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ABSTRACT

Social justice advocacy is a major aspect of the work of professional counselors and counselor educators (ACA, 2014; ASCA, 2010; CACREP, 2016; CAS, 2011). Research has demonstrated that certain demographic variables (i.e., completion of a graduate level social justice course, political ideology, religion and spirituality, and membership in marginalized groups) may be significant factors in counselors’ social justice advocacy engagement. Research has also shown that many counselors choose a counseling career out of a sense of career calling and interest in social justice advocacy (Duffy, Foley et al., 2012). This study explored the relationship between career calling and social justice advocacy. The participants in this study consisted of 90 counselors who are employed in P-16 educational settings, have a graduate degree in counseling or related field, and are members of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) and/or the American College Counseling Association (ACCA). Participants completed a demographics questionnaire and three instruments: the Brief Calling Scale (BCS; Dik, Eldridge et al., 2012), the Calling and Vocation Questionnaire (CVQ; Dik, Eldridge et al.,
2012), and the Social Justice Advocacy Scale (SJAS; Dean, 2009). The results of $t$-tests comparing this population’s career calling scores to others in literature indicated that P-16 counselors strongly identify as having the presence of a career calling to the profession. Results of a multiple regression analysis indicated that career calling predicts engagement in social justice advocacy. Finally, results of a multiple regression analysis indicated that the P-16 counselor who is most likely to engage in social justice advocacy is one who; (a) has completed a graduate course(s) with all of these words in the title(s); advocacy, multicultural, and social justice, (b) identifies as moderate or liberal in political ideology, and (c) ascribes to having a calling to a counseling career. Implications of this study and suggestions for future research are discussed.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Social justice advocacy is a major aspect of the work of professional counselors and counselor educators (ACA, 2014; ASCA, 2010; CACREP, 2016; CAS, 2015). Moreover, the modern counseling profession grew out of the pioneering, social justice-inspired career counseling work of Frank Parsons and Jesse Davis in communities, schools, and colleges (Hoyt, 2001; Pope, 2000; Savickas, Pope, & Niles, 2011). Despite counseling’s foundation in social justice, there has been little study of factors that motivate counselors to engage in social justice advocacy (Dashjian, 2014). In the few extant studies of factors that lead counselors to integrate social justice advocacy into their work, researchers have reported tentative factors such as various minority statuses, political ideology, religion and spirituality, and graduate coursework (Caldwell & Vera, 2010; Linnemeyer, 2009; Steele, Bischof, & Craig, 2014). However, an additional factor that has yet to be empirically explored is the ancient concept of career calling. Such inquiry is important, given the recent research indicating that counselors may enter the profession from a desire to be a social justice change agent and to pursue a sense of career calling (Duffy, Foley et al., 2012; Hall, Burkholder, & Sterner, 2014).

Connection of Career Calling and Social Justice

The social justice movement in career counseling has a lengthy history. In fact, the inverse is more accurate – career counseling had its birth in the social justice movement of the late 19th century (Pope, Briddick, & Wilson, 2013; Stebleton & Eggerth,
Several well-known contemporary counseling organizations can trace their lineage directly to the social justice-inspired career counseling movement of Frank Parsons: National Career Development Association (NCDA), National Board of Certified Counselors (NBCC), American Counseling Association (ACA), and Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) (Lara, 2004; Savickas, Pope, & Niles, 2011; Zytowski, 2001). Social justice has been an important quality of career counseling for more than one hundred years, and career counseling has been a central practice of counselors.

Contemporary research on career calling began in the 1990’s as researchers investigated applications of calling in ways that could accommodate both religious and non-religious perspectives (Davidson & Caddell, 1994; Galles & Lenz, 2013). This exploration opened the way for the phenomenon of career calling to become an object of interest to researchers in the field of career counseling (Dik, Duffy, & Eldridge, 2009; Duffy, Dik, & Blustein, 2010; Hall, Burkholder, & Sterner, 2014). Duffy and Dik (2013) asserted in their broad review of research on calling that “studies suggest that calling is a salient construct for a substantial proportion of college students and working adults” (p. 430). Therefore, career calling and social justice may share a relationship which holds implications for professional counselors.

The most apparent connection between career calling and social justice lies in their common emphasis on benefit to society. Scholars of both career calling and social justice promote this idea in terms of prosocial orientation (Dik, Duffy, & Steger, 2012) and harmony (Crethar, Rivera, & Nash, 2008). Research has even indicated that counselors first enter the profession from a sense of career calling and an interest in
social justice advocacy (Duffy, Foley et al., 2012). Therefore, the prosocial dimension of
the multi-dimensional construct of career calling may, indeed, be the fulcrum of
connection to social justice career counseling.

In addition to prosocial orientation, there is other overlap between social justice
and career calling. Both emphasize access and removal of barriers (Crethar, Rivera, &
Social justice emphasizes access for all individuals to vocational opportunities (i.e., job
and career), social opportunities (i.e., relationships and memberships), and educational
opportunities (Constantine, Hage, Kidaichi, & Bryant, 2007; Constantine, Miville,
Warren, Gainor, & Lewis-Coles, 2006). Barriers in the work world limit some
individuals, based on their personal characteristics, from obtaining an occupation from
which to derive a sense of job satisfaction, meaning, and purpose (Dik & Duffy, 2009).
Moreover, individuals who are deprived of living out a career calling are deprived feeling
a sense of job satisfaction, meaning, and purpose in their work (Duffy, Allan, Autin, &
Bott, 2013). Individuals’ access to following a calling to specific jobs and careers is
important to their well-being (Blustein, McWhirter, & Perry, 2005; Dik & Duffy, 2009).
Career calling, thus, may need to be considered as a part of P-16 counseling’s
comprehensive program and advocacy efforts toward helping students achieve their
career aspirations.

**Relevance of Career Calling to P-16 Counselors**

Literature about career calling was initially located in the discipline of religion,
where it remained for centuries (Hardy 1990; Placher, 2005; Weber, 1992). Near the end
of the twentieth century, researchers began studying the application of the concept of
career calling to various social science career fields: sociology (Bellah et al., 1985, 2007),
organizational behavior (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009; Elangovan, Pinder, & McLean, 2010; Hall & Chandler, 2005; Peterson et al., 2009), vocational psychology (Hunter, Dik, & Banning, 2010), counseling psychology (Duffy, Foley et al., 2012; Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007), and career counseling (Hall, Burkholder, & Sterner, 2014).

Scholars eventually expanded the definition of career calling beyond a merely religious or non-religious connotation (Dik & Duffy, 2009; Dobrow & Tosti-Kharas, 2011; Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, & Schwartz, 1997). This expanded view of career calling resulted in a rapid increase of inquiry into career calling and a modest foundation of literature consisting of position papers and research studies. However, there is a need for much more research across a range of disciplines using various research methods (Duffy & Dik, 2013). Although career calling research has grown over the past ten years in the fields of management and industrial/organizational psychology (Duffy, Allan, Bott, & Dik, 2014), there has been little to no research on individuals’ sense of calling to a career as a counselor (Hall, Burholder, & Sterner, 2014). This empirical study of career calling, therefore, among counselors can address this lack of research.

Career Calling as a Factor in Social Justice Advocacy

A small number of researchers have investigated factors that have contributed to counselors engaging in social justice advocacy (e.g., Caldwell & Vera, 2010; Linnemeyer, 2009; Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005; Steele, Bischof, & Craig, 2014; Ratts & Wood, 2011). Likewise, a few researchers of career calling have mentioned social justice in their studies (i.e., Dik & Duffy, 2009; Dik, Duffy, & Steger, 2012; Duffy, Allan, Autin, & Bott, 2013; Hall, Burkholder, & Sterner, 2014). Only one empirical study (i.e., Davidson & Caddell, 1994) included both social justice and career calling as variables for
comparison. However, researchers later raised questions about the reliability and validity of the instruments used in that study (Dik & Duffy, 2009). The two concepts, social justice and career calling, have been the exclusive focus of only one article – a conceptual paper by calling’s most prolific researchers (i.e., Dik, Duffy, & Steger, 2012). No strong empirical research is currently available on the relationship of social justice and career calling. An additional challenge to researching the connection between the two constructs lies in the fact that research on each construct, independent of the other, is in its formative years (Duffy & Dik, 2013; Manis, 2012). Research may even support the notion that career calling is a mediator of several domains within career development and social justice (Dik, Duffy, & Steger, 2012; Dik, Eldridge, Steger, & Duffy, 2012). Essentially, there is little research to inform a study of the relationship of the two constructs, especially applied to P-16 counselors. It follows, then, that there is opportunity for researchers to contribute to both fields of study and practice.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between career calling and social justice advocacy in counselors who are employed in P-16 educational settings and are members of the American College Counseling Association (ACCA) or the ASCA (American School Counselor Association). As such, this study will compare scores on a measure of career calling of the sample population to other populations reported in literature, career calling to social justice advocacy, and career calling to demographic factors identified in literature as having effect on social justice advocacy behaviors. This study will utilize three instruments in addition to a questionnaire: the Brief Calling Scale (BCS; Dik, Eldridge, Steger, & Duffy, 2012), the Calling and Vocation Questionnaire
(CVQ; Dik et al.), and the Social Justice Advocacy Scale (SJAS; Dean, 2009). By using these well-known instruments, this study will facilitate the field’s understanding of the possible relationship of career counseling and social justice counseling.

**Significance of the Study**

The concept of calling has existed for almost two millennia (Placher, 2005), but has only recently gained the attention of researchers in the field of career counseling (e.g., Dik, Duffy, & Eldridge, 2009; Duffy, Dik, & Blustein, 2010; Hall, Burkholder, & Sterner, 2014). The construct of career calling may, indeed, provide additional insight into factors that motivate counselors to engage in social justice advocacy. That insight can be vital to counselors, counselor educators, policy makers, and theorists. However, insight gained from research on career calling is still emerging, as “no empirical research on calling existed before 1994” (Duffy & Dik, 2013; Duffy, Dik, & Blustein, 2010, p. 75). As recently as 2009, no empirical studies of calling “did so with instruments supported by strong evidence for reliability and validity” (Dik & Duffy, 2009, p. 436). Yet, a review of extant literature on work as calling concluded that individuals who reported that having a calling benefitted them personally and professionally (Duffy, Dik, & Blustein). There is no precise research available from which those stakeholders to glean insight about a possible connection between career calling and social justice. This study, therefore, could yield needed knowledge that has implications for counseling professionals and the students they serve.

There are potential implications for the population of study in this dissertation – counselors who are members of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) and the American College Counseling Association (ACCA) and employed in P-16
Counselors employed in P-16 settings (i.e., colleges and schools) are the primary providers of career counseling and career development resources to students. The ASCA has a membership of 26,804 individuals (American School Counselor Association, 2016). The ACCA has approximately 1,400 members (American College Counseling Association, 2016). On a broader scale, over 250,000 professionals are employed as career counselors and school counselors (U.S. Department of Labor, 2014). Counselors influence vast numbers of people in schools and the workforce and deserve the latest knowledge in the field for competent career counseling practice.

Furthermore, this study has implications for students since counselors are significant influences in students’ lives. Career counseling is one of three domains school counselors must address with students (American School Counselor Association, 2010). If career calling is indeed relevant and beneficial to adult and student populations, as several studies have claimed (Duffy, Dik, & Blustein, 2010), then counselors employed in P-16 educational settings may do well to consider calling-related interventions in their career counseling work. Moreover, students’ access to those benefits is a social justice issue. For example, individuals who believe they have the presence of a career calling tend to have a greater clarity about their career interests and abilities, may feel more decided about their choice of career, and feel more comfortable about career decision-making tasks (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007). Students should have access to those benefits and counselors should have access to career calling-related interventions that can produce those beneficial outcomes. Any insight gained by research in the field of career calling and social justice holds the potential to positively impact many students.
Finally, this study has implications for counselor educators, career development theorists, and career development researchers who may consider including career calling in their work, especially in relation to social justice principles and advocacy behaviors. If evidence were found to support increased social justice behaviors from counselors who have a sense of calling to their profession, counselor educators might consider how to insert career calling into program curricula. Career theorists may even consider augmenting their theories with this emerging concept of career calling, as it is not explicitly present in the existing career development theories. A deeper understanding of career calling holds the potential to “cast a deeper and different light on a range of work-related behaviors” (Elangovan, Pinder, & McLean, 2010, p. 428). In summary, this study could provide many stakeholders with another tool for helping students with their career decision-making.

Description of the Study

This proposed exploratory quantitative research will involve data collection on a one-time basis from counselors employed in P-16 educational settings who are members of ASCA or ACCA. Participants will be solicited through the ASCA and ACCA listserves. Participants will complete a demographics questionnaire, two instruments that measure career calling, and one instrument that measures social justice advocacy behaviors. The demographics questionnaire will include questions related to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age, employment status, political ideology, religion and spirituality, and social justice course completion. These demographic variables have been found to be significant factors in counselors’ social justice advocacy behaviors, as discussed in a review of literature in Chapter Two of this dissertation. The researcher will
use descriptive and inferential statistical methods to analyze data and present findings related to the research questions listed below.

**Research Questions**

1. To what extent does the sample population compare to other populations reported in career calling research literature on the Brief Calling Scale (BCS)?

2. Does the presence of a career calling (as indicated by participants’ BCSp scores) relate to social justice advocacy behaviors (as indicated by participants’ SJAS scores)?

3. To what extent does a three-dimensional measure of the presence of a career calling (as indicated by participants’ CVQp scores) predict social justice advocacy behaviors (as indicated by participants’ SJAS scores)?

4. To what extent does presence of career calling (as indicated by participants’ CVQp scores) combined with participant-specific factors (as reported on the demographic questionnaire) predict participants’ social justice advocacy behaviors (as indicated by participants’ SJAS scores)?

**Definitions**

Writers and scholars have defined *career calling* many ways over the centuries, as there has been no single agree-upon definition (Duffy, 2006). Career calling is a construct, as used in this study, consisting of (a) external source, (b) meaning and purpose, and (c) prosocial orientation (Dik & Duffy, 2009). Although the various definitions of career calling differ on whether the source of a calling is external or internal (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007), this researcher will utilize a definition which asserts an external source of calling that “intentionally leaves open the content of the perceived
source or sources” (Dik & Duffy, p. 427). Secondly, individuals can derive a sense of meaning in life through engaging in work that they believe is consistent with their career calling (Steger & Dik, 2009). Finally, individuals who stated working within their career calling believe that their work benefits others and society (Dik & Duffy). This study on career calling may require the use of other career development terms; such as, career, job, occupation, vocation, and work. Those are defined as follows, as are advocacy and social justice advocacy.

1. Advocacy: “Advocacy has been defined as “action a mental health professional, counselor, or psychologist takes in assisting clients and client groups to achieve therapy goals through participating in clients’ environments. Advocacy may be seen as an array of roles that counseling professionals adopt in the interest of clients, including empowerment, advocacy, and social action” (Toporek & Liu, 2001).

2. Calling: “A calling is a transcendent summons, experienced as originating beyond the self, to approach a particular life role in a manner oriented toward demonstrating or deriving a sense of purpose or meaningfulness and that holds other-oriented values and goals as primary sources of motivation” (Dik & Duffy, 2009, p. 427). The term calling took on the connotation of relating to a person’s career, giving rise to the term used in this dissertation - career calling. For the sake of clarity, the term career calling will be used in the remainder of this dissertation; however, it may be noted that career calling and calling may be used synonymously. Most of the published literature simply uses the term calling.
3. Career: “The sequence of occupations, jobs and positions that a person occupies and pursues during the course of a life of preparing to work, working, and retiring from work” (Super, 1992, p. 422).


5. Occupation: “The specific activity with a market value that an individual continually pursues to obtain consistent and steady income” (Super, 1954)

6. Social Justice Advocacy: “Actions that contribute to the advancement of society and advocate for equal access to resources for marginalized or less fortunate individuals in society” (O’Brien, 2001, p. 66).

7. Vocation: “A vocation is an approach to a particular life role that is oriented toward demonstrating or deriving a sense of purpose or meaningfulness and that holds other-oriented values and goals as primary sources of motivation” (Dik & Duffy, 2009, p. 427).


Chapter Summary

The social justice perspective in P-16 counseling is still in its early stages of growth and published research is scarce. Available studies have indicated several factors that may lead counselors to engage in social justice advocacy on behalf of their students. But, results of those studies are tentative and sometimes even contradictory. The exploration of additional factors is necessary if counselor educators and leaders of the profession are to understand how to facilitate counselors to engage in social justice
advocacy. An equally new area of research, career calling, may provide more insight. One aspect of the career calling construct, according to most seminal career calling researchers, is that individuals choose a career out of motivation to help others or benefit society. That aspect has much in common with aspects of social justice. This study, therefore, will explore the extent to which career calling and other participant-specific factors may or may not translate into social justice advocacy behaviors among counselors who are employed in P-16 counseling. This study will also provide some of the first empirical data on the relevance of career calling to P-16 counselors’ decisions to work as counselors in educational settings.
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter consists of a presentation of the two overarching constructs of career calling and social justice within P-16 educational counseling. The suspected relationship between the two is discussed -- a relationship that has become possible due to the enlargement of the concept of career calling from purely religious occupations to more universal application that potentially spans all occupations. Included in this chapter is also a brief history of these constructs to help readers understand the integration of them in the P-16 education system. Findings from pertinent peer-reviewed, published research of the constructs will also be presented. Because this study purports to explore the relationship of career calling to social justice advocacy behaviors for specific participant demographics (participant-specific factors), those demographics will be discussed. This chapter is divided into the following sections; (a) intersection of social justice and career calling in P-16 career counseling, (b) development of the career calling construct, (c) the career calling construct as a factor in this study, (d) social justice advocacy in counseling, and (e) participant-specific factors in counselors’ social justice advocacy behaviors.

Intersection of Social Justice Advocacy and Career Calling in P-16 Counseling

The social justice movement in counseling and career counseling has a lengthy history, spanning more than one hundred years (Baker, 2009; Pope, Briddick, & Wilson, 2013; Zytowski, 2001). The inverse, however, is more accurate -- career counseling was a product of the social justice movement of the late nineteenth century and precipitated
the founding of what is now known as the National Career Development Association (NCDA) in 1913 (Pope, Briddick, & Wilson). Despite career counseling’s foundation in social justice advocacy, some have argued that the profession of career counseling has departed from its historical foundation of serving marginalized individuals (Blustein, 2006; Flores, Hsieh, & Chiao, 2011). For example, research on the career development of immigrants is almost absent from the past 35 years of top career development journals (Flores et al., 2006). There is little information available about the career needs of immigrant students (Conway, 2009; Flores, Hsieh, & Chiao, 2011; Reynolds & Constantine, 2007; Singaravelu, White, Bringaze, 2005; Teranishi, Suárez-Orozco, & Suárez-Orozco, 2011). This is ironic, given that career counseling’s founder, Frank Parsons, was a social justice advocate for the education, vocational training, and job placement of one of the marginalized populations of his day: immigrants (Crethar, Rivera, & Nash, 2008; O’Brien et al., 2001). In the twenty-first century, scholars in the field of counseling are reaffirming these historical links through the contemporary emphasis on social justice. Both social justice advocacy and career counseling are experiencing a resurgence of salience in contemporary P-16 educational counseling (Baker, 2009; Schenck, Anctil, Smith, & Dahir, 2012).

**P-16 Education as a Setting for Career Counseling and Social Justice Advocacy**

The P-16 movement began in Georgia in 1995 as the governor sought to coordinate the work of several education-related departments (Weldon, 2009). The goal of the P-16 authors was to create a more seamless movement of students across the education levels from pre-kindergarten through four years of post-secondary studies, as well as to improve students’ equity, access, and readiness for post-secondary education.
(Davis & Hoffman, 2008; Weldon). The American School Counselor Association (2005, 2008, 2012) affirmed the importance of school counseling in school counseling programs. Career counseling is, therefore, a vital function of modern P-12 school counselors and has its foundation in social justice, as explained below.

Historically, career counseling in P-12 schools dates to the early twentieth century (Pope, 2009). The school counseling movement began around 1913 through the work of Jesse Davis, who was an educator in Grand Rapids, Michigan (Pope; Schenck, Anctil, Smith, & Dahir, 2012). As an adolescent, Davis struggled with choosing a career and admitted having no one to turn to for help (Pope). Finally, Davis chose to become a high school history teacher. His decision-making process instilled in him a passion for helping students use the same process to prepare in character and scholarship for the responsibilities of adulthood. As a high school principal, he created the first guidance program. Davis was also the founder of what became the modern NCDA and, thus, had a profound impact on the profession of career counseling (Pope, 2009). Davis believed in benefitting his community as he followed his career passion, worked to empower students with career decision-making competence, and strived against racial prejudice and for women’s equal access to education (Pope). By 1920, Davis’ work and influence had placed career guidance in most school systems in the United States (Baker, 2009). Davis displayed in his work and writings the social justice principles of harmony, empowerment, and access.

Davis believed in the guidance he and other guidance counselors gave students, chronicling many of stories about his students developing into successful adults (Pope, 2009). Modern research supports Davis’ belief in the effectiveness of school counseling.
Results of meta-analyses have indicated that school-based career development interventions have positive effects on students’ career development (Hughes & Karp, 2004). Hughes and Karp (2004) endeavored to review “all known published articles on school-based guidance and career development” for evidence that would determine whether or not school-based career guidance influences students’ career and academic outcomes (p. 9). Findings indicated the effectiveness and benefits of school-based career and academic interventions (Hughes & Karp).

