of 30 percent or less. Only 10.4% \((n = 21)\) of participants came from schools whose populations of English Language Learners were 31 to 60%. Approximately 10 percent of participants \((n = 21)\) indicated that they had English Language Learner populations of 61 to 100%.

The most common ethnic group among participants’ English Language Learners was Latino students, 67.3% \((n = 136)\). Counselors also served students from African (6.4%; \(n = 13)\), Asian (13.3%; \(n = 27)\), European (4.4%; \(n = 9)\), Middle Eastern (1.4%; \(n = 3)\) and Native American (5.9%; \(n = 12)\) ethnic groups. School counselors reported 45 different languages spoken by their students. Participants reported that their English Language Learners also spoke the following languages: Amharic, Arabic, Bongli, Cantonese, Creole, English Lakota, Ethiopian, Farsi, Filipino, French, German, Hidatsa, Hmong, Hochunk, Islanders-Taboo, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Mandarin, Marshallese, Mixteco, Nepali, Oromo, Pautua, Polish, Portuguese, Punjabi, Romanian, Russian, Sioux, Somali, Spanish, Swahili, Tagalog, Tarascan, Tegado, Twi, Ukrainian, Urdu and Vietnamese. School counselors identified the languages most commonly used in their schools. The language most commonly reported by participants was Spanish. Those languages included English, Hmong, and Spanish. The most common language reported was Spanish, 57% \((n = 116)\). A complete description of the school environments of the sample is shown in Table 2.
Table 2

*Characteristics of Participants’ Work Environments*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Size (n)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School District Setting (Geographic Location)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in School District Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in School Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of Counselor Caseload</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-300</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-400</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401-500</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 501</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of English Language Learner Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10 percent</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 percent</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 percent</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 percent</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 percent</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 percent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70 percent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80 percent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90 percent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-100 percent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic Groups among English Language Learners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Counselors</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Bilingual Counselors</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreters</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Interpreters</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quantitative Findings**

The purpose of this study is to describe school counselors’ beliefs about their ability to work effectively with English Language Learners. The first research question, “How confident are school counselors in their ability to work effectively with English Language Learners?” was measured using a frequency distribution. School counselors completed the School Counselor Self-Efficacy with English Language Learners instrument. Participants answered questions on a Likert scale with responses from one to four. The researcher calculated an overall score for each participant. The frequency distribution was computed to gauge school counselors’ self-efficacy with English Language Learners.

The second research question, “What differences in self-efficacy do school counselors possess when considering school counselor’s school level, race, U.S. region, size of English Language Learner population, language and prior training with English Language Learners?” was examined by conducting a one-way analysis of variance. These measures were carried out to compare the effect of school level, race, U.S. region and size of the English Language Learner
population on School Counselor Self-Efficacy with English Language Learners (SC-SELL) scores. When significance at the .05 level was found, additional post-hoc testing using a Tukey HSD was completed to determine where differences in groups lie. T-test statistics were calculated to determine the impact of language, counselor personal training and school district training on school counselor self-efficacy with English Language Learner scores. When significance at the .05 level was found, the findings were considered significant.

The final question, “What English Language Learner training opportunities are school counselors most interested in accessing?” was analyzed by developing a frequency distribution. The frequency distribution identified the training opportunities selected most often by participants. The results for these questions are presented under each variable heading.

**School Counselor Self-Efficacy with English Language Learners**

The school counselors in this study completed the School Counselor Self-Efficacy with English Language Learner scale. Participants answered questions on a Likert scale from one to four. An answer of “one” indicated that a school counselor was “not at all confident” in his or her ability to engage in a task on the questionnaire. A response of “two” denoted that a participant was “somewhat confident.” A response of “three” indicated that a school counselor was “confident” in his or her ability to complete an activity described on the scale and a score of “four” signified that a participant was “very confident.” Each participant received an overall score between one and four. The frequency distribution was computed to gauge school counselors’ self-efficacy with English Language Learners.

The majority of participants, 65.3% ($n = 132$), received SC-SELL scores of three, indicating that they were “confident” in their ability to engage in school counseling tasks with English Language Learners. Sixty-two school counselors, 30.69%, received overall scores of
four, signifying that nearly a third of participants were “very confident” in their work with English Language Learners. Conversely, 3.47% (n = 7) received SC-SELL scores of two, indicating that a small percentage of school counselors were “somewhat confident” in their ability to engage in activities with English Language Learners. The frequency of scores is illustrated in Figure 1 below.

![Figure 1 School Counselor Self-Efficacy with English Language Learners](image)

While the majority of school counselors in this study had overall self-efficacy scores of three or higher, there were areas in which school counselors received higher and lower self-efficacy scores. The researcher identified the 10 questions with the highest and lowest scores. Each question was part of a specific domain.

Six of the 10 highest scores were in the areas of “relationship with students” and “consultation/collaboration.” Questions in the relationship with students category measured counselors’ confidence in their ability to develop trust and positive relationships with English Language Learners. Consultation and collaboration questions assessed counselors’ beliefs about their ability to work with school staff and community members to develop programs and provide resources to meet the needs of English Language Learners and their families.
Eight of the 10 lowest scores were in the areas of “communication and interaction with home” and “sensitivity to language.” Four of the lowest scores were in the area of communication and interaction with home, which assessed counselor confidence in communicating school-related information to the families of English Language Learners. Four additional questions were in the area of sensitivity to language. These questions evaluated counselors’ perceived ability to use a second language to communicate with English Language Learners. This area also included questions that measured school counselors’ ability to assess how language may be influencing the learning experiences of English Language Learners.

School Level

The independent variable “school setting” included four levels: elementary, middle, high school and K-12. The researcher conducted a one-way analysis of variance to compare the effect of school level on school counselor self-efficacy with English Language Learners. The mean SC-SELL scores for elementary school counselors were slightly higher ($M = 2.85$, $SD = .439$) than those for middle school ($M = 2.79$, $SD = .524$), high school ($M = 2.83$, $SD = .474$) or K-12 settings ($M = 2.65$, $SD = .494$). There was not a significant effect of school level on counselor self-efficacy at the $p < .05$ level, $F(3, 196) = .855$, $p = .465$. The difference in means between school levels was not significant.

U.S. Region

English Language Learners attend school in all 50 U.S. states. Because the populations, histories and backgrounds of those students vary across the country, U.S. region should be considered when measuring school counselor self-efficacy with English Language Learners. Participants worked in the Midwestern, North Atlantic, Southern and Western regions. A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to compare the effect of U.S. region on school counselor
self-efficacy with English Language Learners. School counselors in the Southern \((M = 2.93, SD = .473)\) and Western \((M = 2.93, SD = .489)\) regions had higher mean scores than counselors in the Midwestern \((M = 2.68, SD = .442)\) and North Atlantic \((M = 2.76, SD = .556)\) regions of the U.S.

