Self-Efficacy as it Relates to Attributions and Attitudes towards Poverty among Pre-Service School Counselors

by

Sarah Oliver Kitchens

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
August 2, 2014

Keywords: poverty, attitudes, attributions, self-efficacy, school counselors

Approved by

Jamie Carney, Chair, Professor of Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling
Amanda Evans, Assistant Professor of Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling
Suhyn Suh, Associate Professor of Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling
David M. Shannon, Professor of Educational Research and Education,
Humana-Germany-Sherman Distinguished Professor

Abstract

This study was conducted in order to examine the self-efficacy of pre-service school counselors and their attributions and attitudes towards poverty. The population for this study consisted of Master's level school counseling students from two southeastern schools. All data were obtained via self-report measures and were collected using an internet survey and paper surveys. Instruments used in the survey included a demographics questionnaire developed by the researcher, the School Counselor Self-Efficiacy Scale (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005), Attitudes About Poverty Scale (Yun & Weaver, 2010), and the Attributions of Poverty Scale (Bullock, Williams, & Limbert, 2011). The study utilized a multiple regression analysis in an attempt to explore the relationships between attitudes and self-efficacy and attributions and self-efficacy. The results of the study show that the pre-service school counselors who participated in this study held similar attitudes and attributions towards the general American population, which are primarily negative. This study also found no significant relationship between self-efficacy and attitudes or attributions.

Acknowledgements

Some days it seems like yesterday I was beginning this journey! I have been encouraged, supported, and inspired by many people. Here, I would like to take the opportunity to express my sincere gratitude and appreciation to all who have made this PhD possible.

Above all, I thank my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, for giving me the wisdom, health, and strength to undertake this degree and enabling me to its completion.

To my sweet, loving, encouraging, and patient husband, Jamie Lee: I thank you for loving and supporting me throughout this journey. Your infallible love and support has been my strength. Your patience and sacrifice means the world to me! Without your love, support and prayers I would not have been able to accomplish much of what I have done. Thank you for believing in me and always encouraging me. I love you more!

A special thanks to my Dad and Mom, Terry and Tamrah Oliver. Thank you both for being two of my biggest cheerleaders, for having faith in me even when I didn't believe in myself. Thank you for your love and support, and for always encouraging me to go after my dreams. I have eaten that elephant… one bite at a time! I love you both!

To my amazing chair, Dr. Carney: I thank you for seeing something in me and believing in me from the beginning! Thank you for your help, advice, inspiration, encouragement, and continued

support throughout my PhD and dissertation. I appreciate all you have done for me; you have been a tremendous mentor for me. You have been invaluable during this journey!

To my committee: Dr. Evans, Dr. Suh, and Dr. Shannon…. Thank you! Dr. Evans, thank you for always pushing me outside of my comfort zone and believing in me. I have enjoyed working with you and learning from you. Dr. Suh, thank you for your encouragement and support during this journey. Dr. Shannon, thank you for putting up with my million and one emails, for encouraging me and supporting me as I trudge through my data. I couldn't have done this without each of you!

To Amber Elizabeth Wackford & Kristin "Daniel" Suggs…Thank you for your help with editing my dissertation. Your timely help and friendship shall always be remembered. Thank you for helping me along the way and also with all of the finishing touches!

To all of my family and friends I haven't mentioned by name… thank you for your support, encouragement, and prayers! It means the world to me to know you believe in me and I have you on my side!

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

Poverty is a growing epidemic in the United States. Currently there are 46.2 million people living in poverty in America (DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, & Smith, 2012). Of those 46.2 million people, children make up 24 percent of the total population and represent 34 percent of all individuals living in poverty (Addy & Wight, 2012). At the beginning of the century, more than 12 million American children lived in poverty; as of 2010 this number has increased to 15.7 million (Macartney, 2011). Poverty does not discriminate. White children make up the largest number of children living in poverty; while African American, American Indian, and Hispanic children have a higher proportion of poor children among their entire population (Addy, Engelhardt, & Skinner, 2013).

Poverty impacts children in a multitude of ways; it contributes to developmental challenges, physical health problems, as well as several mental, emotional, and behavioral issues (Komro, Flay, & Biglan, 2011). In addition, low-income children characteristically live in poor neighborhoods and attend lower quality, underfunded schools with high teacher turnover and low morale (Brooks-Gunn, Linver, & Faith, 2005). Children living in poverty are often perceived less positively by their teachers, receiving less positive attention and less reinforcement for good performance (McLoyd, 1998).

Both teachers and counselors-in-training are prepared during their programs to work with various diverse populations. It is unknown to what degree the training impacts stereotypes, assumptions, and attitudes for counselors. Research has shown many teachers prefer to teach in a school with similar ethnic and social class backgrounds to their own, and are resistant to teach in high poverty schools (Wolffe, 1996; Zeichner, 1996; Groulx, 2001). With an ever-increasing number of children living in poverty and the severe implications of poverty on children, there is a high likelihood that teachers and counselors-in-training will work in schools with students who

live in poverty. New teachers and counselors may find themselves in high poverty schools, creating a need for teachers and counselors to have attitudes and skills that enable them to work effectively with students of diverse backgrounds and of low socioeconomic status. Teachers and counselors who are uneducated on reaching low-income students are unprepared and may be biased in how they meet the needs of children living in poverty.

In an attempt to educate qualified school counselors to work in high-poverty schools, there is a need to better understand the attitudes and preconceptions prospective school counselors hold towards individuals living in poverty. School counselors have an important role in the academic, personal/social, and career development of all students, including students living in poverty (ASCA, 2012). The American Counseling Association's (2005) code of ethics asks counselors to "recognize diversity and embrace a cross cultural approach in support of the worth, dignity, potential, and uniqueness of people within their social and cultural contexts (Preamble, Para.1). School counselors are in a position to meet the needs of students and families living in low-income situations through counseling, consultation/collaboration, leadership, and advocacy (ASCA, 2005).

There are several factors school counselors must consider when meeting the needs of the students in their school. First, it is important for school counselors to have an understanding of different groups of students and their developmental needs (Williams, 2003). Students' living in poverty is one such group. Next, it is important to look at school counselors' attitudes towards poverty and what they believe attributes to individuals living in poverty (Van Velsor, & Orozco, 2007). Finally, it is important to consider a school counselors' understand of advocacy and their own self-efficacy as it relates to their ability to perform their duties (Van Velsor, & Orozco, 2007).

In the school counseling field, counselor education preparation programs have concentrated on developing counselor awareness and knowledge in multiple areas and multilayered components including gender, race, ethnicity, ability, sexual orientation, and social class (Brinson, Brew, & Denby, 2008; Constantine, 2002; Wakefield, Garner, Pehrsson, & Tyler, 2010). The American School Counselor Association (ASCA) National Model has developed multiple competencies to help school counselors develop or maintain a comprehensive school counseling program to address academic, career planning, and personal/social development (ASCA, 2012). These competencies are used for school counselors, school administrators, and school counselor education programs in order to meet the needs of all students in multiple areas. With this information, although there is a focus to develop counselor awareness and knowledge of all students in multiple areas, there remains a paucity of counseling literature that addresses the issues of working with low-income students and families.

Significance of the Study

In the past ten years, America has seen an increase of over 3.7 million children living in poverty (Macartney, 2011). Of the total population of children living in poverty, 24 million live in urban areas, while 5.7 million children live in rural areas (Addy & Wright, 2012). Due to the ever increasing number of children living in poverty in America, there is a high likelihood that school counselors will have children in their schools living in poverty.

Although researchers have spent decades looking at the impact of multicultural biases on counseling (Burkard, Ponterotto, Reynolds, & Alfonso, 1999; Sue & Sue, 2008; Gelso, Fassinger, Gomez, & Latts, 1995; Gushue, 2004; as cited in Smith, Mao, Perkins, Ampuero, 2010), counselors' attitudes towards poverty have been rarely considered. The research that has been done has shown negative attitudes and attributions exist towards poverty and individuals

living in poverty (Cozzarelli, Wilkinson, & Tagler, 2001; Bullock, Williams, & Limbert, 2003). Despite our understanding, there is a scarcity of counseling literature that addresses the issues of pre-service school counselors and their attitudes and attributions towards poverty. Additionally, in order to attract qualified school counselors to work in high-poverty schools, there is a need to better understand the attitudes and preconceptions pre-service school counselors hold regarding working in this type of environment. It is imperative that counselors gain awareness, knowledge, and skills to work with students from diverse backgrounds. As counselors gain awareness, knowledge, and skill specifically related towards poverty, they can more effectively meet the needs of students while helping them realize their worth and potential (ACA, 2005). Without counselors focusing on poverty, many children may remain unnoticed and unable to overcome the obstacles often associated with poverty.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to extend the literature pertaining to training counseling students about poverty by examining how attitudes about poverty, personal attitudes and beliefs of attributions, and self-efficacy impact the actual work of school counselors. The current study provides pertinent information for counselor educators regarding professional school counselors and provides possibilities for relevant courses and professional development experiences to develop values, information, and skills of pre-service school counselors who work with students living in poverty situations.