Once again the pendulum has swung back toward more career-related counseling and guidance in schools (Schenck, Anctil, Smith, & Dahir, 2012). Schenck et al. (2012) identified three themes that have reoccurred in school counseling over the past one hundred years: (a) the place, or priority, of career counseling among school counselors’ many responsibilities, (b) the importance of equity, access, and social justice in career intervention, and (c) the importance of career counseling as a component of a comprehensive school counseling program. These themes directly relate to this dissertation by addressing career calling and its intersection with social justice advocacy as a potential approach to career counseling with students.

One example of the reoccurring emphasis on career counseling in schools is found in Georgia. Under Georgia House Bill 400 (Georgia General Assembly, 2010), commonly known as the Bridge law, career guidance is more intentionally integrated in middle and high school students’ education than before. The Bridge law prescribes specific career development interventions that sixth through twelfth grade students must complete each school year. School counselors play a key role in implementing and reporting on the Bridge law (Georgia Department of Education, 2011). The renewed
focus on career development in educational counseling is reminiscent of the beginnings of the counseling profession in the early twentieth century in which career development was the primary focus of counselors’ work (O’Brien, 2001; Zytowski, 2001). In this respect, career counseling and social justice advocacy are concurrently developing in contemporary P-16 education.

College counselors are also responsible for providing career counseling to students. The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) published standards and guideline which assist college counseling center personnel to improve their services (2015). CAS guidelines include assisting students with their career goals; “the primary mission of Counseling Services is to assist students in defining and accomplishing personal, academic, and career goals” (p. 5). The standards further clarify that counseling services must include individual and group career interventions delivered directly or through collaboration to students (CAS, 2015). Counselors employed in P-16 educational settings are, therefore, key deliverers of career- and social justice-related counseling interventions.

In essence, career counseling and social justice advocacy have a seeming symbiotic relationship over the past 120 years. This connection is evident in the inner-city work of Frank Parsons with immigrants and in the work of Jesse Davis in P-12 education. Since career calling rests in the discipline of career counseling, one may speculate about career calling’s symbiosis with social justice. Indeed, literature has begun to give evidence of a connection.
Intersection of Social Justice and Career Calling

Based on the conceptualization of career calling put forth by career calling theorists, there appears to be a relationship between career calling and social justice. Perhaps the overlap is most apparent by virtue of several career calling theorists’ inclusion of a prosocial, other-oriented, socially beneficial dimension in their constructs of career calling (Dik & Duffy, 2009; Dik, Duffy, & Steger, 2012). Prosocial orientation has been described as positive contribution to the well-being of society (Dik & Duffy).

The prosocial values dimension of career calling refers to the idea that one’s work is a means for promoting the greater good or greater societal and individual well-being (Dik, Duffy, & Steger, 2012). Duffy (2006) stated that individuals with a career calling pursue careers “that are not chiefly financially motivated and that are perceived to be for the good of a higher power or of society” (p. 55). Dreher, Holloway, & Schoenfelder (2007) summarized the Protestant Reformers’ centuries-old understanding of calling as that of individuals using their talents to serve their neighbors, as discussed below.

Social justice also includes this prosocial concept. Prosocial orientation seemingly overlaps with a core concept in social justice counseling of promoting “human development and the common good” (Crethar, Rivera, & Nash, 2008, p. 270; Dik & Duffy, 2009; Dik, Duffy, & Steger, 2012). Dik and Duffy (2009) affirmed the relationship, or intersection, between the two constructs of social justice and career calling, stating that “an explicitly prosocial approach to vocational psychology research and practice is consistent with vocational psychology’s recent push to promote a social justice agenda” (p. 443). One may surmise, therefore, that a relationship exists between calling and social justice advocacy. The intersection, or commonalities, between these
two constructs may be examined through the framework of this researcher’s synthesized definition of social justice advocacy:

Social justice advocacy behaviors can be understood as actions at all levels (student, community, and society) by P-16 counselors to empower students and confront societal barriers so that all students have equitable access to the resources they need to develop and live out their full potential in pursuit of their career goals, resulting in benefits to the student and society.

The following discussion will expound upon the words emphasized in the above definition as a framework to discuss the intersection of social justice and the prosocial dimension of career calling. The discussion will address the areas of (a) actions, (b) empower students, (c) confront societal barriers, (d) equitable access, (e) equitable access, and (f) benefits to student and society. The findings of this study relating to these areas will be further discussed in chapter 4.

**Actions.** Action is part of the definition of advocacy (Toporek & Liu, 2001). Counselors should be competent in advocacy and take actions to advocate for and with students (ASCA, 2010). Lewis, Arnold, House, & Toporek (2003) diagramed and listed advocacy competencies that counselors can follow to take action with or on behalf of students at three levels: individual, institutional or community, and societal or governmental. Professional counselors, school counselors, and career counselors have the ethical responsibility of taking actions in any or all of these levels (ACA, 2014, A.7.a.; ASCA, E.2.; NCDA, 2011, A.6.a.)

**Empower Students.** Counselors work to empower clients/students by helping them identify resources, recognize personal strengths, and develop skills so that they are
able to achieve a reasonable amount of control over their own lives and even to advocate for self and others (Crethar, Rivera, & Nash, 2008; Toporek, Lewis, & Crethar, 2009).

The social justice principle of participation also relates to empowerment. Participation refers to the right of individuals to have a voice in matters that affect their lives and the lives of people in their communities (Crethar et al.). When individuals are not allowed participation in matters that affect their lives, they “lose a sense of control,” become disenfranchised and disempowered (Crethar et al.).

A sense of control and empowerment relates to career calling through self-efficacy. First, Grier-Reed and Skaar (2010) investigated the potential of a constructivist career course to affect a group of culturally diverse undergraduate students’ sense of empowerment. Results, indeed, indicated an increase in a sense of empowerment. The part of their study that is of particular interest is that the researchers operationalized empowerment as career decision-making self-efficacy. Second, studies of college students have shown evidence that career calling is related to career decision-making self-efficacy (Dik, Sargent, & Steger, 2008; Hirschi, 2011; Hirschi & Herrmann, 2013). In other words, college students who had a sense of career calling had a significantly higher sense of career decision-making self-efficacy, and thus a greater sense of empowerment. Career calling was also found to predict career decision-making self-efficacy (Dobrow & Tosti-Kharas, 2011).

**Confront Societal Barriers.** Both social justice counselors and empowered students confront barriers that unjustly limit access to “knowledge, power, resources, and services that would allow them to gain control over their lives (Crethar, Rivera, & Nash, 2008, p. 271). Blustein, McWhirter, and Perry (2005) connected the above discussed
terms of actions and empowerment to confronting barriers. Blustein et al. asserted that client/student personal change is limited and not fully beneficial as long as “the systems that reinforce and replicate their disempowerment remain untouched” (p. 152). Blustein et al. called on counseling psychologists to confront oppressive barriers in society.

Dik and Duffy (2009) concurred with Blustein et al., calling on career development professionals and career counselors to confront barriers to meaningful work that marginalized students face. The dimension of meaningful/purposeful work is, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, the second dimension of the construct of career calling used in this dissertation. But, some individuals in society face barriers that unjustly keep them from living out their calling. Dik and Duffy conceded that in society “obstacles to meaningfulness and purpose at work are present on multiple levels” that are changeable when confronted (p. 429). To prevent individuals from living out a career calling is to prevent them from experiencing life and job satisfaction, as was shown in the study by Duffy, Allan, Autin, and Bott (2013). Those barriers are a social justice issue.

**Equitable Access.** Equity means that all individuals experience “fair distribution of resources, rights, and responsibilities” (Crethar, Rivera, & Nash, 2008, p. 270). Distribution of resources should not be based on an individual’s privilege. Privilege refers to unearned benefits gained by virtue of possessing certain intrinsic personal characteristics (e.g., race, socio-economic status, gender, etc.) (Crethar et al.). Those who have less power in society may be oppressed by the privileged in society such that access to resources is denied or limited by those who are privileged and, thus, hold power (Goodman, 2000). On the other hand, the powerful and privileged of society can become allies with oppressed/marginalized individuals to help them gain equitable access to
resources (Goodman). Privileged individuals may be motivated to become allies out of empathy, moral principles, spiritual values, and self-interest (Goodman). Career counselors can be those allies because equitable access to career development resources in order to pursue a career calling is not a reality for some people.

Illustrating this reality is a study by Duffy, Allan, Autin, and Bott (2013). They found that while a substantial portion of participants expressed having a career calling, those who felt that they were actually living out that calling felt a greater sense of life satisfaction. Further, they found that socioeconomic class and educational attainment were related to the ability to live out a career calling. They surmised that individuals with more privilege were better able to live out their calling (Duffy, Allan, Autin, & Bott, 2013). The opportunity for an individual to have the choice to live out a calling, then, is a social justice issue.

Dik and Duffy (2009) concurred that career calling should be equitably accessible to marginalized or oppressed individuals and that those citizens are the ones who most need the benefits of having a sense of calling or vocation. Dik and Duffy (2009) further contended that it is “prejudicial…that only the privileged are able to experience a sense of meaningfulness and purpose in life or in the work role” (p. 429). Career counselors should be aware that some clients/students have lived in a “work system that has been restrictive and inequitable” (Dik and Duffy, 2009, p. 36). In such cases, the principle of equitable access leads counselors to empathize with marginalized, or underrepresented, groups of students (Goodman, 2000; Kiselica & Robinson, 2001).

Counselors may then need to give extra effort and attention to the particular student of group of students to bring equal access of resources and opportunities to the
students, which includes informing school staff about the students and identifying necessary changes to the school’s policies, systems, and programs (ASCA, 2012). Essentially, counselors concerned for equitable access try to ensure decision-makers create policy that “respects and is protective of human rights, is inclusive of a plurality of interests, and is responsive to the most marginalized members of a society” (Dean, 2009, p. 3). Career counselors, then, should work toward the goal of making living out one’s career calling a reality for marginalized groups.

**Empirical Study of Social Justice and Career Calling**

Only one empirical study explicitly included social justice and career calling as variables in their research design. Davidson and Caddell (1994) tested their hypothesis that “church members who stress social justice beliefs will view work as a part of their calling to build a more just and equal world” (p. 138). Their study utilized archival data from an earlier study of a sample of 1,869 members of 31 large churches of various Christian denominations in one particular city of the US. The researchers analyzed data only from participants who were employed (79% were employed full-time). Results indicated that social justice belief was the strongest predictor of participants viewing work as a calling, career, or job. In other words, the higher participants scored on the measure of social justice beliefs, the more likely they were to view their work as a calling, rather than a job or a career. There were some weaknesses of the study, however. The researchers did not describe the three-item, social justice beliefs instrument that they used, stating only that the instrument lacked strong psychometric support. Their career calling instrument, as well, lacked evidence of validity (Dik & Duffy, 2009). Finally, the results have limited generalizability due to the demographics of the sample population. In
particular, participants of middle-class to upper-middle-class socio-economic statuses were overrepresented in the sample population. The results, therefore, were tentative and to be interpreted with caution.

**Development of the Career Calling Construct**

An explanation of career calling’s historical development will add context to the above discussion, given its lingering historical connotation that may get confused with its contemporary reconceptualization. Existing literature concerning career calling was located, initially, in the discipline of religion, where it remained for centuries (Hardy 1990; Placher, 2005; Weber, 1992). The concept of *calling* first appeared in the earliest Christian writings, which were originally written in Greek (Hardy; Placher). The English word *calling* derives from the Greek word *kaleo*, which was used several times by New Testament writers (Arndt & Gingrich, 1979; Weber, 1992). The oft-used modern English word, *vocation*, came about when *kaleo* was translated from Greek to Latin as *vocare*, lending to the interchangeability of the modern English words *calling* and *vocation* (Placher). As a result of these translations, the terms *calling* and *vocation* are sometimes used interchangeably in the literature, although this study will adhere to the term *career calling* to cover both translations.

The prevailing attitude about work from the beginnings of Christianity through the Middle Ages aligned with the Greek philosophy that work was a necessary evil meant only for meeting the needs of one’s physical body (Dik & Duffy, 2009; Hardy, 1990). *Kaleo*, or *calling*, was not initially thought of as a concept applicable to one’s work occupation, unless it was a religious occupation (Placher, 2005). Instead, calling was understood during the first four centuries CE as call to follow Christ, even at risk of
discrimination, persecution, or death (Placher). During the Middle Ages, 500 to 1500 CE, calling was perceived as either a literal call to a religious occupation, such as monastic or priest, or a figurative call to live a life of self-denial or separation from the prevailing popular culture (Placher). Consequently, these prevailing attitudes limited the application of the term to purely religious applications.

A major shift in the conceptualization of calling took place during the Protestant Reformation, 1500 to 1800 CE, in which calling came to connote a calling to a work-related profession or occupation (Hardy, 1990; Placher, 2005). Approaching calling from a Protestant Christian theological perspective, Martin Luther, John Calvin, and subsequent Christian Reformation theologians propagated the idea that any occupation could be described as a calling (Dreher, Holloway, & Shoenfelder, 2007; Hardy; Placher). They formed what could be labeled the classical conceptualization of career calling whereby a person feels a God-given sense of destiny and personal duty to follow a particular career path (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). Max Weber (the early twentieth century sociologist, philosopher, and economist) discussed this very understanding of calling and its influence on the economics of Western society in his book The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (1992), which is one of sociology’s most significant books (Kaelber, 2002). The classical view of career calling prevailed from the early twentieth century into the early twenty-first century.

The classical view of calling can be found in contemporary student affairs literature. For example, in a position paper calling for student affairs professionals to give greater consideration to students’ spirituality, Jon Dalton (2001) observed in his work as a university administrator that many students made career decisions out of “a strong
sense of personal destiny or calling that is deeply personal and often unspoken” (p. 20). Recent research with a measure of career calling influenced by the classical perspective (i.e., the Vocational Identity Questionnaire; Dreher, Holloway, & Shoenfelder, 2007) may support Dalton’s ideas. For example, Hall, Burkholder, and Sterner (2014) studied 415 graduate counseling students enrolled in CACREP-approved master’s degree programs. They concluded that students’ not only experienced a strong sense of calling to the counseling profession, but that their spiritual well-being was predictive of their sense of calling (Hall, Burkholder, & Sterner, 2014). Even though the classic understanding of calling does not explicitly use the same term as this study (career calling), these scholars give a foundation for bringing together these two words and concepts.

The next shift in the understanding of calling took place late in the twentieth century as researchers in the US began studying the application of the concept of calling to various social science career fields:

- Sociology (Bellah et al., 1985)
- Organizational behavior (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009; Elangovan et al., 2010; Hall & Chandler, 2005; Peterson et al., 2009; Wrzesniewski et al., 1997),
- Vocational psychology (Hunter, Dik, & Banning, 2010),
- Counseling psychology (Duffy et al., 2013; Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007), counseling (Hall, Burkholder, & Sterner, 2014), and
- Career counseling (Dik, Duffy, & Eldridge, 2009).

The work of these scholars expanded the definition of calling to have a more inclusive and not necessarily religious or non-religious connotation (Dik & Duffy, 2009; Dobrow & Tosti-Kharas, 2011; Wrzesniewski et al, 1997). Thus, there already exists a broadened
concept of career calling, to which this study will add through the quantification of the concept of career calling’s relationship to social justice.

Essentially, each conceptualization of calling has been couched in historical context. Calling began in a spiritual-religious context from the time of early Christianity to Protestant Reformation. From the time of the Reformation to the Twentieth Century, the understanding of calling expanded include God’s call to any occupation within the prevailing economic, political, and sociological milieu in Western civilization. The Protestant Reformers successfully argued in Christian theological terms that calling encompassed a broad range of occupations, not just religious ones (Dobrow & Tosti-Kharas, 2011; Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). The evolution and application of the term has thus grown from its religious roots to embrace a wide range of fields.

Modern scholarship on career calling is still in its infancy (Duffy & Dik, 2013). Indeed, “no empirical research on calling existed before 1994” (Duffy, Dik, & Blustein, 2010, p. 75). As recently as 2009, no empirical studies of calling “did so with instruments supported by strong evidence for reliability and validity” (Dik & Duffy, 2009, p. 436). As discussed above, the concept of calling has existed for almost two millennia (Placher, 2005), but the influence of calling in career decision-making has only begun to be studied in the last two decades (Duffy & Dik, 2012). While there exists a modest foundation of calling literature over the past decade consisting of position papers and research studies, more inquiry of career calling in P-16 career counseling is needed (Adams, 2012; Duffy & Sedlacek, 2010). Further, no known researcher has empirically investigated the relationship of career calling with social justice advocacy, per a review of literature at the time of this writing.
Synthesis of Career Calling Research Groups and Synthesis of Research

There is no single, consensus definition of career calling (Zhang, Dik, Wei, & Zhang, 2015). Instead, there are five distinct lines of research on career calling, each consisting of a particular group of researchers with their preferred definition of career calling that was derived either from literature, research, or both. For the purposes of this research study, those five groups are distinguished by a clearly stated definition of career calling, a validated career calling assessment instrument based on their definition, and published research studies based on their definition and instrument. A table showing career calling research divided by the five groups of researchers and listing representative research studies with populations studied is provided in Appendix A.

Davidson and Caddell (1994) were the first researchers to empirically study work as a calling (Duffy, Dik, & Blustein, 2010). Davidson and Caddell, influenced by Max Weber’s (1992) critique of John Calvin’s Protestant work ethic, understood calling as a religious (classical) construct and career and job as secular constructs. Although their calling-focused instrument lacked strong evidence for reliability and validity (Dik & Duffy, 2009), their groundbreaking study provided a foundation for future calling researchers to build upon;

- Dreher, Holloway, and Shoenfelder (2007)
- Bunderson and Thompson (2009)
- Peterson, Park, Hall, and Seligman (2009)
- Hall, Burkholder, and Sterner (2014)
Dik, Duffy, and other researchers who have built on their foundational work have published over two dozen peer-reviewed studies of career calling -- more than any other group of career calling researchers, per a thorough review of peer-reviewed literature. The impetus for such a number of publications over the past seven years was Dik and Duffy’s (2009) position paper, which was published for the purposes of clearly defining the constructs of calling and vocation in the field of counseling psychology, stimulating career calling research, and facilitating specific counseling applications (Dik & Duffy, 2009; Dik, Duffy, & Eldridge, 2009). Their instrument, the Brief Calling Scale, was found to be the best predictor of presence of calling compared to other calling instruments (Duffy, Autin, Allan, & Douglas, 2015). Researchers with peer-reviewed studies utilizing Dik and Duffy’s definition and instruments are numerous:

- Steger, Pickering, Shin, and Dik (2010)
- Eldridge (2010)
- Duffy, Bott, Allan, Torrey, and Dik (2012)
- Domene (2012)
- Duffy, Allan, Autin, and Bott (2013)
- Hirschi and Herrmann (2013)
- Dumulescu, Opre, and Ramona (2015)

Further expansion of career calling from its classical origins took place when organizational management scholars Dobrow and Tosti-Kharas (2011, 2012) published three studies about career calling from their seven-year, three-stage longitudinal research of individuals in the career fields of music, art, general business, and management. The researchers concluded that calling is a “solid predictor of [vocational choice] outcomes
several years hence” (Dobrow & Tosti-Kharas, 2011, p. 1042). Their studies added to career calling scholarship in several ways: (a) they provided the first data from a longitudinal study of calling, (b) they included participants from a greater diversity of ages and occupations than previous studies, thus providing evidence for its generalizability, and (c) they provided one of the first validated measures of calling.

Research on career calling has also taken place outside the US. Hagmaier and Abele (2012) completed a four-part qualitative study and development and validation of a dual-language career calling instrument with samples of working adults in Germany. They then validated the English version of their instrument in Germany and the US among working adults. They found that career calling to be a multidimensional construct consisting of (a) identification and person-environment-fit, (b) sense and meaning and value-driven behavior, and (c) transcendent guiding force. They also found that participants’ understanding of calling did not significantly differ by age or gender.

Another study of career calling outside the US was undertaken in Australia by Praskova, Creed, and Hood (2015a, 2015b). These researchers assumed a developmental perspective toward career calling. Through their study of a diverse sample of young adults, they and created the only expressly age-appropriate measure of career calling.

As these researchers and their studies have suggested, there is not a single definition or construct of career calling. Some researchers assert that it is a single-dimension construct. Others hold that it is a multi-dimensional one. Nonetheless, a prominent conclusion of most researchers is that career calling is a relevant concept to substantial portions of the population. Even researchers (i.e., Bunderson & Thompson, 2009) who did not intend to study career calling found that it emerged as a prominent
theme in a qualitative study of how zookeepers viewed their commitment to their work. There are also common features of career calling across the groups of researchers: (a) perceiving a source of the calling (external or internal), (b) feeling that the career is a good fit, (c) feeling that the career is meaningful, (d) feeling a sense of passion for the career, and (e) believing that the career benefits others and society. The above discussion also indicated that research has been conducted on samples of students and working adults in several countries. The next section presents the construct used in this dissertation.