There was a significant effect of U.S. region on school counselor self-efficacy at the \(p < .05\) level, \(F(3, 197) = 4.383, p = .005\). Due to the statistically significant result, a Tukey post-hoc test was computed. The Tukey resulted in statistically significant differences in mean scores between school counselors in the Midwestern \((M = 2.68, SD = .442)\) and Southern \((M = 2.93, SD = .472)\) regions. There were also statistically significant differences in mean scores between school counselors in the Midwestern \((M = 2.68, SD = .442)\) and Western \((M = 2.93, SD = .478)\) regions. School counselors in the Southern and Western regions had higher self-efficacy scores than counselors in the Midwest. There were no significant differences in self-efficacy scores between counselors in the North Atlantic region \((M = 2.76, SD = .557)\) and counselors in the Midwestern, Southern or Western regions.

**School Counselor Race/ Ethnicity**

Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines and Johnston (2008) found that school counselors self efficacy and training can be influenced by race. School counselors of color’s personal experiences influenced their perceptions about their ability to work with diverse student populations. Asian, Black, Hispanic, Multiracial, Native American and White. A one-way analysis of variance was computed to compare differences in school counselor SC-SELL scores by race. Differences were measured by the racial categories listed above. There were statistically significant differences in SC-SELL scores by race at the \(p < .05\) level, \(F(5, 195) = 6.975, p = .000\).
As a result of the statistically significant result a Tukey post-hoc test was completed to
determine where there were differences in scores. The Tukey resulted in statistically significant
differences in scores between Latino school counselors \( (M = 3.32, SD = .505) \) and Caucasian
school counselors \( (M = 2.70, SD = .424) \), African American school counselors \( (M = 2.92, SD =
.499) \) and Asian school counselors \( (M = 2.47, SD = .261) \). Latino school counselors’ SC-SELL
scores were significantly higher than those of Caucasian, African American and Asian school
counselors. There were also statistically significant differences in scores between African
American school counselors \( (M = 2.92, SD = .499) \) and Caucasian school counselors \( (M = 2.70,
SD = .424) \). African American school counselors yielded higher SC-SELL scores than their
Caucasian counterparts.

**Size of English Language Learner Population**

English Language Learners attend schools in each state. Student experiences are often
influenced by the number of English Language Learners enrolled at their specific school. The
size of English Language Learner populations should be examined when measuring school
counselor self-efficacy. The means and standard deviations for the size of English Language
Learner populations are included in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of ELL Population</th>
<th>Size ((n))</th>
<th>Mean ((M))</th>
<th>Standard Deviation ((SD))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (1-30 percent)</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (31-60 percent)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (61-100 percent)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to determine the impact of size of English
Language Learner population on school counselor self-efficacy with English Language Learners.
There was a significant effect of size of English Language Learner population on school
counselor self-efficacy at the p < .05 level, F(2, 197) = 15.06, p = .000. Due to the statistically
significant result, a Tukey post-hoc test was computed. The Tukey resulted in statistically
significant differences in mean scores between school counselors with small English Language
Learner populations (M = 2.72, SD = .429) and school counselors with medium (M = 3.07, SD =
.505) and large English Language Learner populations (M = 3.21, SD = .527). School counselors
with larger English Language Learner populations had higher self-efficacy scores than
counselors with smaller English Language Learner populations.

Language

School counselors have diverse backgrounds; some school counselors speak one
language, while others speak several. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare
differences in school counselor self-efficacy between school counselors who spoke only one
language and those who spoke two or more languages.

There was a significant difference in SC-SELL scores between participants who spoke
two or more languages (M = 2.98, SD = .567) and participants who spoke only one language (M
= 2.75, SD = .420); t(194) = 2.75, p = .007. School counselors who spoke a second language had
significantly higher self-efficacy scores (M = 2.98, SD = .567) than school counselors who spoke
only one language (M = 2.75, SD = .420).

Personal Training with English Language Learners

School counselors are required to take multicultural counseling courses in their graduate
training programs; however, training dealing specifically with English Language Learners is not
required. Some counselors indicated that they pursued additional courses or life experiences that
contributed to their knowledge about English Language Learners. The variable of personal
training with English Language Learners encompassed nine levels: no training, language
courses, ESOL courses, experience abroad, district training, outside workshop or conference, personal identification as English Language Learners, on the job experience and multiple experiences. A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to compare the effect of prior training with English Language Learners on school counselor self-efficacy.

Personal training did not have a significant effect on school counselor self-efficacy scores. The findings were not statistically significant at the p < .05 level F(7, 109) = .735, p = .643. Several levels of training had differing means. Participants who participated in study abroad experiences had the highest mean scores (M = 3.19, SD = .504). Counselors who identified as English Language Learners also had high mean scores (M = 3.01, SD = .524). School counselors who took part in language courses also had larger mean scores (M = 2.90, SD = .524). While these findings were informative, they were not significant.

The results of the one-way analysis of variance did not account for the self-efficacy scores of school counselors without personal training with English Language Learners. A t-test was conducted to measure significance between school counselors who pursued personal training with English Language Learners and school counselors who did not pursue personal training. There was a significant effect for personal training with English Language Learners t(192) = 4.54, p < .05, with counselors with personal training receiving higher self-efficacy scores (M = 2.94, SD = .474) than counselors without personal training with English Language Learners (M = 2.64, SD = .446).

A t-test was also conducted to measure significance between school counselors who received English Language Learner training from their school districts and school counselors who did not receive this training. There was no significant effect for counselors who received English Language Learner training from their school districts, t(192) = 1.12, p > .05. While
counselors with school district training had higher mean scores ($M = 2.87$, $SD = .465$) than counselors without training ($M = 2.79$, $SD = .479$), the differences were not statistically significant.

**Training Opportunities**

The training opportunities school counselors most desired were analyzed by creating a frequency distribution. Frequency distributions illustrate how often scores occur (Salkind, 2007). Participants indicated that they were interested in pursuing various types of learning opportunities related to English Language Learners. Approximately 77% ($n = 155$) of participants indicated that they would definitely attend training about counseling options that do not rely on language. A majority of participants, 67.8% ($n = 137$), reported that they would definitely attend training addressing the psychosocial needs of immigrants. A large segment of the sample, 65.3% ($n = 132$), also indicated that they would definitely attend training about the cultural practices of different cultural groups.