Research Questions

In order to examine school counselors-in-training beliefs and attitudes associated with socioeconomic status and school counseling self-efficacy, the following research questions will be examined:

1. What is the nature of the attitudes school counselors-in-training hold regarding low SES?
2. What is the nature of the attributions toward poverty held by school counselors-in-training?
3. What is the relationship between the level of perceived school counseling self-efficacy and attitudes toward low SES among school counselors-in-training?
4. What is the relationship between the level of perceived school counseling self-efficacy and attributions toward low SES among school counselors-in-training?

Definitions

The following definitions of terms for this study are offered for clarification:

School Counselor is a certified/ licensed educator who has attained a graduate-level degree in school counseling, which qualifies them to address pre-K-12 students' academic, personal/social, and career development needs (ASCA, 2012).

Poverty is a calculation designed to identify the threshold at which a family's resources do not meet their basic needs of food, shelter, and clothing expenses. The most common poverty measure used in the United States is determined by U.S. Census Bureau by comparing household size and income with the consumer price index (APA, 2007). The 2013 guidelines range from an annual income of $11,490 for a family of one to just over $39,630 for a family of eight (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2013).

School Counselor Self-Efficacy is a term that represents an individual's beliefs in their own ability to successfully accomplish a task or goal (Bandura, 1994). In this study, self-efficacy will be measured by the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCCS; Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005).

Attitude is conveyed by evaluating a person or even with favor or disfavor (Eagly & Chaiken, 1998). In this study, attitude about poverty will be measured by the Attitudes about Poverty Scale Short Form (ATP) Scale developed by Yum and Weaver (2010).

Attribution refers to how an individual explains the causes of behaviors and events (Bullock, Williams, & Limbert, 2003). Attributions of poverty are broken into three categories: individualistic, structuralistic, and fatalistic (Bullock, Williams, & Limbert, 2003). For the purposes of this study, attributions of poverty will be measured using the Attributions of Poverty Scale developed by Bullock, Williams, and Limbert (2003).

Summary

In conclusion, this chapter provided an overview of literature concerning how a client might be impacted by poverty, and bias was briefly discussed. This chapter provided the significance and focus of the proposed study to examine the degree in which demographic characteristics correlate to pre-service school counselors' perceived self-efficacy to provide services to students, and pre-service school counselors' attitudes and attributions of poverty.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

An overview of the professional literature relevant to this study is presented in this chapter, including a review of the literature on poverty, education, and school counseling. This literature review provided a framework for examining current thinking on poverty, school counseling, and education.

Poverty is a major social issue in the United States (Hurst, 2004; Rank, 2004). American lawmakers have tried to put an end to poverty for many years. Yet, the same question has been asked repeatedly, "How do you break the cycle of poverty and create economic opportunities for people, particularly young people, to overcome obstacles to achieving a better standard of living?" (Smith, 2013). Each year in the United States, billions of dollars are spent trying to answer this question and trying to help fight the impact of poverty (Smith, 2013). Policies and programs to fight against poverty have been implemented since the time of the Great Depression when Roosevelt created several relief programs to help individuals facing poverty (Rose & Baumgartner, 2013). Since then, several additional programs have been put into place to help address issues associated with poverty. There are more than 70 means-tested programs in the United States budget that have been developed based on individuals income levels (Rose & Baumgartner, 2013). The programs support four main categories including 1) temporary monetary support, such as TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families), 2) assistance with medical needs and/or sustenance, such as food stamps; 3) school based programs, such as Head Start; and (4) career programs, such as job training (Rose & Baumgartner, 2013). Despite the attempts to decrease poverty, the number of individuals living in poverty continues to rise. The

number of people living in poverty has risen four consecutive years, reaching 46.2 million people living in poverty by 2011 (DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, & Smith, 2012).

Of those 46.2 million people living in poverty, children make up 24 percent of the population (Addy & Wright, 2012). In total, 45 percent of all children under the age of 18 live in low-income families (Addy & Wright, 2012). There are 25.9 percent of children under the age of five living in poverty, while children ages five to 17 make up 20.5 percent (Children's Defense Fund, 2012). There are various reasons a child may grow up in poverty. In general, the reasons children face poverty varies from race/ethnicity, parents' level of education or employment (Addy & Wright, 2012). Rodgers and Payne (2007) found a correlation between unemployment, higher tax resources and the level of poverty in different states in the United States. That is to say, the states with less unemployment and higher tax resources had less poverty and the states with high unemployment and low tax resources had higher poverty levels. They also found states with high minority populations, unwed and teenage mothers, single parents, and parents without high school diplomas had higher poverty rates (Rodgers & Payne, 2007).

Research has shown poverty impacts children in numerous ways. Studies have shown children living in high poverty areas are more likely to face depression (Cutrona et al. 2006), obesity (Burdette & Hill, 2008), infant death, low birth weight, teenage pregnancy, increased dropout rates, child maltreatment, adolescent delinquency, injuries, homicide, suicide (Sampson et al. 2002), and overall health problems (Do et al., 2008). Poverty has also been found to impact child development in numerous ways including physical and mental health and wellbeing, child development, and social development (Komro, Flay, & Biglan, 2011). Children living in poverty also often face social isolation and shame due to the humiliation related with poverty (Ozkan,

Purutcuoglu, & Hablemitoglu, 2010). This is due to the fact that children and adults alike look at social class as an indicator of worth and ability (Ozkan, Purutcuoglu, & Hablemitoglu, 2010).

Other factors that create barriers for children living in poverty include taxing relationships between the parents and children, parental mental illness, low-quality education and childcare, insufficient health care, and repeated violence exposure (Ozkan, Purutcuoglu, & Hablemitoglu, 2010). In addition, research has shown children living in poverty often complete less years of schooling, make less money as adults, and face poor health (Children's Defense Fund, 2012). Children living in poverty also suffer from poor diets which can create vitamin deficiencies and they may face lead poisoning, asthma, and physical ailments (Armstrong, 2010).

While children living in poverty are faced with a multitude of problems, it does not stop at home, it continues on into education (Truscott & Truscott, 2005). Children living in poverty are considered "at-risk" due to a lack of resources (Children's Defense Fund, 2012). Without high quality interventions, children in poverty are likely to face dropping out of school, becoming a teen parent, being placed in special education, never attending college, and being arrested for a violent crime (Children's Defense Fund, 2010). In research completed by Mark Kishlyama and colleagues (as cited in Armstrong, 2010), they found children living in poverty have increased cognitive impairments including a struggle with language acquisition, low attention span, and poor memory. Additionally, low-income children may have lower level brain functions when compared to higher-income children; the difference is similar to stroke damage (Armstrong, 2010).

Furthermore, low-income children are less likely to participate in school activities (Cappella, Frazier, Atkins, Schoenwald, & Glisson, 2008). Poverty also predicts deficits in

verbal skills, low IQ, and grade repetition (Cappella, et al., 2008). Children in low-income neighborhoods have a lack of quality resources. This may include a lack of materials (books and supplies) and inadequate school facilities (Cappella, et al., 2008). They are also faced with a lack of qualified teachers, as those teachers in low-income schools often lack expertise on the subject matter they teach (Armstrong, 2010). Experienced teachers have been found to either avoid working at low-income schools or leave the schools when additional opportunities arise (Morgan, 2012). Robinson (2007) found most teachers in low-income schools "hold less educational credentials, teach a subject they do not specialize in, and graduate from less prestigious universities when compared with teachers who teach in more advantaged areas" (as cited in Morgan, 2012, p. 292). In addition, graduation rates are considerably lower for children living in poverty by as much as 20 percentage points (Children's Defense Fund, 2012).

Attitudes and Attributions Associated with Low Socioeconomic Status

Research is clear that children living in poverty face a multitude of difficulties in their daily life impacting their social, emotional, physical, and cognitive well-being. All of these factors are important for counselors and counselor educators when determining the best approach in counseling and working with individuals living in poverty. In addition, it is not only important to look at the impact poverty has on individuals, but it is important to examine the attitudes individuals hold about poverty and what they believe causes poverty. Attitudes and beliefs influence how we respond to individuals and situations. Cozzarelli, Wilkinson, and Tagler (2001) discuss the importance of looking at attitudes and attitude formation due to the fact that attitudes are important predictors of behavior. Attitudes can be defined as how an individual feels about another person or group (Allport, 1954; Cozzarelli, et al., 2001). Allport (1954) believes attitudes and prejudice are created with two main ingredients: attitude of favor/ disfavor

and overgeneralization belief. For example, individuals who have a negative attitude towards those living in poverty believe persons in poverty have negative characteristics. An individual's belief as to what causes poverty can be linked to their attitude towards individuals living in poverty (Merolla, Hunt, & Serpe, 2011). Therefore, negative attitudes create a bias against individuals living in poverty. This bias adds to an inequality of support for programs designed to help the poor, including reducing the educational achievement gap (Limbert & Bullock, 2005).