The Career Calling Construct as a Factor in this Study

As discussed in the above review of literature, there are several definitions and validated instruments for career calling. Dik and Duffy’s (2009) definition of career calling will guide this study and posits three dimensions, or domains: transcendent summons, derivation of a sense of purpose or meaning, and motivation from other-oriented values and goals. Those three domains are discussed below.

Transcendent Summons

The first domain in Dik and Duffy’s (2009) construct of career calling and measured by the CVQ (Dik, Eldridge, Steger, & Duffy, 2012) is transcendent summons. Dik and Duffy hold that a career calling comes from a source that is external, or transcendent, to an individual. However, Dik and Duffy do not impose specifics about the source of the career calling. They, instead, promote an external source of calling that “intentionally leaves open the content of the perceived source or sources” (Dik & Duffy, p. 427). In spite of their intentionally open source, researchers are divided on this point.
The three positions on source of calling are that the source is either internal to the person, external to the person, or ambiguous.

Some researchers believe that the source is internal; it emanates from inside a person. For example, Dobrow and Tosti-Kharas (2011) described the source as a personal passion. Bunderson and Thompson (2009) said a calling comes from a person’s idiosyncratic gifts, talents, opportunities. Praskova, Creed, and Hood (2015a) stated that the source is a self-determined career goal. Thus, in the view of these scholars, the person is the ultimate source of his or her own sense of calling.

Other researchers believe that the source of a calling is transcendent, or external to the person. Davidson and Caddell (1994) followed a classical definition of calling, stating that the source is God. As noted before, Dik and Duffy (2009) assert a transcendent source, but do not specify who or what the transcendent source may be. Likewise, Hagmaier and Abele (2012) said the source of a calling is a transcendent guiding force. In essence, these researchers, while suggesting an external source, let each individual specify his or her own source for a career calling.

On the other hand, some researchers either refrain from addressing the concept of a source of calling or leave the source ambiguous. Dreher, Holloway, and Shoenfelder (2007) did not discuss the source. Elangovan, Pinder, and McLean (2010) also said that calling’s source can be internal or external. Zhang, Dik, Wei, and Zhang (2015) found that Chinese students believe in a guiding force that can come from personal passion, personal faith, a sense of duty, a sense of destiny, family need, or societal need. Wrzesniewski, Dekas, and Rosso (2009) discussed simply a beckoning. These ambiguous designations also leave room for individuals to name their own sources.
Research may, however, begin to indicate that the source of a calling may not matter. A study of 200 working adults in the US from a range of occupations were studied according to the three positions discussed above. Results indicated that the source of a calling was not important to participants, as long as they felt that they were living out their calling in their current work (Duffy, Allan, Bott, & Dik, 2015). In contrast, a qualitative study of 295 undergraduate psychology students at a Western research university and two Midwestern Christian liberal arts colleges concluded that an external, transcendent source was “very clearly represented in participant responses, and pointed to both secular and sacred sources of a calling” (Hunter, Dik, & Banning, 2010). It is anticipated in this study of P-16 counselors that a large percentage of them will agree that they have a career calling that originated from an external source. The instruments used in this study, however, will not collect further data about that source.

**Personal Outcome: Derivation of Purpose and Meaning**

The perceptions of individuals in the studies also figure in the second dimension: personal outcomes of meaning and purpose. Dik and Duffy (2009) described this second domain of their career calling construct as “being mindful of the purpose and meaningfulness of one’s activity within a particular life role and how one’s efforts may fit into a broader framework of purpose and meaning in life” (p. 427). Other career calling researchers have also placed the meaning of work prominently in their career calling constructs. For example, Dobrow and Tosti-Kharas (2011) discussed the meaningful passion aspect of career calling. Wrzesniewski, Dekas, and Rosso (2009) referred to the meaningful significance of one’s activities. Hagmaier and Abele (2012) spoke of sense and meaning as one of the five categories of their German construct of
calling. Praskova, Creed, and Hood (2015b) stated that a career calling involves career goal-setting that is meaningful and gives a sense of purpose to an emerging adult.

Certainly, studies have shown that individuals can derive positive personal outcomes from career calling. For example, individuals with a calling can have a sense of living a meaningful life through engaging in meaningful career (Steger & Dik, 2009). In their study of 231 undergraduate students at a public university in the US, Steger and Dik (2009) explored whether or not finding meaning in life and finding meaning in work were related. They found that individuals who viewed their careers as a calling reported having greater meaning in life and greater well-being. Steger, Dik, and Duffy (2012) found similar results in their study to develop and validate a measure of work meaning (i.e., the Work and Meaning Inventory). They studied a sample of 370 employees from a large Western research university and found that scores on their meaningful work instrument were positively correlated with presence of career calling (measured by the BCS) and with measures of work-related well-being and general well-being (Steger, Dik, & Duffy, 2012). So, career calling is related, statistically, to positive outcomes in life and work.

Researchers using qualitative methods have also discussed the aspect of meaning and purpose. As Bunderson and Thompson (2009) unintentionally discovered, meaningful work is an important part of calling and vice versa. As discussed in a previous section above, they began qualitatively investigating what zookeepers’ work meant to them. They stated unexpectedly finding that the most coded category in their interviews of zookeepers was a sense of calling to the work (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009). Again, career calling’s dimension of meaning and purpose is a salient concept in the minds of employed adults, according to findings from those sampled.
In addition, the theme of meaning and purpose was prominent in the qualitative data of one of the extremely few studies of career calling in a non-Western culture. Zhang, Dik, Wei, and Zhang (2015) interviewed 210 participants from two universities in China and asked them three open-ended questions regarding how they define calling, how they define calling in a career, and what does it mean to view career as a calling. Meaning and purpose was the second most coded theme in the data. Participants’ responses indicated that they understood calling to relate to both domains of finding meaning -- in career and in general life. Confirming these results was a subsequent study in which Zhang, Herrman, Hirschi, Wei, and Zhang developed a career calling instrument, the Chinese Calling Scale (CCS). They reported that meaning and purpose was one of the three prominent factors indicated by the 788 college students in China. Researchers also found that greater level of calling predicted greater hope, which in turn, led to a greater sense of life meaning and life satisfaction. There were no significant differences between males and females in the study, indicating that the CCS is a valid instrument for these two genders (Zhang, Hermann et al.). Once again, meaning and purpose were important to individuals studied.

Operating in a country outside the US but still within a collegiate atmosphere, Hunter, Dik, and Banning (2010) explored calling with 435 undergraduate and graduate students from a public research university and two Christian colleges. As in the Zhang, Dik et al. (2015) study, researchers identified meaning as the second most prominent theme in the data. Affirming the personal outcome domain of a career calling, participants strongly stated a theme about meaning in work -- the concepts of enjoyment, personal fit, well-being, strength, and interest (Hunter, Dik, & Banning, 2010). In
summary, the personal aspect of deriving a sense of meaning and purpose from one’s work is an important concept in considerable segments of the population, both working adults and college students. It is expected that a large portion of the P-16 counselors in this study will express that they became counselors from a desire to gain a sense a meaningful and purposeful life from their career.

Social Outcome: Other-Oriented Motivation

Several career calling scholars have theorized that career calling involves a focus on other people. They hold that, in addition to an individual deriving a sense of meaning and purpose from his or her work, a person’s work will also have some level of focus on other people. Further, many career calling theorists go beyond simply stating calling has a focus on other people, but that the focus is potentially beneficial to others. For example, Duffy, Dik, and Blustein (2010) asserted that career calling promotes the welfare of others. Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, and Schwartz. (1997) stated that calling beckoned individuals toward socially significant activities. Elangovan, Pinder, and McLean (2010) spoke of calling involving actions with pro-social intentions. Praskova, Creed, and Hood (2015a) posed that career calling for emerging adults that is other-oriented. This pro-social orientation gives strong hint toward a possible connection to social justice.

Duffy and a team of researchers (Duffy, Bott, Allan, Torrey, & Dik, 2012) added more evidence for the connection to social justice. They used Consensual Qualitative Research method (CQR; Hill, Thompson, & Williams, 1997) to explore career calling among eight counseling psychologists. After coding the data for domains, researchers listed six domains. Under the domain regarding the content of their personal calling, all
participants stated “being a support to others and/or helping others” and less than half stated “promoting social justice/changing greater society” (p. 301). Researchers concluded that the prosocial aspect of career calling was the dominant theme that emerged from the data.

Similarly, Bunderson and Thompson (2009), in their qualitative study of zookeepers, found that participants expressed a dominant theme of having a sense of duty and destiny to the profession. However, beyond feeling simply a sense of duty to their work for self-fulfillment, participants believed that their work was mostly a way that society could benefit from their particular skill-sets and talents. In other words, they felt that they were called to use their talents to serve a societal need. This finding appears congruent to the social justice concept of harmony.

Of particular interest to this research study, Duffy led a second team of researchers (Duffy, Foley et al., 2012) to conduct the only known study of career calling to include participants who were working in the counseling or psychology professions, as opposed to students of counseling or psychology. The research team used Consensual Qualitative Research method (CQR; Hill, Thompson, & Williams, 1997) to explore how eight counseling psychologists defined calling, how their callings developed, and how their callings were currently experienced. Seven of the eight participants were White. Four were female. The eight held diverse religious affiliations. Four worked as counseling practitioners and four worked in academia. In response to questions about current experiences of calling, all eight participants stated that they are called to help or serve other people. Researchers concluded that the prosocial aspect of career calling was
the dominant theme that emerged from the data (Duffy, Foley et al., 2012). This pro-
social, other-oriented dimension is an important finding in these studies of career calling.

Most career calling scholars included the pro-social, or other-oriented, domain in
their constructs. Zhang, Dik, Wei, and Zhang (2015), discussed above, also found that
Chinese students identified altruism as one of calling’s four domains. Similarly, French
and Domene (2010) in their qualitative study of seven Caucasian females from various
majors at a Christian university in Canada identified altruism in the data. They reported
that each of the seven participants expressed that helping others held a central place in
her calling (French & Domene, 2010). Hunter, Dik, and Banning (2010) also
identified altruism as a prominent feature of calling in their qualitative interviews of 435
undergraduate students at a large Western research university in the US. Finally, while
Hagmaier and Abele (2012) did not explicitly write altruism or pro-social stance into
their definition of calling, they included the concept under the domain of sense and
meaning and value-driven behavior. On their nine-item calling instrument, the MCM, two
of the nine items relate serving the common good and making the world a better place
(Hagmaier & Abele, 2012). One may infer from the research that a considerable a
number of people think of their careers as a way to benefit others and may, indeed, feel
motivated by such.

Nevertheless, other-oriented motivation is not present in one conceptualization of
career calling. Dobrow and Tosti-Kharas (2011) did not include this domain in their
construct of calling. Their definition, instead, focuses on the idea of calling as leading
one to have passion toward a domain. Domain, in their construct, is a very broad term.
For some individuals that domain may refer to their work. For others it may refer to a
cause, leisure activity, or avocation. Still, for others, the domain may be an other-oriented or pro-social focus. Hirschi (2011) was also nonspecific about the other-oriented dimension of calling. In his study of 407 German undergraduate students from different majors, he asserted that “people in all sorts of work and with all sorts of work motivation and values can have a sense of calling and that callings need not be restricted to pro-social and self-transcendence work values” (Hirschi, 2011, p. 70). However, this study will include the other-oriented motivations, especially at points of connection with social justice. It is anticipated that a large proportion of participants will agree that they are motivated in their P-16 counseling careers by benefitting other people through their work. This is also a central concept in social justice advocacy.

Social Justice Advocacy in Counseling

In contrast to the construct of calling, which has a long history in the religion and the construct of career counseling which has more recently emerged (as discussed above), social justice advocacy is becoming more accepted as part of professional counselors’ identity and practice as a “cutting edge” approach to resolving clients’ problems (Lewis, Ratts, Paladino, & Toporek, 2011, p. 6; Smith, Reynolds, & Rovnak, 2009; Ratts, 2009). This perception of newness is the contemporary consensus despite the fact that social justice advocacy was present at the beginning of the counseling profession over one hundred years ago (Pope, Briddick, & Wilson, 2013; Ratts; Zytowski, 2001). Some scholars observed that social justice is a “recurring wave” in the counseling profession which rises in importance at certain moments in history and recedes at others (Smith, Reynolds, & Rovnak, p. 484). Others believe that social justice advocacy is a permanent complement to the four major theoretical approaches in professional counseling as a
“fifth force” (Ratts, p. 160). Nonetheless, empirical study of social justice advocacy in counseling is young (Manis, 2012; Smith, Reynolds, & Rovnak). Little is also known about factors that contribute to social justice advocacy behaviors by counselors (Dashjian, 2014). Consequently, this study proposes to study those factors and the additional factor of career calling in relationship to social justice advocacy.

**Definition of Social Justice Advocacy for this Study**

A definition of social justice that fits with the purpose of this dissertation is one put forth by O’Brien, Patel, Hensler-McGinnis, and Kaplan (2006). O’Brien et al. discussed the historical and contemporary contexts of career counselors as social justice advocates and agents. They defined social justice as “actions that contribute to the advancement of society and advocate for equal access to resources for marginalized or less fortunate individuals in society” (p. 66). This definition would include equal access to resources to follow one’s career calling. Toporek and Liu’s (2001) definition of advocacy can be added to this definition. Advocacy, according to Toporek and Liu, involves actions of a counselor to assist clients to achieve counseling goals by participating in clients’ environments and intervening in clients’ best interest to empower, advocate, and take social action. Synthesizing these two definitions, as previously stated, this research defined social justice advocacy behaviors as actions at all levels (student, community, and society) by P-16 counselors to empower students and confront societal barriers so that all students have equitable access to the resources they need to develop and live out their full potential in pursuit of their career calling and career goals, resulting in benefits to the student and society.
Elements of a Social Justice Advocacy Definition

Social justice is difficult to define because there is no universally agreed-upon definition (Crethar, Rivera, & Nash, 2008). Scholars, however, have identified several essential concepts to a social justice counseling approach. Crethar, Rivera, and Nash (2008) listed two concepts that a social justice approach holds in common with closely related approaches and theorists. First is the concept that individuals live in social systems that constantly affect them. That impact can be especially limiting or oppressive to certain individuals or groups of individuals as they become marginalized, or disenfranchised, from mainstream society. Marginalization leads to impeded access, or barriers, to society’s resources and opportunities for those individuals. Individuals or groups of individuals may be unjustly marginalized based on characteristics including, but not limited to, race, ethnicity, gender, age, physical ability, religion, socioeconomic class, sexual orientation, mental ability. Their second concept is that a social justice approach necessitates that counselors and others in the helping professions cultivate awareness of how “injustice, oppression, discrimination, marginalization, and social-cultural privileges adversely affect marginalized individuals” (Crethar et al., p. 269). In particular, these two concepts may provide a more nuanced description of the other-orientation of career calling within the present study.

Furthermore, social justice is an approach emphasizing that all people have equal worth, dignity and value and should not be deprived of those qualities by any other person or system (Counselors for Social Justice, 2011). But, a social justice advocacy approach in counseling goes beyond simply awareness. Social justice advocacy proponents urge counselors to engage in actual actions toward realizing protection of
equal rights, liberties, and access for all individuals in society (Crethar, Rivera, & Nash, 2008). Counselors’ social justice actions are aimed at changing “societal values, structures, policies, and practices” so that marginalized individuals may access to adequate basic resources necessary for self-determination (Goodman et al., 2004, p. 793). Social justice scholars have issued a call to would-be counselors.

In addition to their two concepts, discussed above, Crethar, Rivera, and Nash (2008) listed four essential principles for social justice advocacy counselors to employ as they engage in advocacy actions: harmony, access, equity, and participation. Harmony refers to the reciprocal interaction of individual self-interest and whole-society benefit. In other words, the needs and rights of all people are considered and society is improved by individuals as they strive to fulfil their personal needs and desires, even if this means sacrificing some of those needs and desires. Access refers to individuals being able, without hindrance from unfair barriers, to gain “knowledge, power, resources, and services” for the benefit of self and society (p. 271). Equity means that all individuals experience “fair distribution of resources, rights, and responsibilities” (p. 270). Participation refers to the right of all individuals to have a voice in matters that affect their lives and the lives of people in their communities (Crethar et al., 2008). Career calling scholars have found a similar, though not as detailed, concept in their studies: many individuals desire to use their careers to benefit others and society. Career calling scholars and social justice scholars appear to be converging on the pro-social, other-oriented motivation. P-16 counselors are potentially being urged, simultaneously, to engage in benefitting others internally (by their career callings) and externally (by published guidelines within the counseling profession).
Guidelines to Assist Counselors to Engage in Social Justice Advocacy

All of these elements defining a social justice advocacy have been incorporated into guidelines for counselors. A social justice advocacy-orientated counselor works toward the goal of all individuals having “the opportunity to reach her or his academic, career, and personal/social potential free from unnecessary barriers” (Lewis, Ratts, Paladino, & Toporek, 2011, p. 7). In effort to guide counselors to engage ethically in advocacy behaviors toward that goal, The American Counseling Association (ACA) developed a set of advocacy competencies (Lewis, Arnold, House, & Toporek, 2003; Toporek, Lewis, & Crethar, 2009). The ACA’s advocacy competencies can also guide school counselors as they advocate for students (Ratts, DeKruyf, & Chen-Hayes, 2007). Similarly, Trusty and Brown (2005) wrote school counselor-specific advocacy competencies to provide guidance to school counselors.

The ACA Advocacy Competencies were further operationalized by the Counselors for Social Justice (CSJ), a division of the American Counseling Association (ACA). In drafting a code of ethics, the CSJ’s intent was to translate the ACA’s code of ethics from a social justice theoretical perspective into social justice practice to help counselors to better put social justice theory into practice. The CSJ (2011) urged counselors to be actively engaged in challenging power and privilege in systems that adversely affect their students/clients and to collaborate with others as they do so. Counselors, then, are urged to translate social justice advocacy competency into actual behaviors.

Another guideline that was based on the ACA Advocacy Competencies is the Advocacy Competency Domains (Lewis, Arnold, House, & Toporek, 2003). The
Advocacy Competency Domains delineated six dimensions in which counselors can take action to confront barriers that limit that oppressed or marginalized individuals (Ratts, Toporek, & Lewis, 2010). The six dimensions are organized around two domains; (a) type of engagement (counselors empowering students to act and counselors acting on behalf of students) and (b) level of intervention (at the student-level, community-level, or societal-level) (Ratts, Toporek, & Lewis). Social justice advocacy implies action at all levels – individual or group (micro-level), institutional or community (meso-level), and society or government (macro-level) (ACA, 2014, A.6.a; Goodman et al., 2004).

In an effort to quantify social justice concepts and competencies as they translate into action, Dean (2009) created an assessment instrument based on the ACA Advocacy Competencies as a way to measure social justice advocacy engagement. Dean’s instrument was created as an attempt to operationalize and measure counselors’ social justice advocacy competencies. During the item generation phase and validation studies of the instrument, Dean found that social justice advocacy competency consisted of collaborative action, social/political advocacy, client empowerment, and client/community advocacy. Dean noted that these four factors were similar to the six domains reported by Lewis, Arnold, House, and Toporek (2003), discussed above. In summary, it is possible that social justice advocacy guidelines can help counselors who believe they have a career calling to more clearly express their calling through concrete actions and behaviors. A definition of social justice advocacy is necessary as this study explores connection to the definition of career calling, stated in a previous section above.
Participant-Specific Factors in Counselors’ Social Justice Advocacy Behaviors

This study will suggest that an individual’s career calling is an additional factor in social justice advocacy behaviors. Several counselor-specific characteristics, or factors, identified in literature that have been found to affect counselors’ involvement in social justice advocacy. Those factors relate to beliefs, training, and demographic characteristics. There are few research studies specifically about characteristics of counselors’ who are involved in social justice advocacy (Parikh, Post, & Flowers, 2011; Steele, Bischoff, & Craig, 2014; Trusty & Brown, 2005). Factors identified in the literature as having an effect on counselors’ social justice advocacy behaviors include: (a) completion of a graduate level social justice course, (b) political ideology, (c) religion and spirituality, (d) gender, (e) race, (f) and sexual orientation. This study will explore these factors, in addition to career calling, as being predictive of social justice advocacy behaviors by P-16 counselors. Each of these factors will be discussed individually, although ten studies integrated all or most of these factors in some manner. The findings of those ten studies will be discussed below in context of the factors.

Graduate-level Social Justice Course

Graduate-level counselor training in social justice advocacy is essential, as indicated by authorities in the counseling profession. The Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) stated that counselor education programs must deliver to their graduate students a foundational knowledge of the theories and models of social justice advocacy (II.F.2.b., CACREP, 2016). In several research studies, counselors have identified social justice courses as an important part of their becoming social justice advocates (Caldwell & Vera, 2010; Steele, 2011; Wiede,
This connection between education and advocacy has been confirmed by several studies.