In contrast, only 31.8% ($n = 63$) of participants reported that they would definitely attend a workshop describing training for paraprofessionals to serve English Language Learners. When asked which continuing education training opportunity was most important, 25% ($n = 70$) of participants identified learning about the cultural practices of different racial and ethnic group as most important. Twenty-one percent of participants identified learning about counseling practices that do not rely on language as the most important training opportunity, and only 5.4% ($n = 15$) of participants selected training paraprofessionals to work with English Language Learners as the most important training opportunity. A small percentage of the sample, 7.9% ($n = 22$), identified learning about the impact of language on therapy as the training opportunity needed most. The training needs identified by participants are detailed in Tables 4 and 5.
Table 4
Continuing Education Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Size (n)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural practices of different racial/ethnic groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely attend</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might attend</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not attend</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of bilingualism on learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely attend</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might attend</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not attend</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second language acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely attend</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might attend</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not attend</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of language on therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely attend</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might attend</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not attend</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training paraprofessionals to serve English Language Learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely attend</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might attend</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not attend</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling options that do not rely on language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely attend</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might attend</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not attend</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about psychosocial needs of immigrant students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely attend</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might attend</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not attend</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another need serving English Language Learners not listed on this instrument.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely attend</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Might attend</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would not attend</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Continuing Education Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural practices of different racial/ethnic groups</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of bilingualism on learning</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second language acquisition</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of language on therapy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training paraprofessionals to serve English Language Learners</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling options that do not rely on language</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information about psychosocial needs of immigrant students</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another need serving English Language Learners not listed on this instrument</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

This chapter has presented the quantitative findings of this study. Descriptions of the school counselor participants and their work settings were presented based on their questionnaire responses. The results of five one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were also presented. These tests were conducted to measure the differences in participant scores on the School Counselor Self-Efficacy with English Language Learner scale. Next, the findings of two t-tests were provided to examine the impact of personal and school district training on School Counselor Self-Efficacy with English Language Learner scores. Finally, the results of a frequency distribution were presented. These findings identified the training opportunities school counselors believed would be most beneficial for their work with English Language Learners. The implications of these findings are discussed in the next chapter.
Figure 2 School Counselor Training Needs
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter will discuss the implications of the findings outlined in Chapter 4. A brief summary of the study and findings will be presented. The limitations of the study will be explicated, followed by a discussion of the study. Implications for school counselor practice and training will follow. The chapter will conclude with recommendations for future research.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this exploratory quantitative study was to describe school counselors’ beliefs about their ability to work with English Language Learners. The researcher also sought to identify the English Language Learner-related training needs of school counselors. At the outset of the study, members of the American School Counselor Association were solicited to complete an online questionnaire. Thirty-two members completed the questionnaire. In an effort to increase the size of the sample, the researcher solicited participation at the 2012 American School Counselor Association national conference in Minneapolis, MN. This resulted in 170 additional completed paper-and-pencil questionnaires. School counselors from each region of the U.S. were represented in this study.

A frequency distribution was conducted to illustrate school counselors’ levels of confidence in their work with English Language Learners. The majority of school counselors’ SC-SELL scores indicated that they were “confident” \( n = 132 \), or “very confident” \( n = 62 \) in their ability to work with English Language Learners. Participants achieved the highest SC-
SELL scores in the areas of developing relationships with students and consultation and collaboration. Counselors’ scored lowest in the areas of language sensitivity and communication and interaction with home.

Five one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were computed to measure differences in School Counselor Self-Efficacy with English Language Learner scores. Differences between school level, school counselor race, U.S. region, size of English Language Learner population and personal training with English Language Learners were measured. There was no significant effect of school level on counselor self-efficacy at the p < .05 level, F(3, 196) = .855, p = .465. There were statistically significant differences in SC-SELL scores by race at the p < .05 level, F(5, 195) = 6.975, p = .000. A Tukey post-hoc test was therefore conducted, resulting in statistically significant differences in scores between Latino school counselors (M = 3.32, SD = .505) and Caucasian school counselors (M = 2.70, SD = .424), African American school counselors (M = 2.92, SD = .499) and Asian school counselors (M = 2.47, SD = .261).

There was a significant effect of U.S. region on school counselor self-efficacy at the p < .05 level, F(3, 197) = 4.383, p = .005. A Tukey post-hoc test resulted in statistically significant differences in mean scores between school counselors in the Midwestern region, (M = 2.68, SD = .442), and the Southern region (M = 2.93, SD = .472).

There was a significant effect of size of English Language Learner population on school counselor self-efficacy at the p < .05 level, F(2, 197) = 15.06, p = .000. Due to the statistically significant result, a Tukey post-hoc test was conducted. The Tukey resulted in statistically significant differences in mean scores between school counselors with small English Language Learner populations (M = 2.72, SD = .429) and school counselors with medium (M = 3.07, SD =
and large English Language Learner populations ($M = 3.21, SD = .527$). Counselors with larger English Language Learner populations had higher SC-SELL scores than school counselors with smaller populations.

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to compare the effect of different types of training with English Language Learners on School Counselor Self-Efficacy with English Language Learner scores. Personal training did not have a significant effect on school counselor self-efficacy scores at the $p < .05$ level $F(7, 109) = .735, p = .643$. $T$-test statistics were calculated to measure differences in self-efficacy between school counselors with and without personal training. The results of the $t$-test indicated that there was a significant effect for personal training with English Language Learners, $t(192) = 4.54, p < .05$. Counselors with personal training had significantly higher self-efficacy scores ($M = 2.94, SD = .474$) than counselors without such training ($M = 2.64, SD = .446$). $T$-tests were also conducted to measure differences in SC-SELL scores between school counselors with school district-provided training about English Language Learners and those without this training. There was no significant effect for counselors who received English Language Learner training from their school districts $t(192) = 1.12, p > .05$.

A third $t$-test was computed to measure differences in school counselor self-efficacy with English Language Learners between school counselors who spoke only one language and those who spoke multiple languages. There was a significant difference in SC-SELL scores for multilingual participants ($M = 2.98, SD = .567$) and participants who spoke only one language ($M = 2.75, SD = .420$); $t(194) = 2.75, p = .007$. School counselors who spoke additional languages had significantly higher self-efficacy scores ($M = 2.98, SD = .567$) than school counselors who spoke only one language ($M = 2.75, SD = .420$).
Finally, a frequency distribution was conducted to identify the continuing education opportunities participants believed would help them most in their work with English Language Learners. The majority of participants indicated that they would definitely attend training about counseling options that do not rely on language (76.7%; \( n = 155 \)), the psychosocial needs of immigrants (67.8%; \( n = 137 \)) and the cultural practices of various cultural groups (65.3%; \( n = 132 \)). In contrast, only a small percentage of participants indicated that they wanted continuing education about training paraprofessionals to work with English Language Learners (31.2%; \( n = 63 \)) or about the impact of language on therapy (34.7%; \( n = 70 \)).

**Limitations**

This study had several limitations. One goal of this study was to hear from school counselors throughout the U.S. A systematic method was used to develop a representative sample of school counselors; however, only members of the American School Counselor Association were solicited. Members of the association may have more knowledge and interest in English Language Learners than non-members.