Although attitude is not an element of attributions; "attributions for poverty are likely to be highly related to attitudes toward poverty" (Cozzarelli, Wilkinson, & Tagler, 2001, p. 209). Attributions look at the causes of behaviors. Research has shown society believes there are three main attributes for causes of poverty. They are: individualistic, structuralistic, and fatalistic (Bullock, Williams, & Limbert, 2003). Individualistic beliefs place the blame on the individual, believing individuals living in poverty have caused their own conditions (Merolla, et al., 2011). Individuals who believe poverty is caused due to individualistic attributions might believe people live in poverty due to lack of motivation or lack of thrift (Bullock, et al., 2003). Structuralistic beliefs hold the social system itself at fault, including economic and political issues (Merolla, et al., 2011). Individuals who believe poverty is caused due to structuralistic attributions might credit unemployment, inadequate schools, and low wages (Bullock, et al., 2003). Fatalistic beliefs focus on poor luck, illness, and unfortunate circumstances (Bullock, et al., 2003).

Society in general holds a negative attitude towards individuals living in poverty (Merolla, et al., 2011). Research has shown Americans believe there are several causes of poverty; however, individualistic causes tend to be favored over structuralistic and fatalistic causes (Bullock et al., 2003; Cozzarelli et al., 2001). Most Americans believe opportunities are readily available with few obstacles to financial stability (Merolla et al., 2011). Insofar as

counselors' attitudes and attributions towards poverty, there has been limited research done to examine counselors' preconceived ideas and the impact they have on the counseling relationship (Smith, Mao, Perkins, & Ampuero, 2011). This is an important area of research for the counseling field due to the increase of individuals living in poverty and their high risk for mental health issues.

Cozzarelli, Wilkinson, and Tagler (2001) conducted a review looking at studies on Americans' attitudes towards individuals living in poverty and scales used to measure attitudes. They found most of the scales used to measure attitudes about poverty were "borrowed from other fields, outdated, and/or typically blur together in a single measure items assessing different attitudinal components (e.g., affect and cognition)" (Cozzarelli, et al., 2001). Through their study, they found a lack of psychological literature dealing with American's attitudes about poverty (Cozzarelli, et al., 2001).

In a recent study, Smith et al. (2011) found a positive correlation between negative counselor attitudes and poor clients, as well as positive attitudes with working-class clients. For example, counselors working with individuals classified as poor were considered lazy as opposed to middle class clients. Past research has also shown counselors hold negative bias towards individuals living in poverty (Neynabar, 1992; Toporek & Pope-Davis, 2005). Neynabar (1992) discovered counselors in training viewed clients in a negative manner due to their low socioeconomic standing. They also found negative views held by counselors impacted the effectiveness of counseling sessions (Toporek & Pope-Davis, 2005). Research has shown a correlation between exposure to poverty and attitudes (Merolla et al., 2011). Those who have been exposed to negative experiences with the poor tend to have an unsympathetic view, while those who have had positive experiences with those in poverty tend to have sympathetic views

(Merolla et al., 2011). Albeit limited research, the reactions presented suggest counselor bias based on social standing and a need for counselors to receive appropriate training in order to serve their clients with limited bias. It is essential that counselor education programs help counselors-in-training debunk the negative attitudes in order to meet the needs of individuals living in poverty.

Poverty and School-Age Student Development

Since the beginning of the century until 2010 the number of children living in poverty has risen by 3.7 million (Macartney, 2011). Children living in poverty are faced with a lot of disadvantages, especially related to education. All areas of a child's life may be impacted by the chronic stress brought about from circumstances associated with poverty (Kiser, 2007; Engle & Black, 2008). Research shows poverty impacts areas of child development that have been recognized as part of normal development (Ozkan, Purutcuoglu, & Hablemitoglu, 2010). Poverty impacts student development in personal/social, academic, and career development.

The environment and connection to a school can impact health, relationships, and academic success of students (Nasir, Jones, & McLaughlin, 2011). According to Awan, Malik, Sarwar, and Waqas (2011) there are three levels on which poverty impacts educational achievements. First, poverty impacts the resources that are available to the children. This includes inadequate facilities, financial resources, technology, text books, and additional materials (Amatea & Olatunji, 2007). The second level that impacts educational achievements of those living in poverty is the social pressures that are placed on low-income students which damage their outlook (Awan, Malik, Sarwar, & Waqas, 2011). Expectations of teachers, schools, and students are lowered in areas of high poverty in the third level (Awan, Malik, Sarwar, & Waqas, 2011).

Children in poverty also suffer developmentally due to the lack of resources appropriate for stimulating cognitive growth, this includes "toys, books, adequate day-care, or preschool education that are essential for children's development" (Ozkan, Purutcuoglu, & Hablemitoglu, 2010, p. 175). In addition, Ozkan, Purutcuoglu, and Hablemitoglu found parents of children living in poverty typically punish their children with harsh physical discipline and are less likely to shown warm affection towards their children. Harsh physical punishment has been shown to increase behavioral problems in children, lower their confidence and emotional attachment (Ozkan, Purutcuoglu, & Hablemitoglu, 2010).

Poverty level children also suffer from an increased level of anxiety and depression (Kiser, 2007; Ozkan, Purutcuoglu, & Hablemitoglu, 2010) and a lower level of school involvement and engagement than children from middle class backgrounds (Kennedy, 2010). Ozkan, Purutcuoglu, and Hablemitoglu (2010) also found children in poverty have a harder time adjusting and are more likely to act out and less likely to follow laws and rules. Children in poverty are often exposed to illegal activities including drugs, gangs, and stealing (Black & Krishnakumar, 1998).

There is research to indicate that poverty also has a direct impact on educational success (Engle & Black, 2008). Specifically, children living in poverty are more likely to present with lower test scores and lower graduation rates (Nasir, Jones, & McLaughlin, 2011). This may be in part linked to other variables, children and adolescents living in poverty have also been found to present with higher rates of developmental difficulties (Engle & Black, 2008). These students are also more likely to have problems related to attendance and tardiness (Nasir, Jones, & McLaughlin, 2011).

Amatea and Olatunji (2007) outline some of the factors that are related to these academic issues for children and adolescents living in poverty. They suggest that some of these contributing factors are not only the economic circumstances of the student but also the schools in which they are enrolled. For example, children living in poverty are more likely to be enrolled in schools with limited resources. Amatea and Olatunji (2007) suggest that the achievement gap that children living in poverty experience is highly related to their school environments including: less experienced and qualified teachers, larger class sizes, fewer materials, and communication difficulties between the school, families, and communities. Due to financial circumstances and a lack of parental education experiences low income parents are often less involved in their children's educational experiences (Ozkan, Purutcuoglu, & Hablemitoglu, 2010). Children in low-income homes are often unexposed to the arts and cultural activities and have a lack of at-home educational materials (Ozkan, Purutcuoglu, & Hablemitoglu, 2010). In addition, the television is often used as a form of distraction and entertainment with a lack of perimeters (Ozkan, Purutcuoglu, & Hablemitoglu, 2010). Children in poverty are also less likely to graduate than their middle-class peers (Teachman et al. as cited in Truscott & Truscott, 2005). A lack of education often results in lower pay, often repeating the cycle of poverty. High levels of education have been found to increase the level of wages, which can result in a decreased percentage of individuals living in poverty (Awan, Malik, Sarwar, & Waqas, 2011).

With these realities, there are continuous challenges for teachers, school counselors and other school personnel working with students in low-income areas. Teachers, school counselors, and other school employees must prepare to meet the needs of these students. Often, educators come from middle-class backgrounds which create a difficulty for educators to relate to students

who live in poverty (Zeichner, 2003). Due to the fact that many educators' personal backgrounds are middle-class, educators look to teacher educators, school district administrators, educational researchers, and other experts to help shape their role in the classroom (Ng & Rury, 2006). In addition, teachers often provide less positive attention and less positive reinforcement for good performance for poor students (McLoyd, 1998). As children in poverty age, they are likely to take on the role they are placed in rather than rise above the situation with positive reinforcement (Ozkan, Purutcuoglu, & Hablemitoglu, 2010). This highlights that poverty may foster personal and academic challenges to students, ones that may not be adequately addressed by our educational systems.

To address these challenges, Ruby Payne (1996) worked on developing a framework for understanding poverty from a societal and educational perspective. Her original work titled *A Framework for Understanding Poverty* (1996) focused on training educational professionals to understand the cultural, educational, and social structures related to poverty. This included the concept that poverty is a social class in America (Payne, 2005). Payne (1996) conceptualized that all economic levels have hidden rules in relation to their thinking, values, and behaviors. This includes those living in poverty. However, Payne (1996) states most schools operate from a middle-class viewpoint, not addressing the challenges or unique issues facing students living in poverty. Payne (2005) believes educators must understand the hidden rules and foster environments that support lower income students while helping them be successful. She believes that one of these components is mentoring. Payne (2005) states that with this type of mentoring, one teacher or educator can make the difference in how successful these students are in school.