For example, Caldwell & Vera (2010) explored the critical experiences and events that led counseling psychologists to engage in social justice advocacy. Their sample consisted of 17 practicing counseling psychologists and 18 doctoral-level counseling psychology students. Participants completed a demographics questionnaire and a qualitative data collection instrument related to identifying critical incidents in social justice orientation development. Over half of the participants stated that formal and informal education contributed to their social justice orientation and engagement. Participants placed education as the fourth most influential theme out of five (i.e., influence of Significant Persons, exposure to injustice, education/learning, work experiences, religion/spirituality). They further specified the subthemes of (a) their graduate-level social justice coursework, (b) personal readings and scholarship on the topics of oppression and social justice, and (c) their graduate training program's commitment to social justice (Caldwell & Vera, 2010).

Wiede (2011) found similar results. The twenty participants, all holding a graduate degree in a mental health field and engaged in some form of advocacy work, were recruited from several cities and work settings. Advocacy-oriented graduate education was a prominent theme in the data, equaled only by the influences of mentors and on-the-job training. Half of the participants identified graduate education, referring to academic coursework, as instrumental in their development as advocates (Wiede, 2011). Wiede, in effect, contributed to the understanding of the skills needed for effective advocacy and how those skills were developed.
Additionally, Steele (2011) investigated the role of counselor education coursework in social justice advocacy training, specifically comparing counseling educators’ and students’ perceptions of the social justice advocacy training in their curricula. The researcher surveyed 212 counselor educators and interns from CACREP counselor education programs. Results indicated that participants who deemed advocacy training important in counselor education were likely to be a racial/ethnic minority born after 1970. Counselor educators and interns did not statistically differ in their view of the importance of the ACA Advocacy Competencies in counselor preparation. However, counselor educators reported teaching advocacy competency skills and behaviors more often than counseling interns reported receiving instruction in them. All participants were statistically equal in reporting that counseling interns were not prepared to engage in the advocacy behaviors given in the ACA Advocacy Competencies (Steele, 2011). Steele’s study in particular points to the need for discovering more about the process of students’ internalizing, i.e. learning advocacy competency skills. This dissertation researcher will extend that knowledge by exploring whether teaching social justice advocacy to counselors combines with career calling to lead to greater engagement in social justice behaviors.

Furthermore, Collins, Arthur, Brown, and Kennedy (2015) interviewed thirty-two master’s level counseling students about critical incidents in their degree program which prepared them to engage in multicultural counseling and social justice practice. Researchers stated that one meta-theme in the data was that students completed their counseling education still lacking competency in social justice attitudes, knowledge, and skills. This finding led researchers to recommend that counselor educators more fully
embed social justice principles into the curriculum and provide students with opportunities to engage in social justice action (Collins, Arthur, Brown, & Kennedy, 2015). Their research added evidence to Ratts and Wood's (2011) call to counselor educators to fully commit to social justice student learning outcomes, per their anecdotal observation that many counselor educators have resisted doing so.

In an earlier study, Pieterse, Evans, Risner-Butner, Collins and Mason (2009) reviewed course syllabi from multicultural and diversity-related courses of 54 APA- and CACREP-approved graduate programs. The researchers analyzed a sample of multicultural course syllabi due to what they perceived as the interchangeability of terms between social justice and multicultural competence in counselor preparation. They found that there is considerable overlap of social justice and multicultural competence content in the courses, lending evidence to the idea that “social justice is at the heart of multiculturalism” (Vera & Speight, 2003, p. 254). They reported that while social justice content was present in many syllabi, the operational definition of social justice varied across syllabi as did the construct of social justice. The titles of courses can also be misleading; researchers found that similar course titles can have vastly different content. Additionally, social justice awareness and knowledge were the dominant areas of focus in courses; only 13% of the courses addressed social justice advocacy skills (Pieterse, et al., 2009). This variability among courses gives a further indication that social justice education needs to be improved.

Further interrogating the education on social justice concepts, Streufert (2012) investigated multicultural competency and social justice advocacy in a sample of 208 White masters-level counseling students. The researcher used the Social Justice
Advocacy Scale (SJAS; Dean, 2009), as this dissertation’s researcher will use. Demographic variables used to test for predicted scores on the SJAS were gender (male, female, and transgender), age, year in program, political affiliation, involvement/future involvement with volunteer/service activities, study/work/travel abroad experience, multicultural training and experiences and students’ desire to participate in social justice advocacy. Results indicated no significant overall predictive effect for the demographic variables and SJAS scores. The researcher stated a limitation regarding graduate coursework that only about half of the participants had completed a graduate-level multicultural course. Based on the results specifically about graduate coursework, the researcher concluded that one multicultural course taken as part of a graduate counseling curriculum was insufficient to equip students with a social justice orientation (Streufert, 2012). As noted in other studies, the delivery and focus of social justice education needs to be improved.

White (2009) also used qualitative methods to investigate the process by which counselors develop into advocates for the counseling profession. The researcher interviewed eight counselors (seven White and one Biracial; seven female and one male), who worked in either school counseling, community counseling, or counseling education. Those counselors were also involved in advocacy for the counseling profession and had participated in the ACA Legislative Institute or the State Legislative Institute. The researcher identified four themes in the data that were influential in their development as advocates; education, mentorship, professional aspects, and personal aspects. Specifically, participants discussed the positive influence that formal coursework had on their becoming advocates for the profession, clients, and students. Participants also
discussed the role of coursework in exposing them to mentors who were committed to advocacy (White, 2009). Thus, White’s study strengthened the hypothesis that education is pivotal in graduate students developing social justice advocacy.

Linnemeyer (2009) used mixed methods to study a sample of 412 clinical, counseling, and school psychology graduate students in APA-accredited programs. The qualitative results of the study indicated that formal education was an important support to participants’ engagement in social advocacy. Linnemeyer reported that the two most frequently coded categories regarding support needed to foster social advocacy engagement were formal experiential training and formal coursework (Linnemeyer, 2009). Thus, the importance of graduate level courses to the development of social justice advocacy has been supported by the results of several studies.

Counselor educators, then, can do more to fully realize the positive potential of social justice coursework in students’ development as social justice advocates (Collins, Arthur, Brown, & Kennedy, 2015; Pieterse, Evans, Risner-Butner, Collins & Mason, 2009; Ratts & Wood, 2011). The researcher in this study suggests that the construct of career calling may complement and expand the self-knowledge of counselors employed in P-16 education, perhaps resulting in a more robust sense of advocacy in social justice. Therein, also, reside implications for counselor education curricula.

**Political Ideology**

For study of the factor of political ideology, this researcher used the categories established by the American National Elections Studies (ANES; 2013). The ANES political ideology measure consists of one question and asks participants to choose one answer to this question; “When it comes to politics do you usually think of yourself as (a)
Extremely Liberal, (b) Liberal, (c) Slightly Liberal, Moderate, (d) Slightly Conservative, 
(e) Conservative, (f) Extremely Conservative, or (g) Haven’t thought much about this.”

The ANES has conducted national surveys using this question since 1972.

In scholarly literature, Steele, Bischof, and Craig (2014) also utilized the ANES’
measure in a study of the perceptions of social justice advocacy among 214 members of 
the American Counseling Association (ACA). These researchers analyzed data regarding 
political ideology and several demographic variables for their effect on ACA members’ 
perceptions of social justice advocacy. Concurrently, they measured social justice 
advocacy by the Advocacy Characteristics Scales (Paylo, 2007), which included 
subscales to measure Advocacy Attributes, Attitudes, Behaviors, Skills, Knowledge, 
Importance of Advocacy, Actual Advocacy Practices, and Levels of Advocacy. Results 
on the ANES measure of political ideology indicated that participants (47% counselors, 
53% counselor educators) were roughly split 54% on the liberal side of the measure, 19% 
m moderate, and 23% on the conservative side of the measure. Researchers found, on the 
overall measure scores, that participants held a favorable perception of social justice 
advocacy and that liberal, conservative, and moderate groups did not differ statistically. 
On the other hand, researchers reported a significant difference between perception and 
actual advocacy, indicating that there may be a gap between participants having a 
favorable perception of advocacy and actually practicing advocacy. Concerning 
individual scales, however, there were significant differences. The extremely 
conservative group (2%) scored significantly lower than other groups on the Importance 
of Advocacy. The extremely liberal group (8%) scored significantly higher than others on 
the subscales of Behaviors, Skills, Knowledge, Importance of Advocacy, and Actual
Advocacy (Steele, Bischof, & Craig, 2014). These subsets may indicate that there is some connection between political ideology and actual practice of social justice.

In addition, Linnemeyer (2009) used a similar question to the ANES to measure political orientation in a mixed-methods study to investigate demographic and person-specific variables that predict social justice advocacy. The researcher studied a sample of 412 clinical, counseling, and school psychology graduate students in APA-accredited programs along variables that included political ideology, sexual orientation, program type, spirituality, discrimination experiences, political involvement, multicultural awareness, and multicultural knowledge. Linnemeyer found that participants holding a far left political ideology scored significantly higher on the measures of social justice advocacy attitudes and behaviors than those having liberal, middle of the road, or conservative ideologies and that the two strongest predictors of social justice advocacy were political involvement and political ideology. The researcher concluded that students most likely to engage in social justice advocacy are those who hold liberal or far left political ideology and are interested in political involvement. (Linnemeyer, 2009). Again, the connection of social justice practices to political ideology has been suggested by this study.

Similarly, Parikh, Post, and Flowers (2011) surveyed 313 members of American School Counselor Association (ASCA) to explore how certain variables (i.e., political ideology, religious ideology, socioeconomic status of origin, race, and belief in a just world) predict social justice behaviors. The researchers found that only two variables significantly predicted social justice behaviors -- political ideology and belief in a just world. The researchers concluded that school counselors who held liberal political
ideologies were more likely to engage in social justice advocacy behaviors (Parikh, Post, & Flowers, 2011). Thus, these three studies posit that political ideology plays a significant role in social justice advocacy. This dissertation, as stated above, will also include this factor in the study of career calling and its relationship, if any, to social justice advocacy.

**Religion and Spirituality**

Not only political beliefs, but also religious beliefs may play a role in social justice advocacy, as several studies show. Wiede (2011) used semi-structured interviews to explore skills needed for a counselor to be an effective advocate and how those skills were developed. There were twenty participants, all holding a graduate degree in a mental health field and engaged in some form of advocacy work. The researcher noted that several participants discussed the important role of religion and spirituality in their advocacy development, even though the researcher did not directly ask about spirituality. More participants indicated influence from religious community and faith teachings than from internship, service learning, and professional organizations (Wiede, 2010). The fact that participants themselves brought up this factor may indicate its importance in the formation of the individual’s advocacy and in fact, as this dissertation may illustrate, constitute a career calling.

Caldwell and Vera (2010) found similar results in their qualitative study. They reported that religion and spirituality was one of the five categories identified in the qualitative data. Further, they stated that 14% of their participants discussed religion and spirituality as crucial to their development of a social justice orientation. Although their study included participants from several major religions, data was not analyzed for
distinctions between them in terms of the research questions. They further reported that participants chose religion/spirituality as the second highest ranked critical incident that contributed to their development as a social justice advocates, followed only by exposure to injustice (Caldwell, 2008; Caldwell & Vera, 2010). Thus, religion and spirituality may be, as Caldwell’s studies suggest, an important factor in social justice advocacy.

In addition, Linnemeyer (2009), in a study of 412 clinical, counseling, and school psychology graduate students in APA-accredited programs, hypothesized that spirituality would predict greater orientation toward social justice advocacy. Linnemeyer measured spirituality with the Expressions of Spirituality Inventory -- Revised (ESI-R; MacDonald, 2000), which is a 30-item, five-dimensional instrument. Linnemeyer used only the six items of the ESI-R’s Cognitive Orientation toward Spirituality subscale. The researcher reported that of the five main hypothesized predictor variables, participants’ spirituality was the second strongest, preceded only by political involvement, at predicting orientation toward social justice advocacy. Participants represented various religious affiliations; roughly 22% Other Christian, 10% Catholic, 10% no specific affiliation, 5% Jewish, 5% Agnostic, 4% Atheist, 2% Buddhist, 2% Unitarian Universalists, 2% Spiritual, 1% Mormon/LDS, less than 1% each as Muslim and Hindu, and 36% did not answer this demographic item (Linnemeyer, 2009). Linnemeyer’s study thus confirms the importance of spirituality while suggesting its relationship to political ideology.

In a subsequent study, Parikh, Post, and Flowers (2011) used one question with a 6-point Likert-type scale asking 313 ASCA members to rate their religious views on a continuum from very conservative to very liberal. Their regression analysis indicated that religious ideology did not significantly predict social justice advocacy behavior scores.
The researchers cautioned about the interpretation of results because the religious ideology question and the political ideology question used the same answer selections and, thus, had strong correlation. Therefore, the researchers expressed suspicion that their questions for religious ideology and political ideology were measuring the same construct (Parikh, Post, & Flowers, 2011). This dissertation with its use of instruments indicating career calling may be able to tease out the distinctions between political ideology and religious beliefs.

Likewise, Nilsson and Schmidt (2005) studied the predictive effect of religious affiliation on measures of actual and desired social justice advocacy engagement as measured by a 1969 measure of socio-political activism. Participants indicated on the religious affiliation question that they were 66% Christian, 16% not religious, 2% Buddhist, 1% Jewish, and 16% other. Results indicated no significant difference between Christian and non-Christian on the measures of actual and desired social justice advocacy engagement. Researchers did not add religious affiliation to their regression analysis, so the predictive effect of that variable was not examined (Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005). Although this section simultaneously discussed religion and spirituality, this researcher studied religion and spirituality as distinct variables.

**Gender**

To distinguish the factor of gender, Linnemeyer (2009) used mixed-methods to investigate demographic and person-specific variables that predict social justice advocacy. Of the 412 clinical, counseling, and school psychology graduate students in APA-accredited programs who participated in the study, 61% identified as women, 13% as men, and 26% did not complete the demographics questionnaire. While gender was
not analyzed specifically in terms of the hypothesis, the researcher found that gender and age were the two most commonly reported reasons for perceived discrimination. Further, data analyses indicated that perceived discrimination experiences were not significantly associated with participants’ social justice advocacy. No other gender-related results were reported (Linnemeyer, 2009). Gender, then, is a factor in social justice advocacy that needs further empirical study.

In their study of desire for and actual engagement in social justice advocacy, Nilsson and Schmidt (2005), mentioned in the discussion above concerning religion and spirituality, reported that their participants were 84% female and 16% male. The researchers reported a significant difference between males and females; males desired engagement in social justice advocacy more so than females on the measure of desire for social justice advocacy engagement. In contrast, the researchers reported that there was no difference between the two groups on the measure of actual social justice advocacy engagement. Researchers did not add gender to their regression analysis, so the predictive effect of that variable was not examined (Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005). So, whether or not gender is a confirmed factor in engagement in social justice advocacy remained tentative.

Lastly, Streufert (2012) explored social justice advocacy among 208 White trainees in counselor education and counseling psychology. The researcher used the Social Justice Advocacy Scale (SJAS; Dean, 2008). Gender (female, male, transgender) was one of the demographic variables used to test for predicted scores on the SJAS. Participants identified as 82% female, 18% male, and 0% transgender. Results of the linear regression analysis indicated no significant overall demographic variables effect on SJAS scores. Other researchers have found similar results; gender did not have
significant effect on social justice advocacy (i.e., Steele, 2011; Steele, Bischof, & Craig, 2014). Given the mixed results reported by prior researchers, this dissertation researcher will include gender as a factor to be explored.

**Race**

One may expect race to be a factor in one’s engagement in social justice advocacy. Dashjian (2014) investigated factors in 370 psychology doctoral students that may related to social justice engagement. Listing several hypotheses, the researcher tested a hypothesis that racial/ethnic minority status would predict higher social justice engagement scores. Results indicated that racial/ethnic minority status was, indeed, a significant predictor of social justice engagement. African American participants scored significantly higher than Hispanic participants on the measure of social justice engagement. However, Caucasian participants and racial/ethnic minority participants did not score significantly differently.

Similarly, Linnemeyer (2009), in a study of 412 clinical, counseling, and school psychology graduate students in APA-accredited programs, hypothesized that minority status (i.e., identification as LGB and/or racial/ethnic minority) would moderate the relationship between experiences of discrimination and social justice advocacy orientation. The researcher found, through hierarchical multiple regression analyses, that this hypothesis was not supported. Minority status was not a moderator between experiences of discrimination and social justice advocacy orientation. Also, students of color (16% of participants) did not report significantly higher levels of social justice advocacy than Caucasian/European American (60% of participants) students. However,
26% of the participants did not complete the demographics questionnaire (Linnemeyer, 2009).

Nilsson and Schmidt (2005) also studied the effect of race on desire for and actual engagement in social justice advocacy. Their participants identified as 84% White, 8% African-American, 4% Hispanic, 4% multiracial, and 1% Asian American. Results indicated no significant difference between students of color and White students on measures of actual and desired social justice advocacy engagement. Researchers did not add race to their regression analysis, so the predictive effect of that variable was not examined (Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005). These studies seem to indicate that race, then, may be a significant factor in social justice advocacy.

However, Steele (2011) compared the perceptions of counseling educators and counseling students concerning social justice advocacy training in their counselor education. The researcher surveyed 212 counselor educators and interns from CACREP counselor education programs. Participants identified as 80% White/Caucasian, 9% African American/Black, 4% Asian/Pacific Islander, 4% Multiracial, and 2% Hispanic/Latino. Results indicated significant group differences only for the variables of race/ethnicity and age. Researchers, therefore, inferred that participants who deemed advocacy training important in counselor education were likely to be a racial/ethnic minority individual born after 1970. Other demographic variables (i.e., sexual orientation, gender, income level, highest degree earned) did not predict level of social justice advocacy importance (Steele, 2011). Finally, research indicated that race was a factor in social justice advocacy.
Similarly, Steele, Bischof, and Craig (2014) studied the perception of social justice advocacy among 214 members of the American Counseling Association (ACA) on several participant-specific variables. Race was found to be a significant factor. Participants included 78% Caucasian, 10% African American, 3% Hispanic/Latino, 2% Asian/Pacific Islander, and 2% Multiracial. Results indicated that African American race was a significant predictor of scores on the measures of social justice advocacy subscales of Importance, Behaviors, and Actual Advocacy. By comparison, only political involvement was predictive of scores on more subscales than race. In contrast, researchers reported that the other participant characteristics (i.e., highest degree obtained, gender, age, sexual orientation, income, and party affiliation) were not significant predictors on any scale. Researchers concluded that individuals who identified as African American and were politically involved were more likely to perceive social justice advocacy as important and be involved in actual advocacy (Steele, Bischof, & Craig, 2014). So, minority status, whether racial or otherwise, may still be considered a tentative predictor of social justice advocacy engagement.

**Sexual Orientation**

Minority statuses beyond race and gender may also be hypothesized to have an influence on social justice advocacy behaviors. Linnemeyer (2009) hypothesized that minority status (i.e., identification as LGB and/or racial/ethnic minority) would moderate the relationship between experiences of discrimination and social justice advocacy orientation. Participants identified as heterosexual (66%), bi-sexual (4%), lesbian (2%), gay (1%), and 26% did not complete the demographics questionnaire. The researcher found that minority status was not a moderator between experiences of discrimination
and social justice advocacy orientation. However, results indicated that participants identifying as LGB reported a significantly greater orientation toward social justice advocacy than heterosexual participants. Even then, of the seven predictor variables tested for effect on social justice advocacy, sexual orientation (heterosexual versus LGB) was the weakest predictor. Finally, the researcher reported that LGB participants scored significant higher on the social justice advocacy orientation measure than heterosexual participants (Linnemeyer, 2009). Sexual orientation, then, remained unconfirmed as a factor in social justice advocacy.

An earlier research study, however, indicated tentative support for sexual orientation as a factor in one’s desire to engage in social justice advocacy. Nilsson and Schmidt’s (2005) study included 134 participants who identified as 92% heterosexual, 4% lesbian or gay, and 3% bisexual. The researchers reported that LGB students desired engagement in social justice advocacy significantly more than heterosexual students on the measure of desire for social justice advocacy engagement. In terms of actual engagement, however, they reported no difference between the two groups on the measure of actual social justice advocacy engagement.

In a more recent study, Dashjian (2014), as discussed above, investigated factors in 370 psychology doctoral students that may relate to social justice engagement. The researcher tested a hypothesis that LGB minority status would predict higher social justice engagement scores. Participants identified as 87% Heterosexual, 9% Bisexual, 2% Lesbian, and 2% Gay. Results indicated that LGB minority status was, indeed, a significant predictor of social justice engagement. Post-hoc analysis further indicated that LGB participants scored significantly higher on the measure of social justice engagement
than heterosexual participants. In contrast, as discussed above, other researchers have reported that sexual orientation did not have significant effect on social justice advocacy (i.e., Steele, 2011; Steele, Bischof, & Craig, 2014). Sexual orientation may, indeed, be a factor worthy of further investigation in conjunction with career calling’s relationship with social justice advocacy behaviors.