Sample representation was further influenced by the researcher’s attempt to increase the size of the sample. In an effort to generate a larger sample, the researcher attended the American School Counselor Association conference in Minneapolis, MN. This convenience sampling influenced the composition of the sample (Johnson & Christensen, 2008), as the conference took place within the Midwestern region and the majority of conference attendees were from this region. Consequently, the bulk of participation included school counselors from Midwestern states (\( n = 90 \)). This sample therefore may not reflect the diversity of the overall school counseling population and findings may not be generalizable to all practicing school counselors (Johnson & Christensen, 2008).
The majority of school counselors who participated in this study reported small English Language Learner populations, comprising one to 30 percent of the student body \((n = 158)\). These counselors’ SC-SELL scores were compared with those of a smaller number of school counselors who reported large English Language Learner populations of 31 to 60 percent \((n = 21)\) and 61 to 100 percent \((n = 21)\). These comparisons produced statistically significant results but must be viewed with caution due to the differences in the number of participants.

Finally, the data collected in this study occurred via a self-report questionnaire. Johnson and Christensen (2008) noted that self-reported measures are always subject to contamination, as self-reported information may not reflect how participants actually behave. Counselors may have altered their responses in efforts to look good in their work with English Language Learners (Johnson & Christensen, 2008).

**Discussion**

**School Counselor Self-Efficacy with English Language Learners**

The majority of participants in this study earned scores between three and four on the SC-SELL, indicating that they were “confident” or “very confident” in their ability to work with English Language Learners. This finding conflicts with earlier studies suggesting that school counselors were not as confident working with English Language Learners (Clemente & Collison, 2000; Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004). When examining the scores of individual questions on the SC-SELL however, participants had more or less confidence in different domains. While the SC-SELL was not designed to measure self-efficacy with English Language Learners in specific areas, the results of this analysis are informative.

School counselors in the current study attained high self-efficacy scores in the areas of relationships with students and consultation and collaboration. Questions in the relationships
with students category address school counselors’ confidence in their ability to develop trust and positive relationships with English Language Learners. Consultation and collaboration questions measured counselors’ beliefs about their ability to work with school staff and community members to develop programs and provide resources to meet the needs of English Language Learners and their families.

Participants achieved low self-efficacy scores in the areas of communication and interaction with home and sensitivity to language. Communication and interaction with home questions assessed counselors’ confidence in communicating school-related information to the families of English Language Learners. Sensitivity to language questions evaluated counselors’ perceived ability to use a second language to communicate with English Language Learners. This area also included questions that measured school counselors’ ability to assess how language may influence the learning experiences of English Language Learners. The low scores in these areas correspond with Schwallie-Giddis et al.’s (2004) findings. In their qualitative study, school counselors described work with parents and families as complex. They indicated that differences in language made communication more difficult and reported frustration due to limited language knowledge and limited access to translators.

Counselors’ low self-efficacy scores in communication and interaction with home and sensitivity to language are troubling. In a 2004 study, parents of English Language Learners cited language as the greatest hindrance to their participation in schools (Spalding, Carolino & Amen, 2004). To address their concerns, the authors recommended that school personnel communicate with parents in their native languages, encourage continued use of the native language at home and consider parents’ schedules when planning school-based activities. The
authors also proposed that schools send communications home in the native language and use qualified translators, bilingual home-school liaisons or multilingual hotlines to help communicate with parents.

Similarly, Bruhn et al. (2004) argued that to best meet the needs of English Language Learners, school counselors should “Be aware of the impact of environmental, cultural, and linguistic influences on learners’ development and achievement . . . Appreciate human diversity by providing equitable guidance and counseling services for all learners, including effectively communicating with ELL students and parents” (Bruhn et al., 2004, p. 151). The low scores on home communication and language sensitivity suggest that school counselors do not feel confident in their ability to engage in these activities. The findings in this study indicate that individual factors such as race, language and training, as well as the location and composition of student populations, may influence school counselor self-efficacy.

**School counselors’ race and language.** This study demonstrated that factors such as race, language and training can impact school counselor self-efficacy. Latino school counselors achieved higher SC-SELL scores than Asian, Black or White participants. Black participants also had higher SC-SELL scores than White school counselors. Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines & Johnston (2008) obtained similar results when measuring school counselor Multicultural Self-Efficacy. The authors argued that culturally diverse school counselors may rate themselves higher due to “in vivo” or real life experiences that make them more aware of and willing to address issues of diversity. The authors also explained that diverse school counselors tend to serve more diverse student caseloads (Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines & Johnston, 2008).

Each of these arguments corresponds with self-efficacy theory. Bandura (1986) argued that the most effective way to acquire self-efficacy was via mastery experiences. Mastery
experiences occur when individuals successfully complete tasks (Bandura, 1986). Counselors of
color may be more self-assured due to their own awareness of and sensitivity to issues of
diversity faced by English Language Learners. The Latino school counselors in this study may
be more confident due to their own experiences as or with English Language Learners.

Of the 13 Latino school counselors who took part in this study, nine (69%) spoke a
language other than English. Nineteen percent \( n = 23 \) of the Caucasian participants and 27% 
\( n = 15 \) of the Black participants spoke a second language. These counselors had higher self-
efficacy scores than their monolingual counterparts. School counselors’ language ability may
impact the types of activities they undertake and the interactions they have with English
Language Learners and their families. Smith-Adcock, Daniels, Lee, and Indelicato (2006) found
that bilingual school counselors provided cultural trust and effective communication for English
Language Learners and their families.

Ramos-Sanchez (2009) observed that the use of native language in counseling settings
allows clients to express feelings and convey messages in ways that a second language may not
permit. Multilingual school counselors may be more confident in their ability to connect with
English Language Learners due to their experience learning and using additional languages.
Scholars have also found that members of racial minority groups often pursued more
multicultural training courses than their Caucasian counterparts and received different types of
training in their counseling programs (Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines & Johnston, 2008).

Personal training with English Language Learners. There was a significant effect for
personal training with English Language Learners, \( t(192) = 4.54, p < .05 \). Counselors with
personal training had significantly higher self-efficacy scores \( M = 2.94, SD = .474 \) than
counselors without this training \( M = 2.64, SD = .446 \). School counselors who had pursued
additional training on their own had higher self-efficacy scores than those who did not pursue training. Personal training was identified by participants as language courses, English as a Second Language courses, experiences abroad and participation at conferences and workshops. Some counselors cited their own experiences, either on the job or as English Language Learners themselves, as providing knowledge that helped them in their work with English Language Learners.

Scholars have suggested that teacher, counselor and counselor trainees experiences with English Language Learner training result in increased educator confidence and better understanding of student needs. Jimenez-Silva, Olson and Hernandez (2012) found that pre-service teacher self efficacy with English Language Learners increased when they received readings and lectures about the policies and experiences impacting English Language Learners paired with interactive and meaningful activities with these students. Schwallie-Giddis et al. (2004) reported that counselors benefited from multicultural professional development about parents and families of English Language Learners. Similarly, Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2008) found that school counselors who had completed five to seven multicultural courses had higher levels of self-efficacy with multicultural students than school counselors who took only one or two courses.