To meet this goal Payne (2005) developed specific interventions to help school personnel deal with some of the hidden behaviors related to poverty. For each negative behavior a child

might display she outlines specific ways to help the child learn appropriate behaviors. An example of this would be a child who has a problem keeping their hands to themselves. Payne (2005) suggests helping the child find constructive ways to use their hands without touching others. Another example is when a student is disrespectful to their teacher. Payne (2005) suggests a child may not fully understand adults are worth respect. In this case, the teacher may explain the child's choice of words is inappropriate and help them find the appropriate way to communicate with their teacher and other adults.

Payne (1996) suggests in her framework ways to help reform students from poverty into middle-class thinking/ culture. She suggests ways such as helping students learn coping strategies, ways to survive in a middle-class school, and goal-setting instructions. She also gives specific instructions for teachers and school workers dealing with discipline, teaching strategies, and building effective relationships (Payne, 2005). Payne (2005) states when speaking about teaching children the appropriate skills to survive a middle-class lifestyle, "It is the responsibility of educators and others who work with the poor to teach the differences and skills/rules that will allow the individual to make the choice" (p. 113).

School Counselors' Self-Efficacy

Bandura's social cognitive theory looks at cognitive factors by triadic reciprocal causation (Bandura, 1986). The triad is made up of behavior, cognitive and other personal factors, and the external environment (Bandura, 1986). These three factors allow individuals to respond to events cognitively, affectively, and behaviorally. Self-efficacy is a major component of social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986). Self-efficacy is defined as the "belief in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to manage prospective

situations" (Bandura, 1995, p.2). Self-efficacy is the foundation of human agency (Bandura, 1999). "Perceived self-efficacy concerns people's beliefs in their capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to exercise control over events in their lives" (Wood & Bandura, 1989, pg. 364). Self-efficacy does not look directly at the skills an individual possesses, but at their personal judgments based on the factors; behavior, cognitive and other personal factors, and external environment (Bandura, 1986).

Bandura (1995, 1997) looks at four sources of self-efficacy which construct self-efficacy beliefs. The four sources include (1) enactive mastery experiences, (2) vicarious experiences, (3) verbal persuasion, and (4) physiological and affective states (Bandura, 1995, 1997). Enactive mastery experiences determine the level of efficacy an individual has; success increases efficacy while failure decreases an individual's efficacy (Bandura, 1997). Vicarious experiences increase efficacy through observational learning, meaning that when individuals observe others have success this in turn increases their own individual efficacy (Bandura, 1995). According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy beliefs are not always stable, new experiences and information can cause self-efficacy to vary.

The role of a school counselor has constantly changed over the past twenty years. With the changing roles of a school counselor, the American School Counseling Association (ASCA, 2012) has developed guidelines and standards to help guide school counselors in their role. These standards do not explain explicitly how a school counselor must accomplish the goals but leaves room for school counselors to determine the best approach depending on their situation, school, and students. However, to accomplish this goal it is imperative that school counselors have the competencies and skill to implement such approaches. A key element of this is counselors' self-efficacy, specifically the confidence and ability to demonstrate appropriate and

effective counseling skills and abilities (Holcomb- McCoy, Harris, Hines, & Johnston, 2008). Thus, it is important to understand how self-efficacy relates to school counselors' perceived ability to appropriately reach the desired outcomes and goals for a student's academic, career, and personal needs (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). This may have a relationship with their perceived ability to address the needs and challenges of working with students living in poverty.

Although there has been an intense professional and research focus to understand self-efficacy as it relates to counseling and counselor education, the amount of literature pertaining to school counseling self-efficacy is limited (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). To fill the void of school counselor self-efficacy literature, Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) developed a measure to assess school counselor self-efficacy. This scale was developed looking at the National Standards for School Counseling (Campbell & Dahir, 1997) and Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs standards (CACREP, 2001). This measure, the *School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale* (SCSE), focused on assessing school counselor self-efficacy. This scale was used to look at school counselors', and school counselors' in training, confidence in their own abilities focusing specifically on the school counselors' confidence in their ability to implement and perform the duties as outlined by the National Standards for School Counseling (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005).

The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSE) looks at five factors: Personal and Social Development, Leadership and Assessment, Career and Academic Development, Collaboration, and Cultural Acceptance (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). In the initial development of the study, Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) found that school counselors who were previously teachers had higher levels of self-efficacy than those who had not previously held teaching positions. In addition, they found that women reported higher levels of self-efficacy in their role

as school counselors than men (Holcomb-May, et al., 2008). Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) study provided the first glance of self-efficacy as it related to school counselors and their ability to implement and provide school counseling services. The current study is needed to help clarify the relationship between self-efficacy and attitudes and attributions towards poverty.

The School Counselors' Role when Working with Students Living in Poverty

The United States has seen large changes in demographics since the 1900s (Sanner, Baldwin, Cannella, Charles, & Parker, 2010). The U.S. Department of State (2012) suggests U.S. minorities will be the majority by 2043, increasing from 37 percent in 2012 to 57 percent by the year 2060. With the increase of diverse populations comes a greater need for counselors to have a deeper understanding of diverse groups. The American Counseling Association (ACA) Code of Ethics (2005) states counselors are to "actively attempt to understand the diverse cultural backgrounds of the clients they serve" (p.4). Due to the correlation between ethnicity and poverty, one such diverse group includes individuals living in poverty. Training and preparation are emphasized in the ACA Code of Ethics (2005), ASCA Code of Ethics (2010), and the ASCA position statement on School Counseling Preparation Program (2008). Counselors also have an ethical responsibility to develop multicultural competencies and acquire educational and training experiences about diverse cultures (ASCA, Ethical Standards, 2010). This is highlighted in the ACA Code of Ethics (2005) which states that counselors must be able to "gain knowledge, personal awareness, sensitivity, and skills pertinent to working with a diverse client population" (p.9).

Gunn and Duncan (1997) explain children living in poverty deal with several disadvantages based on their parents' lack of income, including "inadequate nutrition, fewer learning experiences, instability of residence, lower quality of schools, exposure to

environmental toxins, family violence, and homelessness, dangerous streets, or less access to friends, services" (as cited in Ozkan, Purutcuoglu, & Hablemitoglu, 2010, pg. 175). In addition, research has shown school counselors face challenges when working with students in low socioeconomic areas (Amatea & West-Olatunji, 2007; Lee, 2005; Van Velsor & Orozco, 2007). The challenges faced by school counselors working with students in poverty include: achievement gaps, a lack of resources and school personnel, and a gap between family and school involvement. In terms of achievement gap, school personnel have been found to prefer working with students with higher academic achievement rather than students who perform poorly (Lee, 2005). This creates a problem due to the fact that research has shown students living in poverty are typically have lower academic achievement (Dearing, Kreider, Simpkins, & Wess, 2006).

It is important for counselors to work to understand the cultural values and expectations of individuals living in poverty and the difficulties they face (Foss, Generall, & Kress, 2011). Often, individuals living in poverty value relationships over material possessions due to living in an environment where possessions are stolen, taken, broken, or inaccessible (Foss, et al., 2011). Due to this, counselors should always take into consideration aspects that accompany poverty in order to best serve this population. Research shows school counselors face several unique challenges while working with students living in poverty (Amatea & West-Olatunji, 2007; Lee, 2005; Van Velsor & Orozco, 2007). Several of these challenges include academic achievement, school climate, resource deficits, cultural gaps between students/ families and the school, and a lack of understanding (Amatea & West-Olatunji, 2007; Lee, 2005; Van Velsor & Orozco, 2007).

Lee (2005) gives an overview of school counseling in urban settings, focusing on schools high in poverty, along with challenges and competencies for school counselors to focus on while

working with children in low-income areas. He explains the challenges for school counselors working with students in high poverty areas and how this differs from those in a traditional school (Lee, 2005). For school counselors to be effective working with students in poverty situations, they must adopt a systematic perspective rather than looking solely at the individual (Lee, 2005). Lee (2005) encourages school counselors to take on the role of empowering students while collaborating with families, community, and leadership in the school system to bring about changes for individuals. Although this article focuses on urban schools, the author feels the information presented in this article is important when working with poverty in all school settings.

School counselors are in the perfect position to help make a difference in the lives of children living in poverty (Paisley & Haynes, 2003). In order to do so, school counselors must use their school-wide perspective on making sure the needs of every student are met (Paisley & Hayes, 2003). Griffin and Steen (2011) continued to explain the role of the school counselor in the lives of students living in poverty. School counselors, along with other school sponsors, must use their role to make positive changes within the school and community for low-income students and families. Noguera (2003) suggests fighting achievement disparities by looking at issues and problems as they arise through the students' support systems. The support systems may include the school, family, and the community. As school counselors, the American School Counseling Association states that school counselors must:

> Become knowledgeable about community resources and actively pursue collaboration with family members and community stakeholders; remove barriers to the successful implementation of school-family-community partnerships (e.g., mistrust and miscommunication between parties, resistance to the concept and

> practice, transportation and childcare issues, accessible meeting times); and serve as an advocate, leader, facilitator, initiator, evaluator, and collaborator to create, enrich, and evaluate the effect of these partnerships on student success (ASCA, 2010, p. 43).