**Chapter Summary**

This chapter presented definitions and discussions of social justice, career counseling, career calling, and the intersection of these in the literature. Initial research has tentatively indicated that counselors enter the profession with both a desire for social justice change and a sense of career calling (Duffy, Bott, Allan, Torrey, & Dik., 2012). The prosocial aspects of social justice advocacy, career counseling, and professional counseling guidelines cannot account for the sometimes failure of counselors to actually engage in social justice advocacy. There also remains much to learn about the factors that predict actual engagement. Examination of the constructs and factors presented in this chapter in light of a sense of career calling may illuminate and further explain, or even predict, actual engagement. However, research is needed on the relationship of career calling and social justice advocacy and factors that lead counselors to engage in social justice advocacy regarding the students that they counsel.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to explore the correlative and predictive relationships between a measurement of a perceived sense of career calling to a measurement of social justice advocacy behaviors for a sample population of counselors who are employed in P-16 educational settings and are members of the American College Counseling Association (ACCA) or the American School Counselor Association (ASCA). The researcher addressed the purpose of this study through three areas of quantitative exploration and analysis: (a) the extent to which the sample population compares to other populations in literature on career calling, (b) the extent to which career calling relates to social justice advocacy behaviors in the sample population, and (c) the extent to which career calling relates to participant-specific demographic factors to predict social justice advocacy behaviors. In other words, this study compared career calling of the sample population to others in literature, career calling to social justice advocacy behaviors, and career calling to other factors in literature that affect social justice advocacy behaviors. The following research questions guided the research:

1. To what extent does the sample population compare to other populations reported in career calling research literature on the Brief Calling Scale (BCS)?
2. Does the presence of a career calling relate to social justice advocacy behaviors?
3. To what extent does a three-dimensional measure of the presence of a career calling predict social justice advocacy behaviors?

4. To what extent does presence of career calling combined with participant-specific factors predict participants’ social justice advocacy behaviors?

This chapter is divided into five sections to describe the methodology that was used to answer the above research questions. The first section explains the research design. Section two designates the sample group from which the participants was drawn. Section three outlines the procedures for sampling and data collection. Section four evaluates the instruments used in this study: the Brief Calling Scale (BCS), the Calling and Vocation Questionnaire (CVQ), and the Social Justice Advocacy Scale (SJAS). Section five describes the data analysis methods for each research question.

**Research Design**

The research design of this dissertation was an exploratory, non-experimental design using quantitative data collection and analysis methods (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). This study was considered non-experimental because the researcher did not have direct manipulation over the independent variable, career calling (Johnson & Christensen). This study was considered exploratory because the researcher collected data then searched for patterns in the data, rather than first stating a theory to test against observed data, as a confirmatory method prescribes (Johnson & Christensen). Thus, this researcher explored the relationship, if any, between the critical constructs of career calling and social justice advocacy.
Participants

The population of focus in this study was professional counselors who are members of either ACCA or ASCA and employed in P-16 educational settings. P-16 is a designation indicating the educational years of a student from prekindergarten through four years of post-secondary education (Van de Water et al., 2001; Weldon, 2009). The total population of counselors employed in P-16 settings, however, would be difficult to quantify and describe expediently and accurately. Professional organizations, by contrast, retain email addresses of members on file. Thus, the population of study was P-16 counselors who are employed in educational settings and who are members of ASCA and ACCA. At the time of this writing, The ASCA has a membership of 26,804 individuals (American School Counselor Association, 2016). The ACCA has approximately 1,400 members (American College Counseling Association, 2016). Criteria for inclusion in this study were that participants must (a) be employment as a professional counselor full-time or part-time in a P-16 educational institution (i.e., P-12 school, college, or university) (b) hold current membership of either the American College Counseling Association (ACCA) or the American School Counselor Association (ASCA), and (c) have completed a master’s degree or higher in counseling.

Procedures

Before recruiting participants and collecting data, the researcher obtained approval from the university’s Institutional Review Board (IRB. The researcher then received permission from the appropriate officers of ACCA (A. Lenhart, personal communication, March 9, 2016; see Appendix B) and ASCA (J. Cook, personal communication, March 3, 2016; see Appendix C) for the researcher to request
participation of their members. As a member of ASCA, the researcher posted the research request and a link to the survey on the ASCA SCENE forum. The researcher also posted the research request and a link to the survey on the ACCA’s listserv, which was emailed to ASCA members.

**Introductory Letter**

Potential participants received an introductory letter with a hyperlinked sentence via the ACCA listserv email or the ASCA forum email (see Appendix D). The link led potential participants to an introduction of the study and to the study’s website in Qualtrics. At the Qualtrics website, potential participants first read a cover letter describing (a) the purpose of the study, (b) informing them of the voluntary nature of their participation, and (c) outlining the procedures. They then chose either to participate in the study or to exit.

**Informed Consent**

Before participants were allowed to access the questionnaire, they read and electronically signed a statement of Informed Consent (see Appendix E). The statement included the; (a) purpose of the research study, (b) estimated time required for completion of the survey, (c) eligibility criteria for participants, (d) potential risks and benefits to taking part in this study, (e) reminder of the voluntary nature of participation and that they may discontinue participation at any time, and (f) statement that their data will remain confidential.

**Data Collection**

Participants who consented to the study completed the demographics questionnaire and three instruments by self-report on the internet-based survey website,
Qualtrics. Thus, the researcher used the cross-sectional data collection method in which all data were collected at one point in time (Creswell, 2009). Participants completed the twelve “presence of calling” items of the CVQ (CVQp) and the two “presence of calling” items of the BCS (BCSp). The researcher’s reason for using only the “presence of calling” scale of these two instruments was that these scales’ questions are commonly asked to participants who are already employed in their careers, as this study’s participants were (Duffy, Allan, Autin, & Bott, 2013; Praskova, Creed, & Hood, 2015b). Participants also completed the Social Justice Advocacy Scale (SJAS; Dean, 2009).

The survey on Qualtrics remained open until a desired number of participants were obtained. The researcher reposted the hyperlink to each listserv approximately once per month for four months. Upon close of the survey, the researcher accessed the data and downloaded it from Qualtrics to SPSS 23. The researcher then inspected the data for missing data, outliers, normality, and linearity.

**Instruments**

The researcher utilized three instruments in this study: the Calling and Vocation Questionnaire (CVQ; Dik, Eldridge, Steger, & Duffy, 2012), the Brief Calling Scale (BCS; Dik, Eldridge, Steger, & Duffy, 2012) and the Social Justice Advocacy Scale (SJAS; Dean, 2009). These instruments were loaded into Qualtrics. Even though the BCS and CVQ are publically accessible instruments (Duffy & Dik, 2012), the researcher received permission to use them and to load them into Qualtrics (R. Duffy, personal communication, March 9, 2016; see Appendix F). The researcher has received similar permission from the author of the SJAS (J. Dean, personal communication, March 11,
Demographics Questionnaire

Participants were asked to complete a demographics questionnaire (see Appendix H). Requested demographic information included the following: job title, work setting, age, race, gender, graduate degree(s), professional association membership, number of years working in P-16 counseling, and whether or not they completed a graduate-level social justice course. Of particular interest to the researcher was the demographic data of (a) whether or not they completed a graduate-level social justice course (Caldwell, 2008), (b) political ideology (Parikh, Post, & Flowers, 2011), (c) religion and spirituality (Caldwell & Vera, 2010), (d) gender (Dashjian, 2014), (e) race (Steele, Bischoff, & Craig, 2014), and (f) sexual orientation (Dashjian) because these have been tentatively found to have an effect on individuals’ engagement in social justice advocacy.

Brief Calling Scale (BCS)

The Brief Calling Scale (BCS; Dik, Sargent, & Steger, 2008; Dik, Eldridge, Steger, & Duffy, 2012) is a 4-item unidimensional measure of career calling to determine the concept’s relevance to a person’s life and career (Dik, et al., 2012; see Appendix I). Two items measure the presence of a calling in one’s career and two items measure the search for a calling to a career. The BCS uses a 5-point Likert-like rating system: 1 (Not at all true of me), 2 (Mildly true of me), 3 (Moderately true of me), 4 (Mostly true of me), and 5 (Totally true of me). Total score on the BCS ranges from four to 20. Presence of calling (BCSp) scale scores range from two to ten, as do the search for a calling scale scores (BCSs).
The BCS is the most utilized instrument to measure career calling and was found to be the best predictor of presence of calling when compared to other validated instruments measuring career calling (Duffy, Autin, Allan, & Douglas, 2015). The validation study of the BCS found evidence for internal consistency reliability construct validity (Dik, Eldridge, Steger, & Duffy, 2012). Researchers have found internal consistency reliability of BCS scale scores of alpha .83 at T1 and alpha .88 at T2 (Bott & Duffy, 2015). The two items of the BCS presence scale score have been found to strongly correlate at $r = .81$ (Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007). Thus, the BCS is an appropriate instrument to answer the research questions in this study.

**Calling and Vocation Questionnaire (CVQ)**

The Calling and Vocation Questionnaire (CVQ; Dik, Eldridge, Steger, & Duffy, 2012) is a 24-item multidimensional measure of the presence of and search for a career calling and vocation in career development. Based on the same definition of career calling as the BCS, the CVQ further defines the construct of career calling, allowing for more precise investigation of career calling in participants’ experiences (Duffy, Autin, Allan, & Douglas, 2015). The CVQ (see Appendix H) contains six scales that measure the presence of and search for calling in terms of (a) transcendent summons, (b) purposeful work, and (c) prosocial orientation. The first of the three scales, transcendent summons, measures whether or not participants believe that the calling originated outside themselves (Dik & Duffy, 2009). Second, the purposeful work scale measures whether or not participants derives a sense of purpose and meaning from a particular life role (Dik & Duffy). Third, the prosocial orientation scale measures whether or not participants are motivated within a particular life role to contribute positively to other or benefit society.
The CVQ is a publically accessible instrument (Duffy & Dik, 2012). These scales, especially the third one, are useful for answering this study’s research questions.

The CVQ uses a 4-point Likert-like rating system: 1 (Not at all true of me), 2 (Somewhat true of me), 3 (Mostly true of me), and 4 (Absolutely true of me). The CVQ yields scores that fall on the continuous scale between 24 and 96. The overall score indicates participants’ sense of the presence of a calling (CVQp) or the search for a calling (CVQs) in their career development (Dik, Eldridge, Steger, & Duffy, 2012). In addition to distinguishing between presence and search, three subscale scores allow for participants to distinguish between each of the three dimensions of career calling’s multi-dimensional construct – transcendent summons, purposeful work, and prosocial orientation (Dik et al., 2012).

The CVQ was created and validated using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis and a multitrait-multimethod matrix design (Dik, Eldridge, Steger, & Duffy, 2012; Eldridge, 2010). Example items include: “I was drawn by something beyond myself to my current line of work,” “My career is an important part of my life meaning,” and “Making a difference for others is the primary motivation in my career.”

Duffy and Dik have used their construct of calling in approximately two dozen research studies to date. The Dik and Duffy (2009) definition of calling has been widely utilized in research studies since 2009 and is the foundation of the CVQ. Researches have used the CVQ in Romania (Dumulescu, Opre, & Ramona, 2015), Canada (Domene, 2012), and translated and validated a Korean version, the CVQ-K (Shim & Yoo, 2012). Dik and Duffy were also involved in developing and validating the precursor of the CVQ,
the Brief Calling Scale (BCS; Duffy & Sedlacek, 2007; Dik, Eldridge et al., 2012). The CVQ is, therefore, an increasingly used instrument across diverse populations in studies that require a more concise measurement of career calling.

In contrast to the CVQ, the BCS is much shorter instrument, containing only four items. The BCS has been used in many more research studies than the CVQ, per the researcher’s review of literature. However, the BCS is a unidimensional measure of the presence of or search for career calling (Dik, Eldridge, Steger, & Duffy, 2012). The BCS would not yield the data needed to compare to social justice advocacy behaviors, as would the CVQ’s prosocial scale, for this study’s third research question. The BCS is, however, the preferred instrument for answering this study’s first research question.

The validation study of the CVQ found strong evidence for internal consistency reliability, moderate test–retest reliability for scale and total scores, and initial support for criterion-related validity and construct validity (Dik, Eldridge, Steger, & Duffy, 2012). Domene (2012) found that the three dimensions, or scales, of the CVQ have good internal consistency, with Cronbach’s Alpha scores ranging from .85 to .92, and moderate test–retest reliability over a one month period ($r$ ranging from .62 to .67). They reported an internal consistency of .88 and a test–retest reliability of $r = .75$ (Dik, Eldridge et al.). Researchers comparing five different instruments to measure calling found that the CVQ was second behind the BCS at predicting presence of a calling, leading those researchers to surmise that the CVQ’s scales more accurately represented the construct of calling than those of the other instruments (Duffy, Autin, Allan, & Douglas, 2015). The researcher chose the CVQ for its usefulness in delineating three distinct dimensions of
the career calling construct, especially its prosocial scale, which was hypothesized to have a significant relationship to a measure of social justice advocacy.

**Social Justice Advocacy Scale (SJAS)**

The Social Justice Advocacy Scale (SJAS; Dean, 2009) is an instrument that was created as one of the first attempts to operationalize and measure counselors’ social justice advocacy competencies. Dean created the SJAS in three phases. The first phase involved expanding each of the 43 competencies of the American Counseling Association’s (ACA) Advocacy Competencies (Lewis, Arnold, House, & Toporek, 2003) through a multidisciplinary review of literature with an emphasis on advocacy behaviors and skills related to each of the 43 competencies. Phase two of SJAS development involved exploring the content validity of the resulting instrument. Phase three, involved investigating the reliability and construct validity of the instrument (Dean).

Dean generated initial items for the instrument through a review of multidisciplinary literature. Then, three practicing counselors who were doctoral students gave feedback about the items. Next, five advocacy specialists, who had contributed to social advocacy literature and practice, gave feedback on the content validity. Finally, to check reliability and construct validity, Dean recruited 112 graduate counseling or counseling psychology students (Dean, 2009).

The resulting Social Justice Advocacy Scale is a 43-item instrument consisting of four dimensions; (a) collaborative action, (b) social/political advocacy, (c) client empowerment, and (d) client/community advocacy (Dean, 2009). The SJAS is intended to measure behaviors related to the 43 items of the ACA Advocacy Competencies (Dean; Lewis et al. 2003). Participants self-rate items on a 7-point Likert-like scale ranging from
1, not at all true, to 7, totally true. Example items include: “I work with clients to develop action plans for confronting barriers to their wellbeing” and “I contact legislators on behalf of clients’ needs” (Dean). The result is a continuous scale score ranging between 43 and 701.

Psychometric study of the SJAS yielded initial evidence for construct validity, content validity overall score reliability; however, replication with a larger sample size is needed (Dean, 2009; Fietzer & Ponterotto, 2015). Despite this limitation, the SJAS has been utilized in at least two dissertations (Fickling, 2015; Streufert, 2012). Reliability study of the SJAS found a Cronbach’s Alpha of .94 (Dean). The SJAS has also been the subject of validation study in its Turkish language version with researchers finding it reliable at a Cronbach’s Alpha of .92 (Bayoglu-Serpen, Duyan, & Ugurluoglu-Aldogan, 2014). Until further validation of the SJAS is conducted, researchers were advised not to interpret its individual scales; however, a total SJAS score has been used in research (Struefert). This potential weakness in the instrument could pose a limitation to the results of this study.

Nevertheless, the SJAS (Dean, 2009) is the appropriate instrument for this study due to its congruence with this study’s research questions’ emphases on actual behaviors of social justice advocacy and due to the lack of a similar validated instrument. For example, Fietzer and Ponterotto (2015) critiqued the psychometrics instruments that purportedly measure social justice advocacy. After reviewing literature, they selected four instruments that met their inclusion criteria. They reported that all four instruments in their review lacked adequate levels of test-retest reliability, diversity of samples in validation studies, and robustness of factor analysis methods. They further reported that
only one instrument’s authors “provided evidence that it predicts actual behavior” (p. 31). Notably, they excluded instruments that were developed in dissertations, specifically citing Dean’s SJAS as their example. Given the lack of sufficiently vetted instruments in scholarly literature (McCarther et al., 2012), the SJAS was chosen for its use in this study because of its utility in measuring actual social justice advocacy behaviors according to the widely accepted ACA Advocacy Competencies (Ratts, Toporek, & Lewis, 2010), a feature unique to this instrument.

**Data Analysis**

Quantitative analysis methods included the use of descriptive statistics and inferential statistics using SPSS 24. This researcher used descriptive statistics to describe the sample population, including frequencies and percentages for each demographic variable. Means, modes, ranges, and standard deviations were reported for scores on each of the three instruments – BCSp, CVQp, and SJAS. Inferential statistical methods used included correlation (Pearson’s $r$ and $t$-test), analysis of variance (ANOVA), and Regression Analysis. Data analysis methods for the research questions are described below.

**Research Question 1**

To what extent does the sample population compare to other populations reported in career calling research literature on the Brief Calling Scale (BCS)?

The mean was calculated for participants’ scores on the two-item presence of calling scale of the BCS (BCSp). Independent $t$-tests were used to compare participants’ mean BCSp scores to mean BCSp scores reported in literature for other sample populations. The purpose of a $t$-test is to determine whether or not
there is a significant difference between the means of two groups (Johnson & Christensen, 2012).

**Research Question 2**

Does the presence of a career calling (as indicated by participants’ BCSp scores) relate to social justice advocacy behaviors (as indicated by participants’ SJAS scores)?

Means were calculated for participants’ scores on each instrument – BCSp and SJAS. The Pearson’s correlation coefficient (r) was be calculated to determine the relationship between the BCSp and the SJAS. A Pearson correlation allows researchers to describe and measure the correlation (linear dependence) between two or more continuous variables (Creswell, 2009). Pearson’s r indicates the direction of the relationship (positive or negative), the form of the relationship (linear or non-linear), and the strength of the linear relationship. Pearson’s r will always be a value somewhere in the range of -1.0 to 1.0, where -1.0 indicates a perfect inverse (negative) relationship, 0.0 is no relationship, and 1.0 is a perfect positive relationship. R-squared was calculated from Pearson’s r to determine how much of the variance in the dependent variable (SJAS score) could be explained by the independent variable (BCSp score).

**Research Question 3**

To what extent does a three-dimensional measure of the presence of a career calling (as indicated by participants’ CVQp scores) predict social justice advocacy behaviors (as indicated by participants’ SJAS scores)?

A Multiple Linear Regression was run to determine which of the CVQp dimensions, or combination thereof, explain the variance in SJAS scores. Multiple
Linear Regression is useful to explain or predict a continuous scale dependent variable based on one or more continuous scale independent variables (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). The dependent variable was the SJAS score. The independent variables, or predictors, were the scores on the three scales of the CVQp. The Pearson Correlation Coefficients and Coefficient of Determination ($r^2$) were calculated to explore the relationships between the independent variable scores (i.e., transcendent summons, purposeful work, and prosocial orientation) and SJAS scores.

**Research Question 4**

To what extent does presence of career calling (as indicated by participants’ CVQp scores) combined with participant-specific factors (as reported on the demographic questionnaire) predict participants’ social justice advocacy behaviors (as indicated by participants’ SJAS scores)?

Multiple Linear Regression was used to answer this answer by virtue of its ability to predict an outcome based on multiple combinations of variables (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). The dependent variable was SJAS score. The independent variables, or predictors, were the scores on the three scales of the CVQp and the participant-specific factors (i.e., those collected by the demographic questionnaire, discussed above). The coefficients of correlation and coefficient of determination ($r^2$) were calculated. Each of the participant-specific factors (independent variables) is categorical and, thus, must be transformed to “dummy variables” or numbers 1, 2, 3, etc. for each level of the independent variable (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black).
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of this study using data collected from 90 participants. First, the population sample is described in terms of sample size and average age. Next, descriptive statistics are presented about the sample population regarding inclusion criteria. Then, two sections present descriptive statistics about the variables used in this study: categorical predictor variables (i.e., data collected from the demographics questionnaire) and continuous predictor variables (i.e., data collected from the three instruments). Next, the results of post hoc analyses are presented. The findings related to the four research questions are presented.

Survey data collected from the three instruments and demographics questionnaire were downloaded from Qualtrics to a Microsoft Excel file. The downloaded data were then screened for missing data and transferred to IBM SPSS 23. The researcher used a variety of statistical tests to analyze the data: Pearson Correlation, independent t-tests, analysis of variance, and multiple regression analysis. Significance for all statistical tests was indicated at an alpha level of .05 or less ($p < .05$).

Description of the Sample

The researcher sent an invitation to participate in the research study by the ASCA and ACCA listservs. One hundred, seventeen individuals participated, or at least began participation, in the study. Of the 117 participants, 93 complete all elements of the survey. Two of the 93 participants completed the survey twice on two different days. The
researcher, therefore, deleted their second sets of data. Another participant, who stated having zero years of P-16 work experience, did not meet the criterion of being employed as a counselor in P-16 education. Thus, the study included 90 who met the criteria for participation.

**Descriptive Statistics of the Inclusion Criteria**

The average age of participants was 44.0 years with a range of 24 to 62 years. Beyond this data, other demographic data was collected from the participants. Those data are described below and pertain to the participation criteria.

Three questions on the demographics questionnaire pertained to the inclusion criteria: currently working in counseling in P-16 education, a member of ASCA or ACCA, and hold a graduate degree in counseling. The researcher calculated the frequency and percent of each, as presented in Table 1. There was almost an even split between membership in ASCA and ACCA. The same was true regarding counselors’ work setting: about half work in P-12 counseling and half work in college or university counseling.

Table 1.