Burnham, Mantero and Hooper (2009) described the results of an experiential training program for school counselor trainees. Roysircar, Gard, Hubbell and Ortega (2005) found comparable results after pairing counseling trainees with English Language Learners as mentors. The counseling participants reported a better understanding of the challenges English Language Learners faced after working with them one-on-one (Roysircar et al., 2005).
The results of the current study support the prior literature. School counselors who pursued English Language Learner-related training outside of their work were more confident in their ability to engage in specific behaviors related to these pupils. In contrast, there were no significant differences in self-efficacy with English Language Learner scores between school counselors who received school district training and those who did not. School district training may be mandatory for school counselors, and counselors who take part in district-mandated training may not have a personal interest in this type of instruction. Jimenez-Silva, Olson and Hernandez (2012) explained that simply presenting teachers with general knowledge about English Language Learners or only incorporating movies about diversity and craft activities were not enough to translate English Language Learner strategies into teaching and practice. Educators needed meaningful interaction with English Language Learners and important dialogue with peers and professors (Jimenez-Silva, Olson & Hernandez, 2012).

**U.S. region.** The findings in this study indicated that participants’ School Counselor Self-Efficacy with English Language Learners scores were influenced by U.S. region. Counselors in the Southern and Western U.S. had higher SC-SELL scores than their Midwestern counterparts. Based on these findings, school counselors working in the Southern and Western regions are more confident in their ability to work with English Language Learners than school counselors in the Midwest. The composition of the English Language Learner population may account for these differences in confidence.

Over the last few decades, the demographics of U.S. regions have been transformed. The southern and western regions are growing more quickly than the Northeast or Midwest (Crouch, 2012). Between 2000 and 2010, the population of the West grew by 14.3 percent and the
South’s population grew by 13.8 percent. In contrast, the Midwest grew by 3.9 percent and the Northeast by 3.2 percent (Crouch, 2012). The diversity within these regions has also changed.

Since the 1960s, the number of Latinos living in the South has grown continuously (Kuscera & Flaxman, 2012). The southern region has transformed from a mostly bi-racial society of African American and White residents to a more tri-racial society consisting of African American, Latino and White residents. Today Latino students account for nearly one-third of students enrolled in Southern public schools (Siegel-Hawley & Frankenberg, 2012). Similarly, the Western region is the most diverse region in the U.S (Kuscera & Flaxman, 2012), with Latinos comprising approximately 40 percent of students enrolled in Western public schools. From 1980 to 2009, the number of Asian students in the western region doubled (Kuscera & Flaxman, 2012). The differences in cultural background yield differences in the languages spoken by students in schools.

The languages spoken by English Language Learners differ by state. The Migration Policy Institute (2010a) identified 28 states with English Language Learners who spoke one predominant language. In 13 of those states, 80 percent or more of the English Language Learners spoke Spanish. Eleven of those states (AK, AL, AZ, CO, CA, ID, NC, NV, TX, UT and WY) are in the southern or western regions of the U.S. Twenty-five percent of the participants in this study (n = 51) practiced school counseling in one of those states. If the majority of students in a region have the same linguistic background, networks and resources may be in place to support students, schools and families (Callahan, Wilkinson & Muller, 2008).

In contrast, some states have more culturally and linguistically diverse English Language Learner populations, particularly in the Midwest. The Migration Policy Institute (2010c) identified 10 states with linguistically heterogeneous English Language Learner populations. In
these states, less than 50 percent of the English Language Learners spoke the most predominant language among English Language Learners (Migration Policy Institute, 2010a). Five of those states (MI, MN, ND, OH, SD) are in the Midwest. Approximately 24 percent of participants in this study (n = 49) work as school counselors in those states. The heterogeneity of the English Language Learner population in this region may make understanding the cultural and language needs of different students more challenging for school counselors.

**Size of the English Language Learner population.** There was a significant effect of the size of English Language Learner population on school counselor self-efficacy at the p < .05 level, F(9, 190) = 4.997, p = .000. A Tukey post-hoc test resulted in statistically significant differences for school counselors with larger English Language Learner populations. This finding suggests that counselors with larger English Language Learner populations are more confident in their ability to work with these students than those with smaller English Language Learner populations.

While English Language Learners attend schools in all 50 states, the number of English Language Learners enrolled in schools differs from state to state, and English Language Learners are not distributed equally across schools. In 2005, researchers determined that 70% of English Language Learners attended 10 percent of U.S. schools (Crouch, 2012). Callahan, Wilkinson and Muller (2009), however, argued that schools with large immigrant or English Language Learner populations tend to evolve to meet the needs of their students. The researchers found that in low immigrant-concentration ESL schools, immigrant students placed in English as a Second Language courses performed at significantly lower levels than their mainstream peers. The authors also determined that second-generation students benefitted most from English as a Second Language courses when they attended schools with many immigrant students.
Callahan, Wilkinson and Muller (2009) suggested that in schools with large English as a Second Language populations, placement in ESOL courses may ensure access to instruction by qualified educators. Students may also be placed in positions of respect and authority in classrooms and in the academic mainstream in these schools. This study suggests that larger English Language Learner populations may also yield environments that promote the development of several sources of self-efficacy for school counselors: mastery experiences, vicarious learning and social persuasion.

Bandura (1986) explicated that the most effective way to acquire self-efficacy is via mastery experiences. Mastery experiences occur when individuals successfully complete tasks (Bandura, 1986). School counselors with larger English Language Learner populations may have more exposure to linguistically diverse students than counselors with smaller populations, creating more opportunities for counselors to work with these students. While not every interaction may be successful, the larger population may provide more occasions for counselors to try to fruitfully engage with these students (Callahan, Wilkinson & Muller, 2009).

A larger population may also allow counselors to engage in vicarious learning. Vicarious learning or social modeling occurs when individuals witness peers engaging in a task effectively (Bandura, 1986). Bandura explained that when individuals see someone similar to themselves complete a task successfully, they believe that they also possess what is necessary to accomplish the same goal. School counselors in schools with large English Language Learner populations may observe their colleagues working successfully with linguistically diverse students and their families. While the school counselor’s role differs, counselors may nevertheless learn how to
engage with students effectively by watching their peers. School counselors may also observe colleagues working with English Language Learners in ways that are unproductive, and learn from those experiences.

Participants with larger English Language Learner populations may also attain higher School Counselor Self-Efficacy with English Language Learner scores as a result of social persuasion. Social persuasion occurs when individuals are verbally persuaded that they can be successful at something (Bandura, 1986). Bandura (1986) argued that individuals could be convinced that they had the skills to accomplish some task. While social persuasion is not as powerful as mastery experiences, this source of self-efficacy can still be influential. School counselors with larger English Language Learner populations may be persuaded by administrators or other school leaders that they “have what it takes” to successfully engage with their English Language Learner population.