Similarly, the ACA (2005) ethical guidelines state, "When appropriate, counselors advocate at individual, group, intuitional, and societal levels to examine potential barriers and obstacles that inhibit access and/or the growth and development of clients" (Standard A.6.a.). In addition to ASCA and ACA, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP; 2009) also states educational programs must develop counselors who promote "cultural social justice, advocacy… and other culturally supported behaviors that promote optimal wellness and growth of the human spirit, mind, or body" (p.10).

Advocacy, then, is an important aspect of counseling. The goal of the school counselor is to serve as an advocate for student success through the school, family and the community (ASCA, 2010). Van Velsor and Orozco (2007) look at a communitycentric approach to helping parents and students from low-income backgrounds in schools. Van Velsor and Orzco (2007) suggest an association between low-income parents and school participation, offering that low-income parents often have low school participation. Based on a study completed with low SES mothers, low-income mothers stated a desire to be involved in their child's education; yet they were uncomfortable around their child's teacher (Machen, Wilson, & Notar, 2005). Previous studies completed by Hoover-Dempsey, Bassler, and Brissie (1987) have shown high rates of parental involvement positively impact student success, attendance, and outlook (as cited in DeTorres, n.d.). Looking at the relationship between the poor and non-poor, it may be deduced that low parental involvement negatively impacts student success, student attendance, and

student outlook. With this information, school counselors must ask themselves how they can work to increase parental involvement to increase student success. Van Velsor and Orozco (2007) suggest several barriers to the lack of parent involvement with low-income families. These barriers include demographic barriers, psychological barriers, teacher attitudes, and school climate.

School counselors can develop or implement strategies to strengthen the relationship between low-income parents and schools to help overcome barriers. The ASCA Model (2010) encourages school counselors to serve as leaders, advocates, collaborators, and systemic change agents on behalf of all students. Van Velsor and Orozco (2007) suggest six community-centered strategies for school counselors working with low-income families. All of the community-centered strategies fall in line with ASCA's standards. They include: learning about the families in the school, learning about the community, helping parents with community concerns, helping parents with on-site services, offering training for school personnel, and employing parent's cultural capital (Van Velsor & Orozco, 2007).

First, it is important for school counselors to learn about the families in the school. Payne (1996) suggests asking parents to come in for a conference may be misunderstood by both sides. Parents may be scared to come or consider the short conference rude; however, school counselors can help school personnel build effective communication with the families in the school (Payne, 1996). School counselors may do so by encouraging teachers to reach out and get to know the families through diverse methods. This may include phone calls, notes home, and home visits (Van Velsor & Orozco, 2007).

Second, it is important to learn about the community. As Payne (2005) suggests, it is important to understand the "hidden rules" of individuals living in poverty. This can be done by

getting to know the community leaders and parent leaders (Van Velsor & Orozco, 2007). School counselors should help the school make connections to the leaders in the community to bridge gaps. They may also help teachers and administrators understand the hidden rules and teach students appropriate middle-class rules (Payne, 2005).

Third, school counselors may help parents with community concerns. School counselors' knowledge of the community and specialized services can help parents meet the basic needs of their family (Van Velsor & Orozco, 2007). This could be accomplished by having a referral sheet with different specialized services listed. School counselors may also serve as a liaison between the school and parents. Providing access to useful information on parenting and other concerns is an effective method to supporting parents (Ozkan, Purutcuoglu, & Hablemitoglu, 2010).

Fourth, school counselors may help parents with on-site services. This may include various educational workshops, social events, medical services, or tutoring (Van Velsor & Orozco, 2007). School counselors can establish these workshops to help parents feel comfortable and connected with the school. Offering support and information to parents can help them feel more actively engaged and supported (Ozkan, Purutcuoglu, & Hablemitoglu, 2010).

Fifth, school counselors can offer training for school personnel. School counselors can provide in-service training focused on specific needs related to the school (Van Velsor & Orozco, 2007). The topics may vary but may include parent communication and general multiculturalism issues.

Lastly, employing parent's cultural capital is an important aspect to understanding the parent's point of view and how they view their surroundings (Van Velsor & Orozco, 2007).

School counselors are encouraged to hone in on their own multicultural competencies in order to be the most effective counselor (ASCA, 2010). This creates teamwork between parents and the school in order to provide the most effective education to the children (Van Velsor & Orozco, 2007).

School counselors have various tools to reach out to the families and children living in poverty. Payne (1996) suggests there are "four reasons one leaves poverty: It's too painful to stay, a vision or goal, a key relationship, or a special talent or skill" (p.11). Payne suggests the school may be the only environment "where students can learn the choices and rules of the middle class" (p.80). With a supportive school environment, children living in poverty will be better equipped to rise above poverty. School counselors can be a key to help students and families break free from the limitations of poverty.

Summary

In conclusion, the review of literature suggests the need for further study of student-client poverty status and the attitudes and attributions that may influence the school counselor behaviors and relationship. Literature shows a clear relationship between an individual's socioeconomic status and their development (Smith et al., 2011). The ACA Code of Ethics (2005) suggest counselors must "recognize diversity and embrace a cross-cultural approach in support of the worth, dignity, potential, and uniqueness of people within their social and cultural contexts" (p. 3). There is a clear need to meet clients where they are and work towards their personal/social, academic, and career development (ASCA, 2005). Literature suggests school counselors, teachers, and additional school personnel must address their own personal bias and learn the appropriate ways to work with individuals living in poverty (Van Velsor & Orozco, 2007).

CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This research study was designed to investigate self-efficacy as it relates to attributions and attitudes about poverty among pre-service school counselors. The purpose is to discover any relationships between attributions and attitudes about poverty, self-efficacy of pre-service school counselors, and other demographic factors.

The research questions will be addressed by using measures to examine pre-service school counselors' attitudes concerning poverty, attributions regarding the causes of poverty, and pre-service school counselors' self-efficacy in regards to their ability to work with individuals living in poverty. The measures are quantitative and will include a demographics questionnaire developed by the researcher, the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005), Attitudes about Poverty Scale (Yun & Weaver, 2010), and the Attributions of Poverty Scale (Bullock, Williams, & Limbert, 2011). The following sections of this chapter detail the research questions which will guide this study, participant characteristics, instruments used, procedures, and data analysis.

Research Questions

In order to examine school counselors-in-training beliefs and attitudes associated with low socioeconomic status, and school counseling self-efficacy the following research questions will be examined:

1. What is the nature of the attitudes school counselors-in-training hold regarding low SES?
2. What is the nature of the attributions toward poverty held by school counselors-in-training?

3. What is the relationship between the level of perceived school counseling self-efficacy and attitudes toward low SES among school counselors-in-training?

4. What is the relationship between the level of perceived school counseling self-efficacy and attributions toward low SES among school counselors-in-training?

Measures

The survey for this study consisted of four measures which includes a demographics questionnaire developed by the researcher, the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005), Attitudes About Poverty Scale (Yun & Weaver, 2010) and the Attributions of Poverty Scale (Bullock, Williams, & Limbert, 2011). In addition, the researcher included several open ended questions to allow participants the opportunity to provide comments or feedback pertaining specifically to the research.

Demographic Questionnaire

The demographic questionnaire was designed to collect specific and relevant participant information. The questionnaire consisted of nine questions focused on demographic data relevant to the participants. This included data regarding gender, age, ethnicity, current state/location, credit hours earned, and socio-economic status of family of origin. In addition, the researcher included several open ended questions to allow participants the opportunity to provide comments or feedback pertaining to the type of school where they would prefer to be employed (Title-I or non-Title I). They were also asked to discuss why they would prefer a Title-I (high poverty) school or a non-Title I school.

Attributions of Poverty Scale

The Attributions of Poverty Scale (Bullock, Williams, & Limbert, 2001) is a 45-item, self-report instrument designed to measure three dimensions of attributions held towards poverty: individualistic explanations, structural explanations, and fatalistic explanations. The scale assesses a broad range of explanations for poverty across individualistic (e.g., laziness, anti-work mentality, and breakdown of traditional families), structuralistic (e.g., lack of transportation), and fatalistic (e.g., sickness, bad luck) attributions. For the purposes of this study, beliefs about the causes of poverty were assessed using a modified, 36-item version of the Attributions of Poverty scale (2001). The alpha coefficients for the three constructs were reported as .91 (individualistic), .91 (structuralistic), and .72 (fatalistic). Participants were assigned membership to one of the three groups based on their scores indicating their belief to attribute specific factors as contributing towards the prevalence of poverty in the United States. Participants answer questions in regards to their beliefs of the causes of poverty. The survey is a 5 point Likert Scale (1= Not at all important as a cause of poverty and 5= Extremely important as a cause of poverty).