*Demographic Characteristics of the Sample Population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Association Membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCA</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle school</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or University</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three participants stated working in “other,” specifying job titles of “school counselor,” “professional counselor/professor,” and “special education counselor” (see Table 1). Data indicated an average of 8.6 years (range of 0.2 to 33.0) working as a counselor in P-16 education. Most participants (76.7%) have a masters degree in counseling or a related field of study.

The researcher examined participants’ job titles in order to further verify that the employment criterion for inclusion in the study was met. The researcher then separated the job titles into categories, as presented in Table 2. Approximately three-fourth of participants indicated having the job title of counselor. The remaining one-fourth stated titles in the counseling profession, but it was unclear from the data whether or not they are also personally providing counseling to students.

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Counseling and Psychological Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Director of Clinical Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Director of Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Counseling and Disability Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Counseling Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director, Student Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Director of the Wellness Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Counselor</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Counselor II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Wellness Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Counselor/Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Therapist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist Intern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor K-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JH Professional Counselor/District School-Based Social Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 School Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12+ Special Education Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional School counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional School Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Health Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral Resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor, Counseling Adjunct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Teaching/Research Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptive Statistics of the Categorical Predictor Variables

Seven questions on the survey questionnaire collected data concerning the seven variables of interest to the four research questions. Those seven variables asked participants for information about their completion of a graduate-level course, race, gender, sexual orientation, political ideology, religion, and spirituality. Descriptive statistics of each of these are summarized below and presented in Table 3.

The majority of the participants had taken a graduate course with either the terms Social Justice, Multicultural, or Advocacy in the course title (91.1%). The majority of the participants were female (82.2%) and identified their racial identity as white (86.7%). When asked about their sexual orientation, most of the participants indicated that they are straight (84.5%) with a portion of those individuals also considering themselves cisgender (35.6%). Regarding their political ideology, 55.5% of the participants consider themselves to be liberal, while 18.9% consider themselves to be moderate and 23.4% consider themselves to be conservative. Almost half of participants (48.9%) indicated that their religion plays a significant role in their social justice advocacy beliefs and behaviors. A large majority of participants (72.2%) indicated that their spirituality plays a significant role in their social justice advocacy beliefs and behaviors.

Table 3.

*Categorical Predictor Variable Characteristics for the Sample Population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Size (n)</th>
<th>Percent N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete a graduate-level course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy &amp; Multicultural</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice &amp; Multicultural</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Social Justice, Advocacy, & Multicultural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None of the Above</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-racial/Multi-racial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North African</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/European</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Identify</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sexual Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straight</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight, Cisgender</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight, Self-Identify</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay, Cisgender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian, Cisgender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisexual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Political Ideology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Liberal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Liberal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Conservative</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Conservative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven’t thought much about this</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spirituality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure how to answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not sure how to answer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not apply</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Spirituality
Descriptive Statistics of the Continuous Predictor Variables

The researcher used three instruments to gather continuous variable data: the presence of a calling scale of the Brief Calling Scale (BCSp), the presence of a calling scale of the Calling and Vocation Questionnaire (CVQp), and the Social Justice Advocacy Scale (SJAS). The BCSp and CVQp data were used as continuous predictor variables in the analysis of the four research questions. Descriptive statistics of the instruments are presented below.

**Brief Calling Scale (BCSp)**

Participants rated the two items of the BCSp (see Appendix I) on a 5-point Likert-like rating system as to how much they identified as having a career calling (1 = *not at all true of me*, 5 = *totally true of me*). For the BCS, the mean was 7.54 (SD = 2.54, range (2, 10)). The two items were highly correlated (α = .891), indicating high reliability for the measure. The data was skewed left, thus, not distributed normally, which is good because it indicates that most individuals in the sample population believe or feel that they have a career calling. The mode was 10 (i.e., 30 of the 90 participants totally agreed with having the presence of a career calling).

**Calling and Vocation Questionnaire (CVQp)**

Additionally, participants rated the 12 items of the CVQp on a 4-point Likert-like rating system as to how much they identified as having a career calling (1 = *not at all true of me*, 4 = *absolutely true of me*). The items were summed to form the total score with the minimal possible being 12 and maximum being 48. The total measure also indicated that the participants view themselves to have a high career calling with a mean of 37.62 (SD =
8.09, range (19, 48)) and a distinct left skew. The total measure had strong internal reliability with a Cronbach’s Alpha of .921.

The CVQ also yielded scores for each of the three dimensions, or subscales: transcendent summons (CVQpTS), purposeful work (CVQpPW), and prosocial orientation (CVQpPO). Four items were summed for each subscale: the CVQpTS (M=11.28, SD= 4.02, range (4, 16)), the CVQpPW (M = 12.76, SD = 3.04, range (6, 16)), and the CVQpPO (M = 13.59, SD = 2.34, range (4, 16). Each of the subscales displayed strong internal reliability with Cronbach’s alphas of .91, .90, and .82, respectively.

**Descriptive Statistics of the Dependent Variable**

The dependent variable was a continuous variable measured by the SJAS. The SJAS data were used as the dependent variable in the analysis. The SJAS is intended to measure behaviors related to advocacy competencies. Participants self-rated 43 items on a 7-point Likert-like scale ranging from 1, *not at all true*, to 7, *totally true*. For SJAS scores, the mean was 190.62 (SD = 42.47, range (90, 294). This measure also showed high internal consistency with a Cronbach’s alpha of .95.

**Quantitative Findings**

The researcher used a demographics questionnaire and three instruments (i.e., BCSp, CVQp, and SJAS) to collect quantitative data for use in analysis. The results of the analyses are presented in relation to each of the research questions guiding this study. The research questions are as follows:

1. To what extent does the sample population compare to other populations reported in career calling research literature on the Brief Calling Scale (BCS)?
2. Does the presence of a career calling relate to social justice advocacy behaviors?

3. To what extent does a three-dimensional measure of the presence of a career calling predict social justice advocacy behaviors?

4. To what extent does presence of career calling combined with participant-specific factors predict participants’ social justice advocacy behaviors?

**Research Question 1**

The first research question explored the extent that this study’s sample population was or was not significantly different from other populations reported in career calling research literature on the BCSp scale. This study sampled a population of P-16 counselors, while all but one of the comparison studies sampled post-secondary students. The remaining study sampled US residents who were employed at least part-time. Table 4 displays each of those studies, listing the researchers, population studied, and descriptive statistics (i.e., mean, standard deviation, and sample size).

Table 4.

*Descriptive Statistics This Study’s Population and Comparison Populations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Study</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Counselors in P-16 education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffy &amp; Sedlacek, 2007</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>University students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dik, Sargent, &amp; Steger, 2008</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>University students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steger, Pickering, Shin, &amp; Dik, 2010</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>University students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffy &amp; Sedlacek, 2010</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2,432</td>
<td>University students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffy, Allan, Autin, &amp; Bott, 2013</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>Employed residents of the US</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because this researcher did not have access to the raw data from the comparison studies, assumptions of normality and equal variances could not be ascertained. Therefore, Welch’s $t$-test was used to determine statistical differences where only the sample size, mean, and standard deviation were known and the assumption of equal variances could not be substantiated (Best & Rayner, 1987). Table 5 presents the findings of the $t$-tests between BCSp scores of participants in this study and participants of other studies. Participants in this study scored significantly higher ($p < .001$) on the BCSp than did participants in each of the comparison studies. The largest difference was between this study ($M = 7.54, \text{SD} = 2.54$) and the Galles and Lenz (2013) study ($M = 5.57, \text{SD} = 2.31$); $t(417) = 6.64, p < .001$. The smallest difference was between this study and the Bott and Duffy (2015) study ($M = 6.49, \text{SD} = 2.36$); $t(531) = 3.62, p < .001$. Effect sizes, expressed as Cohen’s D (see Table 5), were medium between this study and all comparison studies, except one which had a large effect size (.81).

Table 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Cohen’s D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duffy &amp; Sedlacek, 2007</td>
<td>4.40*</td>
<td>3,179</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dik, Sargent, &amp; Steger, 2008</td>
<td>4.79*</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steger, Pickering, Shin, &amp; Dik, 2010</td>
<td>4.89*</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffy &amp; Sedlacek, 2010</td>
<td>5.52*</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duffy, Allan, Autin, &amp; Bott, 2013</td>
<td>3.63*</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 2

The second research question explored whether or not the presence of a career calling, as measured by the BCSp, related to social justice advocacy behaviors, as measured by the SJAS. A Pearson Product-Moment Correlation indicated that there was a positive correlation between the two, $r (90) = .186$, $p = .079$. The relationship, however, was not significant at $p < .05$ level. A post-hoc power analysis using G*Power 3.1 (Faul & Erdfelder, 1998) determined large effect size of .99, indicating that sufficient power was represented in the sample to detect significance for the independent $t$-tests. The answer to this research question is that career calling, measured by the BCSp, is not significantly positively correlated to social justice advocacy behaviors.

Research Question 3

The third research question explored the extent that a three-dimensional measure of the presence of a career calling, the CVQp, predicted social justice advocacy behaviors, as measured by the SJAS. Multiple regressions were conducted to evaluate whether the three dimensions of the CVQp predicted social justice advocacy behaviors.

Initially, each of the predictors was entered into separate regression analyses. When the CVQ transcendent summons (CVQpTS) was entered as a predictor of SJAS, the model significantly predicted social justice advocacy, $F (1, 88) = 4.040$, $p = .047$, with the model contributing to approximately 4.4% of the variance in social justice advocacy behaviors (see Table 6 for full regression results). As for the purposeful work
and prosocial orientation subscales, neither of the individual models significantly predicted SJAS, although CVQPW approached significance $F(1, 88) = 3.77, p = .055$. When all three CVQ subscales were entered into the multiple regression model none of them continued as significant predictors, indicating that all three subscales were so similar that they were each vying for the same variance in the model causing them all to become non-significant. In order to adjust for this issue, the total CVQ measure was entered into the regression model. This model produced a significant prediction of social justice advocacy, $F(1, 88) = 4.859, p = .030$, with an $r^2 = .05$, indicating that the model accounts for approximately 5% of the overall variance in social justice advocacy behaviors. A post-hoc power analysis using G*Power 3.1 (Faul & Erdfelder, 1998) determined sufficient effect size of .59 to proceed with analysis. The answer to the third research question is the presence of a career calling, measured by the CVQp, can predict engagement in social justice advocacy behaviors. Further, the transcendent summons dimension of a career calling can predict engagement in social justice advocacy.

Table 6.

*Regressions with CVQp subscales Predicting Social Justice Advocacy Behaviors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CVQpTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>.044*</td>
<td>4.04*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>2.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVQpPW</td>
<td></td>
<td>.041†</td>
<td>3.77†</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.94†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVQpPO</td>
<td></td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVQp All subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td>.053*</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transcendent Summons  

<p>| Transcendent Summons | .13 | .94 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purposeful Work</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosocial Orientation</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVQp Total Summed</td>
<td>.052*</td>
<td>.23* 2.20*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† \( p < .10 \)

* \( p < .05 \)

** \( p < .01 \)

*** \( p < .001 \)

**Research Question 4**

The fourth research question explored the extent that the presence of a career calling combined with seven participant-specific factors predicts participants’ social justice advocacy behaviors. Presence of a career calling was measured by the CVQp and its three subscales. The seven participant-specific factors were completion of a graduate-level course, race, gender, sexual orientation, political ideology, religion, and spirituality. These eleven factors were entered into a stepwise regression analysis. A post-hoc power analysis using G*Power 3.1 (Faul & Erdfelder, 1998) determined sufficient effect size of .97 to proceed with analysis.

Completion of a graduate-level course, race, gender, sexual orientation, political ideology, religion, and spirituality were entered as main effects by creating separate dummy coded variables, as indicated by Aiken and West (1996). Aiken and West suggest that each comparison group must have at least 5 scores. Therefore, when it was logical, group size was increased by combining groups with small numbers of participants. For example, for the political ideology variable, all conservative and liberal selections were combined into two individual groups while a third group was unmodified as moderate. The variables of race, sexual orientation, and political ideology were each condensed to form three categorical groupings. Table 7 displays the original categories for each demographic variable as well as the condensed/combined variables. Only the variables
that were condensed are included in the table. When creating the grouped variables, any responses that were given as not sure, had not thought about it, or does not apply were treated as missing data as there is no theoretical basis for including them in the analyses.

Table 7.

*Regrouping for variables with small numbers in categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Original Category</th>
<th>Combined Grouping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (n = 78)</td>
<td>White (n = 78)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (n = 7)</td>
<td>Black (n = 7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian (n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi/Multi-Racial (n = 2)</td>
<td>RaceOther (n = 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight (n = 45)</td>
<td>Straight (n = 45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straight/CisGender (n = 32)</td>
<td>Straight/CisGender (n = 32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian (n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CisGender (n = 6)</td>
<td>OrienOther (n = 13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BiSexual/CisGender (n = 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay/CisGender (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian/CisGender (n = 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Ideology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Liberal (n = 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal (n = 29)</td>
<td>Liberal (n = 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Liberal (n = 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (n = 17)</td>
<td>Moderate (n = 17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When running multiple regressions with dummy-coded categorical variables, one group is selected to be the reference group within each variable (Aiken & West, 1996). The reference group is chosen based on theoretical reasoning. For example, the literature suggests that graduate courses in social justice, advocacy, or multi-cultural issues would increase an individual’s social justice advocacy. Therefore, in the current study, those individuals who had not taken any courses with those emphases were created as the reference group. For each of the six categories within the course variable, a new variable was created in which a single category was entered as a 1 and all other categories were entered as 0. In order to be able to detect if those individuals who had taken courses with the proposed emphases had different social justice behaviors than those who did not take those courses, all the newly created variables were entered into the regression analyses.

The same pattern of creating dummy-coded variables was followed for all of the other demographic variables. The regression analyses were conducted twice so the reference group was changed in order to make all possible comparisons. The summed Career and Vocation Questionnaire was entered as the first step of each regression, with each other demographic variable entered in its own step, in order to be able to detect the effect size of each demographic variable via the change in the $R^2$. 
Table 8.

*Regressions Including CVQp with None as the Graduate Course Reference Group, White as the Racial Reference Group, Other as the Sexual Orientation Reference Group, Conservative as the Political Ideology Reference Group Predicting Social Justice Behaviors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Social Justice Behaviors</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( t )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>CVQ\text{total}</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1.86(^\dagger)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Course – Social Justice vs. none</td>
<td>.18(^*)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course – Multi-cultural vs. none</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course – SJ/Advoc/MC vs. none</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.99(^\dagger)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course – Advoc/MC vs. none</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course – SJ/MC vs. none</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Race – Black vs. White</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.98(^\dagger)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race – Other vs. White</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>Gender – Male vs. Female</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>Orientation – Straight vs. Other</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation – Straight/CisGender vs. Other</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td>Politics – Liberal vs. Conservative</td>
<td>.13(^**)</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>2.85(^**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politics – Moderate vs. Conservative</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>2.41(^*)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7</td>
<td>Incorporating Religion – No vs. Yes</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 8</td>
<td>Incorporating Spirituality – No vs. Yes</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\dagger\) \( p < .10 \). \(^*\) \( p < .05 \). \(^**\) \( p < .01 \). \(^***\) \( p < .001 \).
Table 9

Regressions Including CVQp with None as the Graduate Course Reference Group, Black as the Racial Reference Group, Straight as the Sexual Orientation Reference Group, Liberal as the Political Ideology Reference Group Predicting Social Justice Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Social Justice Behaviors</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td>CVQtotal</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>2.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td>Course – Social Justice vs. none</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course – Multi-cultural vs. none</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course – SJ/Advoc/MC vs. none</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>2.01*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course – Advoc/MC vs. none</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course – SJ/MC vs. none</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td>Race – Other vs. Black</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race – White vs. Black</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td>Gender – Male vs. Female</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td>Orientation – Other vs. Straight</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation – Straight/CisGender vs. Straight</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td>Politics – Moderate vs. Liberal</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politics – Conservative vs. Liberal</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>2.80**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 7</td>
<td>Incorporating Religion – No vs. Yes</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 8</td>
<td>Incorporating Spirituality – No vs. Yes</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† p < .10. * p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.

The results for the two multiple regressions can be seen in Tables 8 and 9. The summed CVQ continued to have an impact on SJAS (β = .27, t = 2.05, p > .05) when controlling for all of the demographic variables. The addition of the course variables
significantly contributed to the prediction of the variance in SJ with a $\Delta R^2$ of .18, indicating that 18% of the variance in social justice advocacy can be explained by the courses taken in graduate school. However, the only grouping of graduate courses that had a significant impact on social justice orientation was the combination of social justice, advocacy, and multicultural courses, such that the individuals who took those courses had significantly higher social justice advocacy than those who did not take any courses with those emphases ($\beta = .31, t = 2.01, p > .05$).

Race did not significantly predict engagement in social justice advocacy behaviors. Black individuals had marginally higher, though not statistically significant, SJAS scores than White individuals ($\beta = .23, t = 1.98, p = .053$). No other racial differences were observed. There was also no significant impact of gender or sexual orientation on SJAS scores. The political ideology variable, however, significantly contributed to the prediction of the variance in SJAS with a $\Delta R^2$ of .13, indicating that 13% of the variance in social justice advocacy can be explained by individual political beliefs. Individuals who viewed themselves as conservative had significantly lower SJAS than individuals with either liberal ($\beta = .41, t = 2.85, p > .01$) or moderate political beliefs ($\beta = .34, t = 2.40, p > .05$). Those individuals who incorporate spiritual or religious discussion into their work did not differ on SJAS from those who do not incorporate it.

**Post Hoc Analyses**

Beyond answering the four research questions, above, the researcher gained a deeper understanding of the phenomena of study through further analysis of the data. A one-way, between-subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) or $t$-test, where appropriate, was conducted for each demographic factor. For analyses with significant omnibus F-
ratios at the $p > .05$ level, post hoc comparisons were calculated using the Tukey Least Significant Difference (LSD) test. The Tukey LSD was chosen for its wide use and high regard by researchers for identifying between-group differences (Gamst, Meyers, & Guarino, 2008). Two instruments, BCSp and CVQp, that were treated as independent variables in the regression analyses discussed above were analyzed as dependent variables in the ANOVA analyses. The findings of the ANOVA post hoc analyses are reported below.

**Brief Calling Scale**

The researcher sought insight about how different participants scored on the two-item career calling instrument, the BCSp, according to their demographics. An analysis of variance showed that the effect the factor named graduate course was significant, $F(5, 84) = 2.83$, $p = .020$. Post hoc analysis using the Tukey LSD indicated that the mean BCSp score for participants who completed a graduate course with social justice and multicultural in the course title (SjMc; $M = 4.00$, $SD = 2.55$) scored significantly less than the other groups (i.e., courses with any other combination of the terms social justice, advocacy, and/or multicultural or none of these in the title). The highest mean score on the BCSp was by participants who indicated having a course with advocacy and multicultural in the title (AdMc; $M = 10.00$, $SD = .000$, but the analysis revealed that the difference was not significant at $p < .05$. These results, however, are tentative because the AdMc group ($N=2$) and SjMc group ($N=5$) had so few participants.

The factors of religion and spirituality were also found to influence career calling. Participants who indicated that their religion plays a significant role in their social justice advocacy beliefs and behaviors scored higher on the BCSp ($M = 8.23$, $SD = 2.05$) than
participants who indicated that it did not (M = 6.19, SD = 2.83). The difference of the means was significant, \( t(73) = 3.60, p = .001 \). Similarly, Participants who indicated that their spirituality plays a significant role in their social justice advocacy beliefs and behaviors scored higher on the BCSp (M = 8.20, SD = 2.16) than participants who indicated that it did not (M = 5.63, SD = 2.73). The difference of the means was significant, \( t(82) = 4.27, p > .001 \).

**Calling and Vocation Questionnaire**

The researcher also sought insight about how different participants scored on the 12-item career calling instrument, the CVQp, according to their demographics. Analysis of variance and \( t \)-tests indicated that the only demographic factors that influenced CVQp scores were religion and spirituality. Participants who indicated that their religion plays a significant role in their social justice advocacy beliefs and behaviors scored higher on the CVQp (M = 39.93, SD = 7.45) than participants who indicated that it did not (M = 33.96, SD = 8.12). The difference of the means was significant, \( t(73) = 3.60, p = .001 \). Similarly, participants who indicated that their spirituality plays a significant role in their social justice advocacy beliefs and behaviors scored higher on the CVQp (M = 39.60, SD = 7.30) than participants who indicated that it did not (M = 32.42, SD = 8.16). The difference of the means was significant, \( t(82) = 3.66, p > .001 \).

The CVQp has three subscales: transcendent summons, purposeful work, and prosocial orientation. ANOVA results indicated that the transcendent summons (CVQpTS) and purposeful work (CVQpPW) subscales had significant demographic-related findings. These findings were similar to those of the total CVQp discussed above.
**Purposeful Work.** For the CVQpPW subscale, spirituality was the only significant factor. Participants who indicated that their spirituality plays a significant role in their social justice advocacy beliefs and behaviors scored higher on the CVQpPW (M = 13.29, SD = 2.94) than participants who indicated that it did not (M = 11.57, SD = 2.93). The difference of the means was significant, $t(82) = 2.23, p = .028$.