**School Counselor Continuing Education Needs**

This study sought to identify the English Language Learner training and continuing education needs of practicing school counselors. Participants desired additional training about the cultural practices of various cultural and ethnic groups. The majority of participants indicated that they would definitely attend training about counseling options that do not rely on language (77%; n = 155), the psychosocial needs of immigrants (67.8%; n = 137) and the cultural practices of different cultural groups (65.3%; n = 132). This finding corresponds to previous literature describing the professional development needs of school counselors working with English Language Learners (Schwallie-Giddis et al., 2004; Paredes, 2011).

This study also identified several professional development opportunities participants were less interested in pursuing. A small percentage of the sample, 6.4% (n = 13), identified the
impact of language on therapy as the training opportunity needed most. Approximately seven percent of participants \( (n = 15) \) identified language acquisition as the most needed training. A larger percentage of participants, \( (15.8\%; \; n = 32) \) identified the effects of bilingualism on learning as a training option needed most. In contrast, cultural practices of different racial groups and counseling options that do not rely on language each received 25 and 20 percentages of training interest respectively. The less significant amount of participant interest in how language is learned and influences English Language Learner school experiences are surprising, principally because the lowest school counselor self-efficacy scores were in the areas of “Communication and Interaction with Home” and “Language Sensitivity.”

Newman, Samimy and Romstedt (2010) identified the professional development needs of educators who work with English Language Learners. The authors recommended that in addition to learning about students’ cultures, educators need to learn the basics of second language acquisition (Newman, Samimy & Romstedt, 2010). Jimenez-Silva, Olson & Hernandez (2012) also argued for incorporation of language theory and policy in training educators to work with English Language Learners. In light of this literature, the author of the current study was surprised that more participants did not identify the need for linguistic training as a continuing education need, especially since the lowest counselor self-efficacy scores were in the areas of communication and interaction with home and sensitivity to language.

**Implications**

This study has several implications. The report explores school counselor self-efficacy with English Language Learners. Self-efficacy identifies a belief in one’s ability to do something. Overall, the majority of school counselors in this study were “confident” or “very confident” in their ability to work with English Language Learners. Participants are very
confident in questions related to “Relationship with students” but achieved low self efficacy scores in the areas of “Communication and interaction with home” and “Sensitivity to language.” These findings correspond to the literature but are troubling since the majority of participants did not identify continuing education in areas related to home communication and language sensitivity (Schwallie-Giddis et al, 2005; Spalding, Carolina & Amen, 2004). In order to take part in new vision, advocacy oriented school counseling with English Language Learners, counselors must communicate with families and understand how language influences English Language Learner experiences in school (Behnke, Gonzalez & Cox, 2010). Without high levels of self efficacy with English Language Learners, school counselors may avoid the tasks needed by these students (Jimenez-Silva, Olson & Hernandez, 2012).

Jimenez-Silva, Olson & Hernandez (2012) argued that effective training will boost educator self-efficacy with English Language Learners. The authors contended that the most effective training included exposure to relevant literature about theoretical principles and policies impacting English Language Learners, relevant classroom discussion, modeling effective English Language Learner strategies within course lectures, student opportunities to participate in those strategies, and meaningful interaction with English Language Learners. Pre-service teachers also benefitted from opportunities to dialogue and reflect on those experiences with peers. These measures suggest that relevant information in conjunction with meaningful experiences yield higher levels of self efficacy. This literature corresponds with the findings in this study.

School counselors with relevant or meaningful experiences with English Language Learners, had higher self-efficacy scores than school counselors without those experiences. Factors such as school counselor race or language; large English Language Learner populations
within a school counselors work setting and personal training with English Language Learners each contributed to school counselors’ self efficacy. While training school counselors and counselor trainees to work with English Language Learners, opportunities for meaningful experiences with English Language Learners should be included. These experiences should occur in conjunction with analysis, reflection and discussion of relevant literature and policy information. Counseling programs may need to consider offering additional coursework or opportunities that provide students experiences with English Language Learners. These courses may need to be tailored address the trends and changing demographics within a state or region. These steps will equip school counselors with the tools they need to understand the experiences of English Language Learners, the policies that influence their schooling and the strategies that are most effective. School counselors can then effectively advocate for all students.

Future Research

Research yields additional questions and this study generated many areas for further inquiry. This study examined school counselor self-efficacy with English Language Learners. The SC-SELL was a useful instrument in measuring overall school counselor self efficacy with English Language Learners. Additional instruments that measure school counselor self-efficacy or knowledge in English Language Learner related areas specific areas such as “Use of language in counseling” or “Home and school Interaction” may provide more information about where counselors need additional support.

This study also highlighted the differences occurring in U.S. Regions. Additional research that measures counselor self-efficacy and continuing education training needs should be
conducted in different U.S. regions and different states. These studies may inform counselor educators and counseling supervisors about the types of training most needed by school counselors in their geographic areas.

This study emphasized the impact that counselor training and professional development can have on their effectiveness with English Language Learners. Additional research about Counselor educator and counselor supervisor self-efficacy and training needs with English Language Learners is essential. Counseling training programs should also be examined in efforts to understand how counselors are being prepared to work with English Language Learners.

Finally, participants in this study shared their beliefs in their ability to engage in tasks with English Language Learners. The actual work school counselors engage in was not examined. Future studies should ascertain how school counselors are actually working with English Language Learners in schools.

**Conclusion**

School counselors are in prime positions to advocate for all students (Portman, 2009). English Language Learners can benefit from advocacy oriented school counselors, but counselors are not likely to engage in activities English Language Learners need without high levels of self-efficacy. This study shows that factors that influence school counselors such as race, U.S. Region, size of English Language Learner population and language each influence school counselor self-efficacy. Counselors are not as confident in areas related to language sensitivity and home and school communication. School counselor training is essential in increasing these levels of self efficacy. Training programs and professional development must be prepared to provide counselors with experiential activities they need to have meaningful interactions with English Language Learners. Unless school counselors have access to these
experiences, English Language Learners may not receive the effective school counseling they need and deserve. Some scholars have already dismissed school counselors from the equation, but school counselors are called to do what needs to be done to help all students.
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APPENDIX A

SCHOOL COUNSELOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNER ASSESSMENT

Please identify your race.
Please identify your gender.
Which state do you work in?