Attitudes about Poverty Scale

The Attitudes about Poverty Scale (Yun & Weaver, 2010) is a 21- item, self-report instrument designed to measure a range of diverse attitudes about poverty and poor people: personal deficiency (7 items), stigma (8 items), and structural perspective (6 items). This measure looks across three factors: personal deficiency (e.g., Poor people are dishonest), stigma (e.g., Welfare mothers have babies to get more money), and structural perspective (e.g., I would support a program that resulted in higher taxes to support social programs for poor people).

Participants respond to each statement by using a five point Likert-type scale (SA = strongly agree (1), A = agree (2), N= neutral (3), D = disagree (4), SD = strongly disagree (5). Scoring of the Attitudes about Poverty Scale show the higher the score, the more favorable the respondents' attitude toward the poor. The Attitudes about Poverty Short Form is fairly recent, due to this there is little data regarding the instruments' validity and reliability. Yun and Weaver (2010) report internal consistency of the total scale to be established with a Cronbach's α of .87. The overall total alpha for the current study is .650. The subscales of the Attitudes about Poverty Short Form exceeded minimum acceptable levels for internal consistency with alpha coefficients between .50 and .70. The specific alphas for each of the subscales in the current study are: personal deficiency .369, stigma .827, and structural .549.

The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale

The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005) is a 43-item; self-report instrument designed to measure school counselor self-efficacy. The ASCA National Standards for School Counseling (Campbell & Dahir, 1997), the program standards set forth by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Program (CACREP, 2001) and already established counseling self-efficacy scales of other counseling specialties were used as the basis for the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale uses a five point Likert scale to measure responses (i.e. not confident, slightly confident, moderately confident, generally confident, and highly confident) and consists of five subscales; personal and social development, leadership and assessment, career and academic development, collaboration; and cultural acceptance. A composite mean is calculated to demonstrate the overall level of self-efficacy.

The School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (Bodenhom & Skaggs, 2005) was developed over four separate studies: the initial item development, item analysis, validity study, and factor analysis. First, item development was intended to determine what items would be best suited for school counselors (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). This was determined through an expert panel and document review of ASCA National Standards and CACREP career expectations of school counselors. The second study, item analysis, was done with practicing school counselors. The responses from the surveys were analyzed for reliability, omission, discrimination, and group differences (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). The third inquiry was the validity studies with school counselors. The purpose of this inquiry was to obtain validity by comparing the results from the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale with other preexisting instruments (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005).

Analysis revealed that the sample was representative of the population and that the items were highly reliable with a .95 alpha coefficient. Analysis also showed that group differences existed, with female participants, those with teaching experience, those who had been practicing for three or more years, and those who were trained and use the ASCA National Standards reporting higher levels of self-efficacy. Construct validity was confirmed through correlation of the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale and a number of other scales that measure constructs helpful in assessing self-efficacy: The Counseling Self-Estimate inventory, a measure of counseling skills (COSE; correlation = .41); the Social Desirability Scale (SDS; correlation = .30); the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI; significant negative correlations); and the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, second edition (TSCS: 2; no significant correlations).

Procedures

The data collected for this research study was facilitated through the use of previously collected data. This study included two institutions in the Southeast, one sample at a large online and campus based private institution and another at a large public campus based institution. Permission to conduct the survey from which previously collected data was utilized was obtained from the Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects of Auburn University. Courses at both universities were identified whose focus was on school counseling skills. The participant population used for recruitment in this study was gathered from graduate level school counselors-in-training at both institutions. Faculty permission to recruit from courses was obtained. This included only participants who are 19 years of age or older.

The previously collected data was collected via paper/pencil surveys and online surveys. The large public campus based institution's data was collected only by paper and pencil. The large online and campus based private institution was collected via emailed online surveys. Prior to emailing the students, the researcher spoke to school counseling students to recruit possible participants for the study and inform them of the email they would be receiving. The survey was then emailed to individual professors in the school counseling department and each professor emailed the survey to their students in their school counseling courses.

During recruitment the investigator told potential participants they were being asked to participate in a study that would take 15-20 minutes, participation was not linked to their current class, and was voluntary. The instructors at the public institution who had participating classes were asked to leave the room during data collection. Survey packets were distributed and potential participants were asked to review the informational letter and if they chose to

participate to complete the provided surveys and return the surveys in the provided envelope. Those choosing not to participate were asked to return the surveys, not completed, in the provided envelope. All responses received were anonymous, as identifiable information was not collected during this study. The instructors at the private institution were asked to forward the email to their entire class. Emails were distributed via the professors of the school counseling courses. The potential participants were asked to review the informational letter and if they chose to participate to complete the provided surveys at the hyperlink provided in the email. All responses received online were also anonymous, as identifiable information was not collected during this study.

Participants

The current study utilized data that was collected from a previously collected study. The past study sought to examine similar constructs among a population of graduate students in school counseling programs. This study was approved by the Auburn University IRB (see approval in appendix A). Permission was obtained to use data relevant to the current study's research questions and area of focus. Participants in this study were Master's level school counseling students at a large private online and campus based southeastern university and a large public campus based southeastern university. The students' classes ranged from introductory counseling courses to practicum and internship courses. Participation in this study was strictly voluntary and no form of reimbursement was offered in exchange for its completion. Participants were given the opportunity to request study results. Participants received a survey package which included the measures described above.

Recruitment

There were no anticipated risks associated with this study. Upon Institutional Review Board at Auburn University, participants were recruited using two methods.

The first method of collection was to distribute and collect the survey materials to Master's level school counseling students at one public southeastern universities. These participants were provided with a packet containing an informational sheet about the study and copies of the measures. Students had the option to anonymously complete and submit the surveys to the researcher or return an incomplete packet if they did not wish to participate.

The second method of collection was to send an email to Master's level school counseling students at one private southeastern universities. The email was sent from the researcher to multiple professors of school counseling students. This email was then forwarded to the students in their school counseling courses. The same informational sheet was included in the email. There was a link provided at the bottom of the informational email with access to the surveys, hosted by Qualtrics. Both the first and second method of data collection contained the same surveys and information.

Data was collected over a period of three weeks. For students who participated in person, the researcher collected the paper copies in person. For the online collection, an email was sent out to students for participation twice. Online data collected was housed through Qualtrics program while the paper copies were kept in a locked drawer at the researcher's house. Upon completion of the study, all data will be destroyed.

Data Analysis

Using the data collected through surveys the researcher analyzed pre-service school counselors' attitudes about poverty, attributions of causes of poverty, perceived self-efficacy when working with students in poverty, and demographic factors. Data collection occurred via paper format and online survey format. Data was collected via paper format at the large public campus. Survey packets were distributed and potential participants were asked to review the informational letter and if they chose to participate to complete the provided surveys and return the surveys in the provided envelope. Those choosing not to participate were asked to return the surveys, not completed, in the provided envelope. Data was collected via email at the large private institution. Prior to emailing the students, the researcher spoke to school counseling students to recruit possible participants for the study and inform them of the email they would be receiving. The survey was then emailed to individual professors in the school counseling department and each professor emailed the survey to their students in their school counseling courses. All responses received were anonymous, as identifiable information was not collected during this study.

Data was entered and analyzed in an aggregate manner using the computer software SPSS (Statistical Product for Social Sciences). Multiple regression was used to assess the relationship across variables. While comparisons were made across demographic data the data was not collected nor analyzed in a manner that allowed for the identification of individual participants.

Summary

In this chapter, an overview of the research methodology was provided with a focus on participant recruitment, instrument selection, assessment distribution practices, and data analysis procedures. In summary, students who were enrolled in courses related to school counseling were encouraged to participate. The instruments used for this study including the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005), Attitudes about Poverty Scale (Yun & Weaver, 2010), the Attributions of Poverty Scale (Bullock, Williams, & Limbert, 2011), and a demographic questionnaire. Reliability and validity information was also presented.

CHAPTER IV. RESULTS

This chapter will present the results of the data analysis for this study. It includes assessment of the participants' demographic information and the results of the statistical analysis as well as descriptive statistics for each scale used in the current study. The purpose of this study was to research and explore pre-service school counseling students' self-efficacy as it relates to their personal attitudes and beliefs of attributions of individuals living in poverty. Pre-service school counselors (i.e., students in school counselor preparation programs) were specifically targeted within the overall sample.

Demographics

The data collected for this research study was facilitated through the use of archival data; these data were collected as part of a larger study that was approved by the Auburn University Institutional Review Committee. Ninety one respondents submitted survey packets or completed the online survey. Data for the 91 participants in the study was visually inspected to identify participants who terminated the study before answering the items designed to collect the data. Of that number, six did not complete the Attributions of Poverty Scale, six did not complete the Attitudes of Poverty Scale, and seven did not complete the School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale. These participants were removed from analysis.

Demographic data collected included gender, age, and race/ethnicity. Nearly 87% of the total number of participants were female (n=79), while the remaining 13% of participants were male (n=12). Participants reported ages ranging from 21 to 53, with a mean of 33. Two participants elected not to state their age.