**Transcendent Summons.** For the CVQpTS subscale, religion and spirituality were significant in the t-tests. Participants who indicated that their religion plays a significant role in their social justice advocacy beliefs and behaviors scored higher on the CVQpTS (M = 12.95, SD = 3.17) than participants who indicated that it did not (M = 8.90, SD = 4.27). The difference of the means was significant, $t(73) = 4.70, p > .001$. Similarly, participants who indicated that their spirituality plays a significant role in their social justice advocacy beliefs and behaviors scored higher on the CVQpTS (M = 12.44, SD = 3.40) than participants who indicated that it did not (M = 7.89, SD = 4.31). The difference of the means was significant, $t(82) = 4.81, p > .001$. 


CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Over the past few years, social justice advocacy has become an important concept in the counseling profession. Researchers have sought to understand what factors contribute to counselors becoming engaged in advocacy behaviors. The identification of such factors could hold beneficial implications for the profession.

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between career calling and social justice advocacy in counselors who are employed in P-16 educational settings and are members of the American College Counseling Association (ACCA) or the ASCA (American School Counselor Association). To do so, the researcher used three instruments: the presence scale of the Calling and Vocation Questionnaire (CVQp; Dik, Eldridge, Steger, & Duffy, 2012), the presence scale of the Brief Calling Scale (BCSp; Dik, Eldridge, Steger, & Duffy, 2012) and the Social Justice Advocacy Scale (SJAS; Dean, 2009). Additionally, a demographic questionnaire collected data about seven factors (i.e., graduate-level social justice course, political ideology, sexual orientation, gender, race, religion, and spirituality) that are indicated in literature as affecting social justice advocacy. Those factors were analyzed in conjunction with career calling for their relationship to social justice advocacy.

This chapter summarizes the findings and implications of this study for each of the four research questions. The first research question explored the relevance of career calling to P-16 counselors. The remaining three research questions explored career
calling's relationship to social justice advocacy. Lastly, implications and suggestions for future research are presented.

**Relevance of Career Calling to P-16 Counselors**

The first research question explored whether or not career calling, measured by the BCSp, is a relevant concept to P-16 counselors. To answer this question, the researcher compared this study’s population to other populations reported in career calling research literature. This is the first known study to statistically compare P-16 counselors’ sense of calling to that of other populations.

The participants in this study scored significantly higher than other populations studied by career calling researchers, which is only somewhat surprising. Other researchers have suggested that counselors enter the career field of professional counseling out of a calling (Duffy, Bott et al., 2012). The more surprising finding, however, was the extent that counselors scored significantly higher than other populations. Despite the comparatively small sample size of this study, which may have yielded an overinflated $t$-test statistic, participants in this study differed from all other populations ($p < .001$), providing overwhelming evidence of difference. This researcher also found internal consistency reliability of the BCSp similar to that found by other researchers (see Bott & Duffy, 2015). The BCSp was, therefore, a reliable measure of career calling for use in this study.

Career calling is therefore a relevant concept for the P-16 counselors in this study. A higher than expected percentage of the sample population (i.e., 33%) indicated that they believed that career calling is “totally true of me.” Only seven percent of participants indicated that career calling was not at all a relevant concept to them. While the
researcher expected that some participants would score this low, it was unexpected that the mode would be highest possible score of 10. This finding is consistent with other research which indicated that counselors enter the counseling profession from a sense of career calling (Duffy, Bott et al., 2012; Hall, Burkholder, & Sterner, 2014). There are implications of this finding for the counseling profession.

**Implications**

Three groups may be most interested in the implications of the findings of this first research question – career counselors, counselor educators, and clinical supervisors. Career counselors may consider using career calling assessments and include discussions of career calling with clients who identify as seeking their career calling or believe they already have a career calling (Dik, Duffy, & Steger, 2012). Second, counselor educators invest themselves in the development of counseling students. Since career calling is such a salient construct to the counselors in this study, counselor educators may consider how to insert career calling into their curricula. One suggestion is that they may discuss career calling with prospective counselor education students. Another suggestion is to include career calling content in the CACREP-required (CACREP, 2016) career counseling course. Finally, clinical supervisors are also concerned with the development of counseling students and new practitioners. Supervisors may consider including discussions of career calling in supervision sessions.

The purpose of the research question discussed above was to explore whether or not career calling was a relevant concept to P-16 counselors. The affirmative finding that it is relevant led the researcher to answer the final three research questions, discussed below. Those questions guided the researcher to explore career calling's relationship to
social justice. Specifically, the BCSp, used in the first research question, was also used in the second research question to investigate career calling’s correlation to the Social Justice Advocacy Scale (SJAS; Dean, 2009), a measure of social justice advocacy behaviors based on ACA Advocacy Competencies (Ratts, Toporek, & Lewis, 2010).

**Correlation of Career Calling to Social Justice Advocacy**

The second research question explored whether or not the presence of a career calling, measured by the BCSp, related to social justice advocacy behaviors, measured by the SJAS. Both instruments were found to be reliable measures of their constructs, thus useful to this study. The relationship between the two constructs, therefore, could be studied because each instrument yielded reliable results.

The relationship between presence of a career calling and social justice advocacy behaviors was found to be not statistically significant. A possible reason could be related to the instruments. Participants very strongly identified with having the presence of a calling. One third of the participants scored the maximum possible presence of a calling score. Participants did not score in the same way toward the high end of the SJAS scale. This difference in score distribution between the instruments indicates that participants, overall, more strongly identified with having a career calling than with engaging in social justice advocacy behaviors and that the two constructs do not necessarily occur together.

**Implications**

The BCSp is not correlated to the SJAS. The implication is that one may not assume that counselors who have a career calling are involved in social justice advocacy. This is a novel finding as no other research has explored the relationship between these two specific instruments, as of the date of this study. However, the relationship between
the two constructs (i.e., social justice behaviors and career calling) has been explored in one previous study. Davidson and Caddell (1994) used two different instruments to find that church members who had strongly held social justice beliefs were likely to view their work as a calling. This study’s findings did not support the Davidson and Caddell findings. A caution to this conclusion, however, is that different instruments may yield a different result as there are several other available and valid measures of career calling and social justice advocacy, as discussed in Chapter 3.

Counselor educators, however, are very interested in leading counseling students to engage in social justice advocacy (Paylo, 2007). This researcher continued to explore career calling as a factor in social justice advocacy. Consequently, the third research question involved the use of a different measure of career calling (i.e., CVQp) that was constructed by the authors of the BCSp. The CVQp yields a multidimensional score that allows for more precise investigation of career calling in the experiences of participants (Duffy, Autin, Allan, & Douglas, 2015). The researcher believed that the CVQp and/or its three subscales, especially the prosocial subscale, would be able to predict counselor’s engagement in social justice advocacy. Those results are discussed below in the third and fourth research questions.

**Predicted Relationship of Multidimensional Career Calling to Social Justice Advocacy**

Research has suggested that counselors enter the profession out of both a sense of career calling and a desire for achieving social justice (Duffy, Bott et al., 2012). Of particular interest to this study is that the CVQp is able to measure the extent that an individual’s career calling is expressed by a desire to benefit society. Social justice
advocacy is largely based on this principle (Crethar, Rivera, & Nash, 2008). Therefore a predictive relationship between social justice’s concept of benefit to society and career calling’s concept of prosocial orientation was explored in this third research question. Each of the CVQp subscales displayed strong internal reliability, thus they are reliable measures of career callings’ transcendent summons, purposeful work, and prosocial orientation dimensions.

The researcher found that the presence of a career calling significantly predicts involvement in social justice advocacy. This finding added empirical evidence to a qualitative study in which counseling psychologists discussed the importance of benefitting society as a large part of their career calling (Duffy, Foley et al., 2012). But, unlike the Duffy, Foley et al. (2012) findings in which the prosocial aspect of career calling was the dominant theme in the data, this study found that prosocial orientation alone did not predict involvement in social justice advocacy. The total CVQp and its Transcendent Summons subscale independently did predict involvement.

The finding that transcendent summons, rather than prosocial orientation, predicted social justice advocacy behaviors was unexpected but logical. The three subscales of the CVQ are strongly correlated (Dik, Eldridge, Steger, & Duffy, 2012). This fact allows one to speculate about the source of calling also having a prosocial aspect. The CVQ leaves the source of calling unspecified (Dik & Duffy’s, 2009), so the source of one's calling may actually come from one's community (Zhang, Dik, Wei, & Zhang, 2015) or even from a just cause (Dobrow & Tosti-Kharas, 2011). Thus, the Transcendent Summons and Prosocial Orientation subscales may be addressing the same reality.
Implications of Career Calling as a Predictor

The presence of a career calling can significantly predict P-16 counselors’ involvement in social justice advocacy. Additionally, having a transcendent summons to a career can predict social justice advocacy. These are novel findings as no other research has explored the relationship between these two specific instruments. This is also one of the first studies to empirically study the relationship of career calling and social justice.

As discussed above in the implications of the first research question, this finding holds similar implications for counselor educators who are concerned with equipping counseling students as social justice advocates with consideration of their career callings. The findings also hold novel insight that social justice theorists and researchers can build upon. For example, this study’s findings in this third research question may, in fact, address a tandem phenomenon. There are two aspects to that phenomenon. First, social justice advocacy involves a focus on others and response to injustices in the community around oneself (Crethar, Rivera, & Nash, 2008; Lewis, Arnold, House, & Toporek, 2003). Second, the CVQ leaves the source of calling unspecified. If the source of one's calling is one’s community or a just cause, then a potentially intriguing push-pull phenomenon is created in which a counselor’s calling emanates from her/his community (e.g., source of career calling) and the counselor then responds with advocacy (e.g., social justice advocacy). This tandem relationship between external source of career calling and internal response to social injustice begs further research.

Factors that Predict Social Justice Advocacy

The fourth research question explored the predictive relationship between social justice advocacy and career calling combined with demographic factors. In total, eleven
factors were included in the analysis: three subscales of the CVQp, total CVQp, graduate-level coursework in advocacy/multicultural/social justice, race, gender, sexual orientation, political ideology, religion, and spirituality. The factors which significantly predicted social justice advocacy in the regression model, in order from greatest to least influence, were graduate coursework, political ideology, and career calling. These findings and implications are discussed below.

**Graduate Coursework**

The first significant finding related to participants’ graduate coursework. This was, in fact, the strongest predictive factor of all factors studied, contributing 18% of the variance in social justice advocacy scores. Only the participants who completed a course or courses with all of the three terms (i.e., social justice, advocacy, and multicultural in the course(s) title(s) were predicted to be engaged in social justice advocacy. Literature affirms that these courses have a bearing on social justice advocacy identity, interest, and actions. (Caldwell & Vera, 2010; Linnemeyer, 2009; Manis, 2012; Voorhis & Hostetter, 2006; White, 2009; Wiede, 2011). The importance of this finding is that counselor educators and CACREP administrators have this additional empirical support for their efforts to integrate social justice, advocacy, and multicultural courses into counselor education curricula. This finding could also indicate that the more counseling students are exposed to diverse ideas and ways of the thinking, the more they are influenced toward a social justice orientation. There is, however, a lack of information about the content of the courses, even among those having the same titles (Pieterse et al., 2009). This study contributes needed information to the study of the effect of graduate counseling education
on social justice advocacy (e.g., Fickling, 2015) that can assist in counselor education curriculum development.

**Political Ideology**

The second most significant factor was political ideology, contributing 13% of the variance in social justice advocacy scores. Counselor identification with politically moderate or liberal ideology significantly predicted engagement in social justice advocacy. Conservative participants scored significantly lower on the SJAS than liberal or moderate participants. This finding is directly congruent with the findings of Linnemeyer (2009) and Parikh, Post, and Flowers (2011). It is moderately congruent with Steele, Biscoff, and Craig (2014) who used the same political ideology categories used in this study (i.e., ANES, 2013) to find that political ideology was not significantly related to their measure of social justice. They did, however, note significantly more social justice involvement from extremely liberal participants and significantly less from extremely conservative participants, which this study’s findings support. The implication of this study’s finding is that the political perspective of counseling students and counselors influences their engagement in social justice. The political aspect of social justice is a reality that counselor educators can be aware of and address as they challenge their students toward growth in professional self-awareness and advocacy skills.

**Career Calling**

Lastly, congruent with the discussion of the third research question findings, the CVQp’s measure of career calling continued to significantly predict social justice advocacy, contributing 5% of the variance in social justice advocacy scores. In other words, career calling remained a significant predictor of social justice even after the
influence of all demographic variables was added. Career calling is, then, a significant predictor of counselors’ engagement in social justice advocacy. As previously stated, counselor educators, clinical supervisors, and counselor development researchers are urged to consider integrating career calling discussions, assessments, and interventions into their work with counseling students and new clinicians.

**Factors that Were Not Significant Predictors**

This study’s findings and those reported in literature remain inconsistent in determining the relationship between membership in marginalized groups and social justice advocacy. This study’s findings suggested that certain demographic factors did not predict social justice advocacy. Those factors were; religion, spirituality, gender, race, and sexual orientation. These findings are discussed below.

Certain demographic statuses analyzed in this study (i.e., race, gender, sexual orientation) were generally suspected to have had a bearing on social justice advocacy scores (Dashjian, 2014; Parikh, Post & Flowers, 2011; Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005). This study’s findings did not support this supposition. While Black/African American participants scored significantly higher than White participants on the social justice advocacy instrument, there was no statistical significance of race in the analysis. Race was predictor of social justice advocacy in several research studies (Dashjian, 2014; Steele, Bischoff, & Craig, 2014; Steele, 2011). For example, Steele, Bischoff, and Craig (2014) found that African American individuals are more likely to perceive social justice advocacy as important. There are also studies to the contrary where race did not have a significant influence (Linnemeyer, 2009; Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005). Literature reports mixed results. Perhaps the fact that this study has so few participants in many of the
minority status categories had a bearing on the results, rendering some relationships not significant simply due to low sample size. Participants in this study could choose one of nine categories of race. Only 13.3% of participants chose a race other than White.

Other demographic factors related to marginalized groups (i.e., sexual orientation and gender) in this study also did not predict social justice advocacy. As stated above, perhaps one reason is the low representation of these groups in the sample. There were ten categories of sexual orientation, but only 15.5% of participants chose something other than straight. Previous research lends support to sexual orientation as a predictive factor (Dashjian, 2014; Linnemeyer, 2009; Nilsson & Schmidt, 2005). Similarly, 74% of participants in this study identified as female and none self-identified as a gender other than male or female. Despite low representation, this study’s findings regarding gender as not a significant factor are supported in literature (Nilsson & Schmidt; Streufert, 2012). For example, gender has been found not to be a significant factor in predicting actual social justice advocacy (Linnemeyer; Streufert). While membership in a marginalized or oppressed group may be assumed to dispose an individual toward social justice interest, it may not necessarily lead one to engage in social justice advocacy behaviors.

Whether or not one’s religion predicts social justice advocacy received mixed findings between this study and previous research studies. Researchers using qualitative methods (e.g., Caldwell & Vera, 2010; Linnemeyer, 2010; Wiede, 2011) indicated that the combined category of religion/spirituality was an important theme in their studies. Arredondo and Perez (2003) suggested that social justice leaders drew from their spiritual convictions to lead in social justice advocacy. Goodman (2000) observed, anecdotally, that people from privileged groups who are engaged in social justice are motivated
partially by spiritual values. Caldwell and Vera (2010) found that one’s religion and spirituality significantly influenced one’s social justice orientation. However, Nilsson and Schmidt found no significant difference between Christian and non-Christian in social justice advocacy.

Similar to findings reported in literature, this research study also did not find religion or spirituality to predict social justice advocacy. Even though 72% of participants said that their spirituality plays a significant role in their social justice advocacy beliefs and behaviors, the regression model did not support this empirically: spirituality was not a significant predictor of social justice advocacy in this study. While career calling was found to predict social justice advocacy in this study, one cannot draw the illogical conclusion that if spirituality predicts career calling and career calling predicts social justice advocacy, then spirituality predicts social justice advocacy. Nonetheless, such a strong indication from participants that spirituality does play a role begs for further and deeper inquiry in future research studies.

**Summary of Implications**

The overarching implication of this study’s findings is that the P-16 counselor who is most likely to engage in social justice advocacy is one who; (a) has completed a graduate course(s) with all of these words in the title(s); advocacy, multicultural, and social justice, (b) identifies as moderate or liberal in political ideology, and (c) asserts having a career calling to the counseling profession. This study adds novel knowledge to both areas of inquiry (i.e., social justice and career calling) which are young and in need of more study (Dashjian, 2014; Duffy & Dik, 2013; Duffy, Dik, & Blustein, 2010; Elangovan, Pinder, & McLean, 2010; Manis, 2012). The findings of this study can be of
value to P-16 counselors, counselor educators, clinical supervisors, researchers, and theorists of social justice and career calling.

**P-16 Counselors**

This study has implications for P-16 counselors. The presence of a career calling is beneficial personally and professionally to individuals (Duffy, Dik, & Blustein, 2010). The results of this study can inform P-16 counselors of the importance of considering the effect of their own calling to the counseling profession and on their social justice efforts in the educational setting. Counselors can also use these findings to as motivation to explore and discuss career calling with their students. Counselors should also consider ways to integrate social justice interventions in their career counseling of students (Dik, Duffy, & Steger, 2012). Finally, the finding that coursework strongly predicts engagement in social justice advocacy may prompt seasoned counselors to seek continuing education courses as a way to improve themselves as advocates. Such continuing education may especially be beneficial to counselors who believe they have a career calling to the profession.

**Counselor Educators and Clinical Supervisors**

Counselor educators and clinical supervisors are concerned with developing students into competent clinicians. Counselor educators might consider how to insert career calling into program curricula and use the results of this study to inform the social justice aspects of curricula. They may give attention to the finding that certain counseling students (i.e., those holding liberal and moderate political ideology) may enter the program already more prone to engagement in social justice advocacy and, thus, may experience much benefit from coursework that equips them as advocates, especially if
they state having a calling to a counseling career. Supervisors and educators are encouraged to help supervisees and students raise awareness and understanding of themselves in terms of how these identities affect their engagement in social justice advocacy. Discussions of these areas can be beneficial to professional development as advocates.

Career calling is a concept that may be new to many counselor educators and clinical supervisors. The results of this study may help to raise their awareness of the novel finding that career calling predicts engagement in social justice advocacy. Educators may consider ways to integrate career calling content into their curriculum, in the required career counseling course, especially one that integrates social justice aspects of career development. Clinical supervisors may consider discussing career calling with their supervisees as an aspect of developing their counseling identity. Educators and clinical supervisors are supported in taking such actions by this study’s findings that career calling can be a strong motivator for their students and supervisees to advocate for the students they serve.

**Researchers and Theorists**

The findings of this study hold novel insight that social justice theorists and researchers can build upon. Career theorists may consider augmenting their theories with the emerging concept of career calling, as it is not explicitly present in the existing career development theories. Social justice theorists and researchers may, likewise, consider how career calling relates to advocacy identity formation and motivation.
Limitations

While some limitations exist in this study, it provided novel information that can be used to understand more about counselors’ likelihood to engage in social justice advocacy. First, the results of this are limited in generalizability to counselors who are employed in P-16 and who are members of ASCA or ACCA. Results are not generalizable to counselors employed in other settings and those who are not members of these two organizations. Additional research with a larger and more diverse random sample is needed in order to extend the results beyond the scope of this study.

Second, this study used a convenience, non-random sample drawn from two listervs. This procedure not only limited generalizability, it may have also biased the data toward participants who already had affinity toward career calling or social justice advocacy. The data collection method of inviting participants via ASCA and ACCA listservs further limits the study’s participant pool to those members who actually utilize those listservs and willingly chose to participate. Perhaps these reasons can explain the low response rate. The small sample size could have been problematic for finding significant relationships from the data, but power analysis and effect size calculations proved otherwise.

Third, results are limited in generalizability due to the potentially non-representative sample sizes in the factors of race, gender, and sexual orientation. The sample was predominantly White (86%), female (82%), and straight (84%). Several demographic categories had only one respondent, leading the researcher to combined categories within demographic variables. Underrepresentation of sample demographics compared to the population demographics can limit generalizability and bias the results.
Future researchers are urged to use a stratified sample to be more intentional about the inclusion of representative participants.

Finally, the social justice behaviors instrument lacked adequate validation study, as previously discussed in Chapter 3. The implication is that counselors’ social justice advocacy may not have been adequately measured with this instrument. Conversely, because there is a lack of valid social justice instruments (Fietzer & Ponterotto, 2015; McCarther et al., 2013), the SJAS was the most appropriate instrument for the research purpose of measuring actual social justice advocacy behaviors, per ACA Advocacy Competencies (Lewis, Arnold, House, & Toporek, 2003). More research is needed on instruments that measure the construct of social justice advocacy, especially validity studies of existing instruments. Future researchers may consider using other social justice instruments, such as ones that measure desire to engage in social justice advocacy rather than actual advocacy. Despite these limitations, significance was found in the data of this small sample population, which may indicate that it is possible to actually identify and predict factors that influence social justice advocacy.