1. How many total years have you worked as a school counselor?

2. Have you counseled or worked as an educator in other states? If yes, which ones?

3. What academic level do you currently work in?
   Elementary _____  Middle _____  High _____  Other _____

4. What grade levels do you serve?
   K__  1__  2__  3__  4__  5__  6__  7__  8__  9__  10__  11__  12__

5. How many students are on your caseload?

6. What percentage of these students are English Language Learners? ______ percent

7. What are the most common ethnic groups among your English Language Learners?
   Most common:
   Second most common:
   Third most common:

8. What languages are spoken in your school?
9. Has the population of your school changed in the last ten years?
_________________________

10. Has the population of your school district changed in the last ten years?
________________________

11. Do you speak a language other than English? Yes _______ No ________
    If you answered yes, what language do you speak?
    __________________________________________

12. If you do not speak a language other than English, do you use the services of a bilingual counselor?  Yes _______  No _________

13. Do you use interpreters to communicate with parents who do not speak English? Yes __  No __

14. What training have you had with English Language Learners?
    Preservice  Inservice  Travel  Family

15. Has your school district provided counselors training on English Language Learners?
    Yes__  No__

16. Given the opportunity to participate in continuing education training that addressed services for English Language Learners please rate the following items with the following choices:
    Definitely attend____  Might attend____  Would not attend____

    Please choose the most important from this list
    a. Cultural practices of different racial/ethnic groups
    b. Effects of bilingualism on learning
    c. Second Language acquisition
    d. Impact of Language on Therapy
    e. Training paraprofessionals to serve English Language Learners
    f. Counseling options that do not rely on language
    g. Information about psychosocial needs of immigrant students
    h. Another need serving English Language Learners not listed on this instrument.

17. Would you like to clarify any of your responses?

18. Is there any other information that you would like to share about your experiences with English Language Learners?
The following statements pertain to school counseling tasks related to working with English Language Learners (ELLs). Indicate your level of confidence in completing each stated task. Give ratings that you actually believe to be true rather than those that you wish were true. Unless otherwise specified, respond to each statement relative to English Language Learners.

1 = not at all confident
2 = somewhat confident
3 = confident
4 = very confident

Q71. I can praise ELLs for their accomplishments using a phrase in their native language

Q3. I can identify ways how students communicate at home may differ from the school norms

Q4. I can communicate with the parents of ELLs regarding their child's achievement

Q21. I can develop a personal relationship with non-ELL students

Q53. I can promote the development of a positive attitude toward school among ELL students

Q14. I can find ways to communicate with a family when no interpreter is available

Q46. I can help ELLs feel like important members of the school

Q74. I can have empathy for the process of second language acquisition

Q51. I can ensure a safe environment for all students in my school

Q57. I can identify how my linguistic/cultural background and experiences have influenced the way I think
Q44. I can use alternative counseling methods to meet student needs.

Q25. I can recognize how the viewpoints and experiences of linguistically different students and families are similar or different from my own.

Q45. I can help students feel like important members of the school.

Q76. I can access local immigrant and refugee services available to help me better work with ELLs.

Q40. I can integrate family and religious issues in the career counseling process.

Q68. I can have documents translated into first language of ELLs’ parents.

Q42. I can adjust my helping style when it is appropriate for a linguistically different student.

Q43. I can be flexible in my delivery of interventions relative to student needs.

Q37. I can develop culturally sensitive interventions that promote postsecondary planning for ELLs.

Q54. I can promote positive attitudes about ELLs among school members.

Q20. I can develop a personal relationship with ELL students.

Q26. I can promote the development of positive self-identities among ELL students.

Q2. I can establish working alliances with parents of ELLs.

Q7. I can identify when I need to involve an interpreter in order to accurately communicate with a linguistically different parent or guardian.

Q24. I can obtain information about my students’ cultural background.

Q84. I can advocate on behalf of ELL students to administrators.

Q28. I can design interventions to match students’ needs.

Q83. I can use data to advocate for students.

Q38. I can conceptualize accurately needs of ELLs.

Q39. I can develop dropout prevention interventions targeted at ELLs.

Q36. I can implement a program which enables all students to make informed career decisions.

Q80. I can provide professional development to school staff on addressing needs of ELLs.

Q61. I can recognize when my speech and tone influence my relationship with linguistically different students.

Q27. I can recognize individual differences among ELLs.

Q8. I can connect parents of ELLs with available resources in the community.

Q77. I can recognize the importance of school-family-community partnerships to student achievement.

Q65. I can nonverbally communicate effectively with ELLs.

Q75. I can work with community leaders and members to assist with concerns of linguistically different student and families.

Q63. I can recognize when language ability impacts student achievement.

Q52. I can help ELL and non-ELL students develop positive relationships with each other.

Q68. I can have documents translated into first language of ELLs’ parents.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q62. I can recognize when language ability impacts student learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q87. I can advocate for fair testing and the appropriate use of testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q81. I can access resources to understand more about a particular ELL subgroup (e.g., Liberians, Mexicans, Vietnamese)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35. I can effectively address the academic needs of ELLs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q47. I can identify ways that the school culture (e.g., values, norms, and practices) is different from my students’ home culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q82. I can find ways to better educate myself about a particular ELL subgroup (e.g.,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Liberians, Mexicans, Vietnamese)

Q6. I can structure parent-teacher conferences so that the meeting is not intimidating.

Q23. I can build a sense of trust in my linguistically different students.

Q41. I can identify when specific cultural beliefs influence students and families' response to counseling.
APPENDIX C

TEACHER SURVEY

Which state do you work in? _________________________

1. How many total years have you been working as a speech-language pathologist? ____

2. Do you work ____ part time? ____ full time?

3. How many students are currently on your caseload? ____

4. What are you students’ ages? (can check more than 1)
   ____ 0–3 years ____ 4–5 years ____ 5–12 years ____ 12+ years

5. What percentage of these students are English language learners (ELLs) who are learning
   English as a second or third language? ________ percent

6. What are the three most common ethnic groups among your ELL students? (e.g., Hispanic)
   most common _________________________________
   second most common ___________________________
   third most common _____________________________

7. Of the total number of ELL students on your caseload, approximately what percentage of them
do you provide treatment for in the following areas? (percentages should add up to 100%)
   ____% articulation ____% voice ____% language
   ____% hearing loss (aural rehabilitation) ____% fluency ____% other

8. Do you speak a language other than English with enough proficiency to conduct assessment
   and/or treatment in that language? _____ yes ____ no

   If you answered “yes,” which language(s) do you speak? __________________________

9. If you do not speak a language other than English, do you use the services of a bilingual
   speech-language pathologist? ____ yes ____ no

   If you answered “yes,” which language(s) does this person speak? ____________________

10. What specific problems do you encounter most frequently in assessing and treating ELL
    students with communication disorders? Please indicate according to the following format:
1 = very frequent 2 = frequent 3 = somewhat frequent 4 = somewhat infrequent 5 = infrequent
a. ___ Lack of appropriate less biased assessment instruments
b. ___ Don’t speak the language of the student being assessed
c. ___ Lack of knowledge about the culture of the student being assessed
d. ___ Lack of knowledge about the nature of second language acquisition
e. ___ Lack of knowledge about the phenomenon of bilingualism
f. ___ Lack of availability of other professionals who speak the students’ languages
g. ___ Difficulty distinguishing a language difference from a language disorder
h. ___ Lack of interpreters who speak the necessary languages to provide services
i. ___ Lack of knowledge of developmental norms in students’ primary languages
j. ___ Other (Please describe briefly)

11. Do you use an interpreter to assess ELL students with potential communication disorders? ___ yes ___ no

12. If you answered “yes” to #11, do you use interpreters to translate standardized tests in English into the student’s primary language for testing? ___ yes ___ no