**Discussion of Results for Future Research**

An exploratory research study is used to generate new ideas, discover new factors, or learn about a phenomenon (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). An exploratory research study, therefore, often raises more questions than answers and leads researchers to ideas for follow-up research studies. More research is needed to determine factors that lead counselors to engage in social justice advocacy, as there are still only a few empirical studies in this area. There may also be other factors not included in this research study that influence social justice advocacy behaviors, given that the strongest factor accounted
for less than one-fifth of the influence. Aside from these issues, several specific questions arose from this study’s results and limitations that call for deeper inquiry.

**Coursework**

The finding that coursework was the strongest predictor of social justice advocacy engagement carried the unexplored question regarding those courses’ contents. Participants only reported data regarding course titles, not course content. The researchers asked simply for participants to indicate whether social justice, advocacy, and/or multicultural were in their graduate course title. But, the content of these courses was unexplored by this researcher and largely unexplored by other researchers. In short, little is known about how the content of certain courses in graduate counseling curricula influence counselors’ social justice advocacy perceptions and behaviors. This research study’s finding that coursework was the strongest predictor essentially gave no insight or guidance to counselor educators toward the construction of curricula or course content. The results of this study and other studies in literature simply indicated that graduate coursework is important and begs deeper, focused empirical study. This same line of questioning may also be applied to career calling. Given the strong identification of participants in this study with having a career calling, researchers may study the influence of career calling content in graduate career counseling courses and its influence on various counselor-related and client-related outcomes.

**Political Ideology**

Political ideology was the second most influential factor in social justice advocacy behaviors. Participants responded to categories used in national election studies, but no more information was gained that would indicate why this factor was so
prominent in the findings. Future research may focus on why participants with liberal and moderate political ideology scored significantly higher than conservative participants. A weakness of the study was that these terms were not defined on the questionnaire, leaving them to personal interpretation. Participant response to this factor may also have been influenced by the timing of data collection: during a presidential election. Finally, the findings may lead future researchers to explore whether or not and how much social justice may be perceived as a politically or socially liberal issue.

Career Calling and Social Justice

Career calling may, indeed, be a factor in social justice advocacy, as this study’s results indicated. Future researchers could use other validated instruments to replicate this study and compare results. For example, instruments that measure desire to engage in social justice advocacy may yield a different relationship to career calling than did this study’s instrument which focused on behaviors. The same may be said about career calling instruments. Given the existence of several operational definitions and valid measures of career calling, new insight may be gleaned from the use of other career calling instruments, especially regarding the multiple dimensions of career calling.

Future research could also focus on the results-informed possibility (discussed above regarding the third research question) that a source of one’s career calling may lie in the field of social justice. Given the strong relationship of career calling to social justice advocacy and the strong relationship of the transcendent summons subscale of career calling to social justice advocacy, researchers have an empirical basis to investigate more deeply into these. In particular, this researcher speculates that there is a tandem push-pull phenomenon in which a counselor’s calling emanates from the social
justice-related conditions within her/his community (e.g., a source of her/his career
calling) and the counselor’s resulting response of engagement in social justice advocacy
efforts. This tandem relationship between external source of career calling and internal
response to social injustice invites inquiry.

**Religion and Spirituality**

The measurement and influence of the factors of religion and spirituality is
noteworthy. Participants’ input on these factors was limited in data analysis to only two
categories: participants believe that religion and spirituality either did or did not influence
their social justice advocacy. This yes-no approach was overly parsimonious, given the
immense complexity of the constructs. Entire research studies and dissertations can focus
on the intricacies of a detailed definition of religion as it relates to social justice and/or
career calling. The same can be asserted for spirituality.

This study gave clear empirical evidence to support further study of the influence
of religion and spirituality on career calling. However, the two constructs’ influence on
social justice advocacy was not statistically confirmed in this study, even though up to
two-thirds of participants stated that religion and spirituality do have influence. Perhaps
that influence can be detected and explained with other social justice instruments.

The relationship between religion, spirituality, career calling, and social justice
may be nonetheless salient and palpable by virtue of a very intriguing aspect of this
study: the question posed to participants was whether or not they believed their
religion/spirituality had a bearing on their social justice advocacy rather than on their
career calling. Intriguingly, participants’ answers about relating religion/spirituality to
social justice yielded significance on the measures of career calling (i.e., BCSp and
CVQp) and on two subscales of career calling (i.e., transcendent summons and purposeful work). Further, had the data been analyzed at the 0.1 level of significance, political ideology and multicultural/social justice graduate coursework would have significantly related to transcendent summons subscale of career calling as they did to social justice.

These intriguing results hint at the possible future detection and understanding of the presence of a triune relationship between career calling, religion/spirituality, and social justice. Perhaps that relationship is mediated through the transcendent summons dimension of career calling. This researcher suggests that future research utilize a variety of research methods to investigate this phenomenon.

**Conclusion**

This study explored career calling as a possible factor in P-16 counselors’ engagement in social justice advocacy. Results indicated that two demographic variables (i.e., completion of a graduate level social justice course and political ideology) and the presence of a career calling predict counselors’ engagement in social justice advocacy behaviors. Essentially, P-16 counselors identified as having the presence of a career calling to the profession of counseling and also that the career calling is a significant reason that they are involved in social justice advocacy for their students. Counselors, counselor educators, clinical supervisors, theorists, and researchers can use the findings of this study to address career calling with counseling students, newly employed counselors, and seasoned counselors. Multidisciplinary co-construction of concepts and intersectionality of identities are important to the counseling profession and have been addressed in this study. Future exploration of the factors presented in this study and other
factors not dealt with in this study is necessary if counselor educators and leaders of the profession are to understand how to facilitate counselors to engage in social justice advocacy.
REFERENCES


American School Counselor Association. (2010). *ASCA ethical standards.* Alexandria,
VA: Author.


Dashjian, L. T. (2014). *Transforming words into action: Factors predicting social justice*
engagement among psychology doctoral students (Doctoral dissertation).

Retrieved from https://mospace.umsystem.edu/xmlui/handle/10355/43883


Retrieved from http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/cps_diss/40


Flores, L. Y., Berkel, L. A., Nilsson, J. E., Ojeda, L., Jordan, S. E., Lynn, G. L., & Leal,


Goodman, L. A., Liang, B., Helms, J. E., Latta, R. E., Sparks, E., & Weintraub, S. R.


counseling and advocacy: Developing new leadership roles and competencies.  

*Journal for Social Action in Counseling and Psychology, 3*(1), 5-18.


Steele, J. M. (2011). *Social justice advocacy and counselor education: A study of*
counselor educators' and counseling interns' perceptions of social justice advocacy training. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from scholarworks.wmich.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi


doi:10.5175/jswe.2006.200303147


### APPENDIX A

**FIVE GROUPS OF CALLING RESEARCHERS AND REPRESENTATIVE STUDIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Group</th>
<th>Research Study</th>
<th>Population (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dik, Duffy, and related researchers</td>
<td>Duffy &amp; Sedlacek, 2007</td>
<td>3091 incoming first-year students at a large, mid-Atlantic, public university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dik, Sargent, &amp; Steger, 2008</td>
<td>255 students from a midsized Midwestern Catholic university (n = 51) and a large Midwestern research university (n = 204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steger &amp; Dik, 2009</td>
<td>231 undergraduate students from a large public university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duffy &amp; Sedlacek, 2010</td>
<td>5,523 incoming lst-year students at a large, mid-Atlantic, public university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steger, Pickering, Shin, &amp; Dik, 2010</td>
<td>295 introductory psychology students from a large public university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hirschi, 2011</td>
<td>407 undergraduate students of various majors at a medium-sized, public university in Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duffy, Bott, Allan, Torrey, &amp; Dik, 2012</td>
<td>201 employed adults of various occupations: business (n = 33, 17%), computer industry (n = 23, 11%), education (n = 18, 9%), customer service (n = 15, 8%), research (n = 9, 5%), sales (n = 9, 5%), information technology (n = 8, 4%), and accounting (n = 8, 4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steger, Dik, &amp; Duffy, 2012</td>
<td>university employees (N ¼ 370) of various occupations from a large Western research university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duffy, Allan, Autin, and Bott, 2013</td>
<td>553 working adults within the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Galles &amp; Lenz, 2013</td>
<td>329 undergraduate students from a large public southeastern university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bott &amp; Duffy, 2014</td>
<td>443 undergraduate students at a large, public Southeastern university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dik, Eldridge, Steger, &amp; Duffy, 2012</td>
<td>456 students at a large, public research university (n = 360) and two small, Christian liberal arts colleges (n = 96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Sample Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domene, 2012</td>
<td>855 first- and second-year undergraduate students recruited from three universities in Atlantic Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumulescu, Opre, Ramona, 2015</td>
<td>497 undergraduate students in the 1st year of study from Babes-Bolyai University, Romania; majored in 5 different areas of study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang, Dik, Wei, and Zhang, 2015</td>
<td>210 Chinese college students from two comprehensive universities in China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobrow, Tosti-Kharas, and related researchers (Dobrow &amp; Tosti-Kharas, 2011)</td>
<td>1500: high school students in art and music, undergrad and grad students in business, adult workers in management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobrow, 2013</td>
<td>450 high school students at two summer music programs in the US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobrow-Riza &amp; Heller, 2015</td>
<td>450 high school students at two summer music programs in the US</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagmaier and Abele, 2012a</td>
<td>working men and women in Germany and US from various fields of employment, ages, and education levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagmaier &amp; Abele, 2012b</td>
<td>16 German women and 9 German men in Germany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagmaier &amp; Abele, 2012c</td>
<td>211 German working adults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagmaier &amp; Abele, 2012d</td>
<td>204 employed German adults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagmaier &amp; Abele, 2012e</td>
<td>85 American adults from various occupations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praskova, Creed, and Hood, 2015a</td>
<td>345 emerging adults in a large city in Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praskova, Creed, &amp; Hood, 2015a</td>
<td>527 emerging adults in Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praskova, Creed, &amp; Hood, 2015b</td>
<td>664 emerging adults in university and vocational training college in a large city in Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creed, Rogers, Praskova, Searle, 2014</td>
<td>355 junior doctors working in hospitals and general practices in Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson &amp; Caddell, 1994</td>
<td>1,869 from 12 Christian denominations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Study Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>196 non-faculty employees of public university and a liberal arts college</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Hall &amp; Chandler, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>415 master’s-level counseling students from CACREP programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Dreher, Holloway, &amp; Shoefielder, 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86 faculty and staff at a private university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Peterson, Park, Hall, &amp; Seligman, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,803 employed adults in various occupations from several English-speaking nations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Bunderson &amp; Thompson, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 zookeepers from 157 zoos in the U.S. and Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Hall, Burkholder, &amp; Sterner, 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>415 master’s-level counseling students from CACREP programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Re: hello from GCCA!

Amy M. Lenhart <ALenhart@collin.edu>
Thu 3/3/2016 2:00 PM

To: Knapp-grosz, Tamara <Tamara.Knapp-grosz@unt.edu>; Christopher Lee Wheelus <cwheelm4@uga.edu>

Hi Christopher,

Thanks for your inquiry and message about sending out your research request to our members. As long as you are a member, we would be happy to post this to our listserv. I don't believe that we will be able to do so on an individual basis, however. Please forward your information if you are still interested, and we would be happy to assist with your research in this capacity.

Best,

Amy

Amy M. Lenhart, MA, LPC, NCC
Professional Counselor
Collin College at Preston Ridge
9700 Wade Blvd.
Frisco, TX 75035
972-377-1008 (PRC)

President of ACCA
APPENDIX C

PERMISSION TO RECRUIT PARTICIPANTS VIA ASCA LISTSERV

8/20/2016

From: Christopher Lee Wheelus [mailto:cwheel14@uga.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, March 9, 2016 11:12 AM
To: Jill Cook <JCook@schoolcounselor.org>
Cc: Pamela O Paisley <ppaisley@uga.edu>

Re: EBSCC & ISPC at UGA

Thank you, Ms. Cook, for the guidance!

I just joined ASCA as an Affiliate member so that I can post my research question and survey link on ASCA Scene, per your advice.

But, please be assured that my interest in ASCA/school counseling is more than just to finish a dissertation. I’ve supervised school counselor interns, assisted school counselors in my area, volunteered through Communities in Schools, and obtained school counselor certification through GA PSC. Whether I work as a school counselor or not, I am a co-laborer with them.

Christopher L. Wheelus, LMFT, LPC, CPCS
GA PSC #50979
PhD Candidate, UGA
Hello Counselors,

My name is Christopher Wheelus and I am a doctoral candidate in the College of Education, Department of Counseling and Human Development Services at The University of Georgia. I am seeking counselors who work in P-16 education to participate in my dissertation research. The focus of this study is to explore Career Calling as a factor in P-16 counselors’ engagement in Social Justice Advocacy. Eligible participants have a master’s degree or higher in counseling or a counseling-related field, work as counselor in P-16 education, and hold membership in American College Counseling Association (ACCA) and/or the ASCA (American School Counselor Association).

Your participation will include completing an online survey that will take approximately 15-30 minutes to complete. If you are willing to participate in this study, please click the link provided here (insert hyperlink to survey here). If you have any questions regarding this study, please do not hesitate to contact me at cwheel14@uga.edu. Your participation is greatly appreciated. Thank you in advance for your time.
APPENDIX E

INFORMED CONSENT

DATE

Dear ACCA/ASCA Member:

I am a graduate student under the direction of Dr. Diane L. Cooper in the Department of Counseling & Human Development Services at The University of Georgia. I invite you to participate in a research study entitled The Relationship of Career Calling and Social Justice Advocacy: An Exploratory Study of Counselors Employed in P-16 Education. The purpose of this study is to explore Career Calling as a factor in P-16 counselors’ engagement in Social Justice Advocacy.

Criteria for inclusion in this study are that participants must (a) be employment as a professional counselor full-time or part-time in a P-16 educational institution (i.e., P-12 school, college, or university) (b) hold current membership of either the American College Counseling Association (ACCA) or the American School Counselor Association (ASCA), and (c) have completed a master’s degree or higher in counseling or a counseling-related field of study.

Your participation will involve responding to survey questions asking for demographic information and for responses on two instruments of career calling and one instrument of social justice advocacy. The survey should only take about 30 minutes. Your involvement in the study is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate or to stop at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If
you decide to stop or withdraw from the study, the information/data collected from or about you up to the point of your withdrawal will be kept as part of the study and may continue to be analyzed.

All information obtained in this study is strictly confidential unless disclosure is required by law. This research involves the transmission of data over the Internet. Every reasonable effort has been taken to ensure the effective use of available technology; however, confidentiality during online communication cannot be guaranteed. Your informed consent to participate in the study will be indicated by electronic signature at the survey website.

Once data is collected, all electronic responses will be kept in an encrypted file. Access will be restricted to the researcher and dissertation supervisory committee. Any hard copies of information or data will be stored in a locked file and will not contain identifying information. The results of the research study may be published, but your name or any identifying information will not be used. In fact, the published results will be presented in summary form only.

The findings from this project may add to the limited amount of information available on the fields of Career Calling and Social Justice Advocacy by exploring the relevance of Career Calling to P-16 counselors and the relationship of Career Calling to Social Justice Advocacy. There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to call me, Christopher L. Wheelus, at (770) 328-3607 or send an e-mail to cwheel14@uga.edu. If you would like to receive an electronic copy of a summary of aggregate results, you may
contact me. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be
directed to The Chairperson, University of Georgia Institutional Review Board; telephone
(706) 542-3199; email address irb@uga.edu.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please click “yes” below, otherwise
click “no” and you will exit the study. Thank you for your consideration! Please keep
this letter for your records.

Sincerely,

Christopher L. Wheelus
APPENDIX F

PERMISSION TO USE BCS* AND CVQ*

RE: request for digital BCS and CVQ in UGA dissertation

Duffy, Ryan <rduf@ufl.edu>
Wed 3/9/2016, 10:32 AM
Christopher Lee Wheelus

00 dissertation


You replied on 3/9/2016 11:13 AM.

Totally fine to post them on an online survey, good luck with your research.

Ryan

Dissertation

Jennifer Dean <jkayedean@gmail.com>
Fri 3/11/2016 7:03 PM

To Christopher Lee Wheelus <cwheel14@uga.edu>

Hi Chris,

Andrew forwarded your email. You are welcome to use the instrument and to put it online.

Good luck with your research and please keep me informed of your results.

Jennifer Dean

Sent from my iPhone
APPENDIX H

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

Directions: Please answer the following questions.

1. What is your current Professional Association Membership?
   _____American College Counseling Association (ACCA)
   _____American School Counselor Association (ASCA)
   _____Both

2. What is the primary Work Setting for your work as a professional counselor?
   _____Elementary School
   _____Middle School
   _____High School
   _____College or University
   _____Other

3. What is your Job Title at your work setting? (please fill in the blank)__________________

4. What is your Highest Degree Completed?
   _____Master
   _____Education Specialist
   _____Doctorate

5. How many years have you worked as a counselor in P-16 education? (please fill in the blank)
   __________

6. What is your Age? (please fill in the blank) _____
7. Did you complete a graduate-level course that had the following in the course title? (please check all that apply)

_____ Social Justice

_____ Advocacy

_____ Multicultural

_____ I did not have a course that could be described by these three options

8. What is your Race?

_____ American Indian or Alaska Native

_____ Asian

_____ Bi-racial/Multi-racial

_____ Black or African American

_____ Hispanic/Latinx

_____ Middle Eastern

_____ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

_____ North African

_____ White/European

9. What is your Gender?

_____ Female

_____ Male

_____ Self Identify: _______________

10. Do you identify with any of the following? Check all that apply.

_____ Straight

_____ Gay

_____ Lesbian
_____ Bisexual

_____ Cisgender (You are comfortable in the gender you were assigned at birth)

_____ Transgender (You are not comfortable in the gender you were assigned at birth)

_____ Self Identify: ________________

11. When it comes to Politics do you usually think of yourself as:

_____ Extremely Liberal

_____ Liberal

_____ Slightly Liberal

_____ Moderate

_____ Slightly Conservative

_____ Conservative

_____ Extremely Conservative

_____ Haven’t thought much about this

_____ Prefer not to answer

12. I believe/feel that my religion plays a significant role in my social justice advocacy beliefs and behaviors (please check one)

_____ Yes

_____ No

_____ Not sure how to answer

_____ Does not apply

13. I believe/feel that my spirituality plays a significant role in my social justice advocacy beliefs and behaviors (please check one)

_____ Yes

_____ No
_____Not sure how to answer

_____Does not apply
APPENDIX I

BRIEF CALLING SCALE (BCS)*

Some people, when describing their careers, talk about having a "calling." Broadly speaking, a "calling" in the context of work refers to a person's belief that she or he is called upon (by the needs of society, by a person's own inner potential, by God, by Higher Power, etc.) to do a particular kind of work. Although at one time most people thought of a calling as relevant only for overtly religious careers, the concept is frequently understood today to apply to virtually any area of work.

The following questions assess the degree to which you see this concept as relevant to your own life and career. Please respond honestly, not according to what is socially desirable or what you feel you "ought" to think. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following statements currently describe you, using the following scale.

1 = Not at all true of me
2 = Mildly true of me
3 = Moderately true of me
4 = Mostly true of me
5 = Totally true of me

1. I have a calling to a particular kind of work.
2. I have a good understanding of my calling as it applies to my career.
3. I am trying to figure out my calling in my career.
4. I am searching for my calling as it applies to my career.

Presence of calling: 1, 2
Search for calling: 3, 4


*A publically accessible instrument (Duffy & Dik, 2012).

APPENDIX J

CALLING AND VOCATION QUESTIONNAIRE (CVQ)*

Instructions: Please indicate the degree to which you believe the following statements describe you, using the following scale. Please respond with your career as a whole in mind. For example, if you are currently working part time in a job that you don’t consider part of your career, focus on your career as a whole and not your current job. Try not to respond merely as you think you “should” respond; rather, try to be as accurate and as objective as possible in evaluating yourself. If any of the questions simply do not seem relevant to you, “1” may be the most appropriate answer.

1 = Not at all true of me

2 = Somewhat true of me

3 = Mostly true of me

4 = Absolutely true of me

1. I believe that I have been called to my current line of work.
2. I’m searching for my calling in my career.
3. My work helps me live out my life’s purpose.
4. I am looking for work that will help me live out my life’s purpose.
5. I am trying to find a career that ultimately makes the world a better place.
6. I intend to construct a career that will give my life meaning.
7. I want to find a job that meets some of society’s needs.
8. I do not believe that a force beyond myself has helped guide me to my career.
9. The most important aspect of my career is its role in helping to meet the needs of others.
10. I am trying to build a career that benefits society.
11. I was drawn by something beyond myself to pursue my current line of work.
12. Making a difference for others is the primary motivation in my career.
13. I yearn for a sense of calling in my career.
14. Eventually, I hope my career will align with my purpose in life.
15. I see my career as a path to purpose in life.
16. I am looking to find a job where my career clearly benefits others.
17. My work contributes to the common good.
18. I am trying to figure out what my calling is in the context of my career.
19. I’m trying to identify the area of work I was meant to pursue.
20. My career is an important part of my life’s meaning.
21. I want to pursue a career that is a good fit with the reason for my existence.
22. I am always trying to evaluate how beneficial my work is to others.
23. I am pursuing my current line of work because I believe I have been called to do so.
24. I try to live out my life purpose when I am at work.


*A publically accessible instrument (Duffy & Dik, 2012).