13. Do you use an interpreter to communicate with parents who do not speak English? ___ yes ___ no

14. When you assess ELL students with potential communication disorders, what measures do you use?
___ standardized tests administered in English
___ standardized English tests translated into the student’s primary language by an interpreter
___ standardized tests in the student’s primary language (e.g., the CELF-3 in Spanish)
___ informal, nonstandardized measures administered in English
___ informal, nonstandardized measures administered in the student’s primary language

15. Do you use dynamic assessment procedures when assessing ELL students? ____ yes ____ no

16. Have you had any speech-language pathology coursework that addressed issues in serving bilingual students? ___ no ___ yes, a whole course ___ parts of one or more courses (e.g., a lecture)

17. Given the opportunity to participate in continuing education training that addressed services to ELL students with communication disorders, please rate the following items in terms of your interest level by circling the appropriate numbers: 1 = extremely interested, 2 = quite interested, 3 = moderately interested, 4 = mildly interested, 5 = not at all interested
a. First/primary language developmental norms 1 2 3 4 5
b. Cultural practices of various groups 1 2 3 4 5
c. Code switching 1 2 3 4 5
d. Effects of bilingualism on language learning 1 2 3 4 5
e. Second language acquisition 1 2 3 4 5
f. Appropriate assessment procedures and materials 1 2 3 4 5
g. Treatment/therapy procedures and materials 1 2 3 4 5
h. Training paraprofessionals to serve ELL students 1 2 3 4 5
i. Use of interpreters 1 2 3 4 5
j. ESL/English proficiency testing 1 2 3 4 5
k. Accent reduction 1 2 3 4 5
l. Less biased methods and materials for distinguishing language differences from language disorders 1 2 3 4 5

19. Please rank the following in order of importance in terms of how our field could best prepare us to carry out less biased assessment of and treatment for ELL students with communication disorders:
1 = very important, 2 = important, 3 = somewhat important, 4 = somewhat unimportant, 5 = unimportant
a. ____ more workshops/inservices offered by school districts
b. ____ more coursework at the university level
c. ____ more convention (state and national) presentations
d. ____ more journal articles in this area
e. Other ____________________________

20. If you believe that it is important for universities to offer more coursework in the area of service delivery to multicultural students who are ELLs, how should this coursework be offered?
___ entire undergraduate course ___ entire graduate course __ infuse into existing courses

21. If this survey had been sent to you electronically (e.g., via e-mail or over the Internet) at work, would you have been able to complete the survey and send it back? _____ yes  ____ no
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APPENDIX D

INFORMED CONSENT

Dear Professional School Counselor:

I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Counseling and Student Development at the University of Georgia. As part of the requirements for my doctorate in Counselor Education, I am conducting a research study involving professional school counselors. If you are currently working as a counselor in any K-12 setting, I invite you to participate in a research study entitled “Professional School Counselor Self-Efficacy with English Language Learners.” The purpose of this study is to assess the beliefs school counselors have regarding their ability to work with English Language Learners.

Should you choose to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete an online questionnaire at the following link: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/8RQG85P. The questionnaire should take less than 30 minutes of your valuable time. Your involvement in the study is strictly voluntary and you may choose not to participate or to stop at any time without penalty. Your responses are anonymous and will not be individually identifiable. The results of the research study may be published, but your name will not be used. In fact, the published results will be presented in summary form only. Your identity will not be associated with your responses in any published format.

There are no risks or discomforts associated with this study, and your participation in this project contributes to the research about school counselors and English Language Learners. If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to call me, Leonissa Johnson, at (843) 453-3535 or send an e-mail to lvj@uga.edu. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to The Chairperson, University of Georgia Institutional Review Board, 612 Boyd GSRC, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; telephone (706) 542-3199; email address irb@uga.edu.

Thank you for your consideration! Please keep this consent form for your records.

Sincerely,

Leonissa Valrie Johnson
APPENDIX E

INFORMED CONSENT 2

Dear Professional School Counselor:

I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Counseling and Student Development at the University of Georgia. As part of the requirements for my doctorate in Counselor Education, I am conducting a research study involving professional school counselors under the direction of Dr. Pam Paisley in the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services at the University of Georgia. As a school counselor working with English Language Learners in a K-12 setting, you have been selected to take part in this study entitled “Professional School Counselor Self-Efficacy with English Language Learners.” You were identified through your attendance at the American School Counselor Association conference. The purpose of this study is to assess the beliefs school counselors have regarding their ability to work with English Language Learners.

Should you choose to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete this questionnaire. The questionnaire should take less than 30 minutes of your valuable time. Your involvement in the study is strictly voluntary and you may choose not to participate or to stop at any time without penalty or loss of benefits which you would otherwise be entitled. Your responses will be confidential. At the conclusion of the questionnaire you will be asked if you are interested in being interviewed at a later time. Saying yes and providing contact information may threaten data security since you will be creating a direct identifier to your results and the data. Any identifiable information that is obtained in connection with this study will be seen only by the researcher. At the conclusion of this study, all identifiers will be destroyed by the researcher. The results of the research study may be published, but your name will not be used. In fact, the published results will be presented in summary form only. Your identity will not be associated with your responses in any published format.

There are no more than minimal risks or discomforts associated with this study. Some participants may feel uncomfortable acknowledging limited awareness or skill in their work with English Language Learners, however individually identifiable responses will remain confidential. You may also skip questions that you do not feel comfortable answering. Your involvement in this project contributes to the research about school counselors and English Language Learners. The results of this study will enhance our understanding of the areas school counselors believe they are equipped to adequately serve English Language Learners. Your participation may increase your awareness of the practices school counselors may engage in with English Language Learners. The results may also inform counselor educators, administrators and supervisors about the training and professional development needs of school counselors.
As an incentive for participation, you can enter a drawing for one of three $50 Gift Cards. Each participant has an equal chance of receiving one of the incentives. If you choose not to take part in this study, you are still eligible to enter the drawing by completing a drawing entry form. The researcher will request an email address from all drawing participants in order to contact winners. This may limit participant confidentiality in the study. Identifiable information will be destroyed at the conclusion of the study. Winners will be notified by July 31, 2012.

The researcher will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the conference.

If you have any questions about this research project after the conference, please feel free to call me, Leonissa Johnson, at (843) 453-3535 or send an e-mail to lvj@uga.edu. You may also contact Pam Paisley at (706) 542-4142 or send an email to ppaisley@uga.edu. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to The Chairperson, University of Georgia Institutional Review Board, 629 Boyd GSRC, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; telephone (706) 542-3199; email address irb@uga.edu.

Thank you for your consideration! Please keep this consent form for your records.

Sincerely,
Leonissa Valrie Johnson

*My signature below indicates that the researchers have answered all of my questions to my satisfaction and that I consent to volunteer for this study. I have been given a copy of this form.*

Signature