More than 65% (*n*=60) of participants in the overall sample identified their race or ethnicity as White, followed by 19% (*n*=19) as Black or African American, 1.1% (n= 1) as

American Indian or Alaskan Native, 2.2% (*n*=2) as Asian, 5.5% (*n*=5) as Hispanic or Latino, and 4.4% (*n*=4) indicating Other race or Ethnicity. In addition, of the 91 total participants in this study, participants live in twenty-four states and one country.

Data were also collected examining participants' family of origin socioeconomic status. Participants were asked to identify with one of six categories including: poverty level or below, just above poverty, lower middle class, middle class, upper middle class, and upper class. There were a total of 15.4% (*n* = 14) of participants who reported as being raised at or below poverty level, 9.9% (*n*= 9) at just above poverty, 19.8% (*n*= 18) at lower middle class, 37. % (*n*= 34) at middle class, 15.4% (*n*= 14) at upper middle class, and 2.2% (*n*= 2) at upper class. While looking at the three categories which make up the middle class (lower middle class, middle class, and upper middle class) a total of 72.6% (*n*=66) reported their family of origin socioeconomic status to be in the middle class range. Frequencies and percentages for all categorical demographic data are represented in Table 1 below.

Table 1
Demographic Characteristics of Study Participants

Characteristic		Frequency (*n*)	Percentage
Gender *(N*= 91*)*	Female	79	87
	Male	12	13
Race/ Ethnicity *(N*=91*)*	White	60	65
	Black or African American	19	19
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	1.1
	Asian	2	2.2
	Hispanic or Latino	5	5.5
	Other race or Ethnicity	4	4.4
Family of Origin SES *(N*=91)	Poverty level or below	14	15.4
	Just above the poverty level	9	9.9
	Lower middle class	18	19.8
	Middle class	34	37.4
	Upper middle class	14	15.4
	Upper class	2	2.2

Assessment of Measure of Reliability

Each of the measures used in this study were evaluated for their reliability or internal consistency. Initial evaluation of the measures for normality revealed that each of the scales met the requirements for linearity. The Chronbach Alpha was determined for each measure and compared against established reliabilities for each scale and subscale. Reliability estimates for all measures used in this study range from .369 to .965 with a median of .740. These measures include the Attitudes about Poverty, Attributions of Poverty, and School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale. In addition, the overall reliability estimates for measures range from .650 to .921 with a median of .725. All scales showed relatively overall high reliability (see Table 2).

Research Question 1: What is the nature of the attitudes school counselors-in-training hold regarding low SES?

A Cronbach alpha for each of the subscales were reported as .82 (personal deficiency), .75 (stigma), and .67 (structural perspective) (Yun & Weaver, 2010). In the current study a total Cronbach alpha of .650 was reported for the overall scale with subscales ranging between .369 and .827. The Cronbach alpha of .369 for the personal deficiency subscale indicating low reliability for this subscale. The mean score for all participants was 3.22. Mean scores for all participants in each subscale were 4.14 (Personal Deficiency), 2.83 (Stigma), and 2.64 (Structural). When looking at the Attitudes about Poverty results, school counselors in training indicated they were most likely to identify personal deficiency factors (highest level of agreement) as related to the causes of poverty (e.g., laziness).

Subscale difference were examined using a Within Subjects Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). Results of the analysis found significant differences between personal deficiency

and stigma (0.001) as well as personal deficiency and structural (0.001). However, there is not a significant difference between stigma and structural (0.361). See Table 2 below.

Descriptive Statistics for Scales

Scale	# of items	Cronbach's α	Mean(SD)	F
Attitudes About Poverty				76.597*
Personal Deficiency	7	.369	4.1462(.53)	
Stigma	8	.827	2.8397(.72)	
Structural	6	.549	2.6498(.56)	
Attributions of Poverty				1.462
Individualistic	15	.630	3.5224(.63)	
Fatalistic	8	.965	3.3229(.56)	
Structural	13	.860	3.3082(.64)	
School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale	43	.921	4.0235(.54)	

*p<.001

Research Question 2: What is the nature of the attributions toward poverty held by school counselors-in-training?

A Cronbach alpha was reported for each of the subscales as .91 (structural), .91 (individualistic), and .72 (fatalistic) by the authors of the measure (Bullock, Williams, & Limbert, 2001). In the current study a total Cronbach alpha of subscales ranging between .630 and .860 was reported. The mean score for all participants was 3.40. Mean scores for all participants in each subscale were 3.30 (Structural), 3.52 (Individualistic), and 3.32 (Fatalistic). When looking at the Attributions of Poverty, school counselors in training indicated they were most likely to attribute the causes of poverty to individualistic factors. Individualistic factors deal specifically with laziness and an anti-work mentality.

When using an ANOVA with repeated measures with a Greenhouse-Geisser correction, the mean scores for attributions were not statistically significantly different ($F(1.462, 139.754) = 1.462$, $p > 0.05$). Therefore, there are no statistically significant differences among the three scale means. Given the non-significant F test, no post-hoc tests were performed.

Research Question 3: What is the relationship between the level of perceived school counseling self-efficacy and attitudes toward low SES among school counselors-in-training?

When looking at the Attitudes about Poverty Scale, a Cronbach alpha was reported for each of the subscales as .91 (structural), .91 (individualistic), and .72 (fatalistic) by the authors of the measure (Bullock, Williams, & Limbert, 2001). In the current study the subscales Cronbach alpha ranged between .630 and .860. The mean score for all participants was 3.40. Mean scores for all participants in each subscale were 3.30 (Structural), 3.52 (Individualistic), and 3.32 (Fatalistic).

To specifically address the relationship between the level of perceived school counseling self-efficacy and attitudes towards low SES among school counselors-in-training, a backwards elimination regression was used to determine the best predictors of counselor self-efficacy. Using three predictors, an overall R^2 of .043 was reached. Through backward elimination, a simpler model retaining just one predictor emerged. The final restricted model contained the *Structural Attitude Scale* and achieved an R^2 of .037 ($F = 3.158$, $p = .079$). The difference of .006 between these two models was not statistically significant ($F = .247$, $p > .05$). Therefore, the more restricted model was preferred. Structural factors accounted for 3.7% of the variance of attitudes about poverty ($R^2 = .037$). This indicates there is no significant relationship between self-efficacy and attitudes about poverty. See Table 3 below.

Table 3

RQ3. Regression Findings – Attitudes & Self Efficacy

Factor	R^2	S.E Estimate	R	Semi-partial	Beta
Full Model	.043[a]	.536			
Personal Deficiency			.054	.075	.083
Stigma Attitudes			.094	-.040	-.052
Structural Attitudes			-.193	-.182	-.224
Restricted Model	.037[b]	.531			
Structural Attitudes					.193*

*p<.05

[a] F(3, 80) = 1.190, p =.319

[b] F(1, 82) = 3.158, p = .079

Research Question 4: What is the relationship between the level of perceived school counseling self-efficacy and attributions toward low SES among school counselors-in-training?

When looking at Attributions of Poverty, a Cronbach alpha was reported for each of the subscales as .91 (structural), .91 (individualistic), and .72 (fatalistic) by the authors of the measure (Bullock, Williams, & Limbert, 2001). In the current study a total Cronbach alpha of .850 was reported for the overall scale with subscales ranging between .630 and .860. The mean score for all participants was 3.40. Mean scores for all participants in each subscale were 3.30

(Structural), 3.52 (Individualistic), and 3.32 (Fatalistic).

To specifically address the relationship between the level of perceived school counseling self-efficacy and attributions of poverty, a backwards elimination regression was used to determine the best predictors of counselor self-efficacy. Using three predictors, an overall R^2 of .065 was reached. Through backward elimination, a simpler model retaining just one predictor emerged. The final restricted model contained the *Structural Attribution Scale* and achieved an R^2 of .056 ($F = 4.87$, $p = .030$). The R^2 difference of .009 between these two models was not statistically significant ($F = .378$, $p > .05$). Therefore, the more restricted model was preferred. Structural attribution factors accounted for 5.6% of the variance of attributions towards poverty ($R^2 = .056$). This indicates there is no significant relationship between self-efficacy and attributions towards poverty. See Table 4 below.

Table 4

RQ4. Regression Findings – Attributions and Self Efficacy

	R^2	S.E Estimate			
Factor			r	Semi-partial	Beta
Full Model	.065[a]	.53			
Structural Attributions			.237	.243	.283
Individualistic Attributions			.055	.074	.077
Fatalistic Attributions			.067	-.078	-.094
Restricted Model	.056[b]	.52			

Structural Attributions	.199*

*p<.05

[a] F(3, 80) = 1.85, p =.144

[b] F(1, 82) = 4.87, p = .030

Summary

The purpose of this study was to research and explore pre-service school counseling students' self-efficacy as it relates to their personal attitudes and beliefs of attributions of individuals living in poverty. The study used several measures to determine attitudes, attributions, and self-efficacy of pre-service school counselors including Attitudes about Poverty Scale (2010), Attributions of Poverty Scale (2011), and School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (2005). Results indicated that participants assigned more structural attitudes toward the poor (e.g., external and economic forces are at fault, for example, society lacks social justice, the poor are exploited) and individualistic attributions towards the poor (poverty is caused by the poor themselves, for example, they lack the effort to find employment, they waste money and they waste their money on inappropriate things). Results also indicated is no significant relationship between self-efficacy and attitudes about poverty or self-efficacy and attributions towards poverty.

CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore pre-service school counseling students' self-efficacy as it relates to their personal attitudes and attributions towards individuals living in poverty. For this study, participants completed several instruments to measure attitudes, attributions and self-efficacy of school counselors. Scores were calculated for the total scale and also subscales within each measure. Descriptive statistics were examined as well as backwards multiple regressions. This chapter will provide the results from the study. In addition, this chapter will discuss the limitations of the current study as well as recommendations for future study and exploration.

Overview

More than 46 million Americans live in poverty (DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, & Smith, 2012). Of those 46 million individuals, children represent 34 percent of all individuals living in poverty (Addy & Wright, 2012). Poverty impacts children in a multitude of ways; it contributes to developmental challenges, physical health problems, as well as several mental, emotional, and behavioral issues (Komro, Flay, & Biglan, 2011). Teachers and counselors-in-training both need to be prepared to work with various diverse populations. However, it is unknown to what degree training impacts stereotypes, assumptions, and attitudes for counselors.

School counselors have an important role in the academic, personal/social, and career development of all students, including students living in poverty (ASCA, 2012). The American Counseling Association's (2005) code of ethics asks counselors to "recognize diversity and embrace a cross cultural approach in support of the worth, dignity, potential, and uniqueness of people within their social and cultural contexts (Preamble, para.1). School counselors also to

possess the ability to meet the needs of individuals living in low-income situations through counseling, consultation/collaboration, leadership, and advocacy (ASCA, 2005). While counselor education programs have concentrated on developing multicultural awareness in school counselors (Wakefield, Garner, Pehrsson, & Tyler, 2010; Brinson, Brew, & Denby, 2008; Constantine, 2002), there remains a paucity of counseling literature that examines issues of working with individuals living in poverty.

This current study focused specifically on addressing these issues in relation to attitudes, attributions, and an individual school counselor's self-efficacy as it relates to those living in poverty.

Discussion of Results

The first research question addressed in this study was: What is the nature of the attitudes school counselors-in-training hold regarding low SES? An individual's belief as to what causes poverty can be linked to their attitude towards individuals living in poverty (Merolla, Hunt, & Serpe, 2011). When looking at the results related to attitudes about poverty, the school counselors-in-training in this study indicated that they were most likely to identify personal deficiency factors when discussing persons living in poverty (e.g., laziness). Individuals who identify personal deficiency factors as the primary contributing factor for poverty are more likely to adhere to attitudinal statements about poverty that focus on individual deficits, example statements include: "If poor people worked harder, they could escape poverty" and "Most poor people are satisfied with their standard of living." (Atherton & Gemmel, 1993). These attitudes about poverty point towards individual choices and behaviors (Toporek & Pope-Davis, 2005) as being the primary cause of poverty. These results are very similar to research completed on the general American population looking at the attitudes held towards individuals living in poverty.

Prior research has shown Americans favor individualistic causes over structuralistic and fatalistic causes (Bullock et al., 2003; Cozzarelli et al., 2001). Reflective of the most negative bias toward poverty, primarily suggesting that poverty is largely the result of limitations, deficiencies, and problems associated with the individual (Cozzarelli et al., 2001, Payne, 2005). However, these findings have to be viewed with caution when considering the low reliability reported for the subscale personal deficiency in this study.

The second research question addressed in this study was: What is the nature of the attributions toward poverty held by school counselors-in-training? When looking at the Attributions of Poverty (2011), school counselors in training indicated they were most likely to attribute the causes of poverty to individualistic factors. Individualistic factors deal specifically with laziness and an anti-work mentality. Individuals who attribute poverty to individualistic factors place the blame on the individual, believing individuals living in poverty have caused their own conditions and also lack motivation (Merolla, et al., 2011; Bullock, et al., 2003). These findings are disconcerting because they suggest that school counselors in training may conceptualize the causes of poverty as being only based on individualized deficits, in essence solely focusing on blaming the individual (Bullock et al., 2003). This may lead to bias in how they see and work with children and adolescents living in poverty as well as their parents. It also may limit their ability to identify societal or economic barriers that could be addressed in counseling.

Although attitudes and attributes related to poverty is an area that has been infrequently considered in the counseling arena (Smith, 2010), it is an area of great importance. A counselor's impressions of a client helps set the foundation for the working relationship (Smith, Mao, Perkins, & Ampuero, 2011). The findings of the current study have parallels to other

studies that have suggested that counselors and those in related fields may hold negative assumptions or beliefs about persons living in poverty. In an earlier study done, Neynaber (1992) found pre-service counselors held a bias against individuals living in poverty. Moreover, Schnitzer (1996) found that certain stereotypes towards individuals living in poverty were reinforced including poor individuals do not follow through in counseling, are unreliable, unorganized, and irresponsible. In addition, Shapiro (2004) found counselors to have negative attitudes towards individuals living in poverty including a resistance of working with individuals living in poverty and their belief psychotherapy could help low-income individuals.

Another area of exploration in this study was whether perceived level of school counseling self-efficacy related to attitudes toward low SES among school counselors-in-training. Overall, the results of this study showed that the best predictor of counselor self-efficacy was the Structural Attitude Subscale (2010). Structural attitudes hold the social system at fault while looking at a variety of factors including economic, societal, and government barriers (Merolla, et al., 2011). However, once the relationship between the structural factors and self-efficacy was examined, it was determined there is no significant relationship between self-efficacy and attitudes about poverty. One point of concern may be that this group of pre-service school counselors held a relatively high level of self-efficacy, with limited actual counseling experience.

The last area of exploration this study looked at was determining if a relationship existed between the level of perceived school counseling self-efficacy and attributions toward low SES among school counselors-in-training. Similar to the previous discussion of attitudes, results of this study suggested that the best predictor of counselor self-efficacy was the Structural Attribution Subscale. Individuals who hold structural attributions attribute issues in economic,

societal, and government barriers towards reasons individuals are living in poverty (Merolla, et al, 2011). However, once the relationship between the structural factors and self-efficacy was examined, it was determined there is no significant relationship between self-efficacy and attitudes about poverty.

Implications for Counselor Education

Overall, the participants' in the current study demonstrated relatively negative attitudes and attributions related to poverty. These findings suggest the need to consider how to address this issue in training. Krumer-Nevo, Weiss-Gal, and Monnickendam (2009) and Mullaly (2007) suggest students who desire to work as helping professions should be informed of social justice issues. This is an important aspect of training because it determines how they will empower or harm individuals in poverty (Krumer-Nevo, Weiss-Gal, & Monnickendam, 2009; Mullaly, 2007). Past research has shown counselors hold negative bias towards individuals living in poverty (Neynabar, 1992; Toporek & Pope-Davis, 2005). In addition, recent studies have found counselors hold negative attitudes towards poor clients and more positive attitudes towards the working-class population (Smith et al., 2011). This current study also supports the argument that pre-service school counselors hold negative attitudes and stereotypes towards individuals living in poverty. With this in mind, it is imperative that counselor education programs help counselors-in-training debunk the negative attitudes and begin to incorporate appropriate socioeconomic training and advocacy projects into counseling programs. By understanding the attitudes and attributions held by pre-service school counselors, counselor educators can make necessary adjustments to courses and programs to ensure the appropriate implementation of humanistic and social justice frameworks.

Within the literature, there are several specific models which may help address this area of concern. Ruby Payne (1996) worked on developing a framework for understanding poverty from a societal and educational perspective. Her original work titled *A Framework for Understanding Poverty* (1996) focused on training educational professionals to understand the cultural, educational, and social structures related to poverty. In addition, Van Velsor and Orozco (2007) look at a community-centric approach which involves six community-centered strategies for school counselors working with low-income families. All of the community-centered strategies fall in line with ASCA's standards. They include: learning about the families in the school, learning about the community, helping parents with community concerns, helping parents with on-site services, offering training for school personnel, and employing parent's cultural capital (Van Velsor & Orozco, 2007).

The results of the study is a step forward in providing a foundation for understanding the attitudes and attributions pre-service school counselors hold towards individuals living in poverty. This study and the implications for the Counselor Education field can help provide information for addressing the impact of the issues and steps forward in implementing a social justice framework into school counseling programs.

Limitations

One of the first limitations to be considered in this study is the possibility of differences that may exist between counseling programs. Responses for this study were limited to two schools in the southeast region and may vary depending on programs. Results cannot be generalized to all counseling programs.

In addition another limitation to be considered is the small sample size and geographical area that was surveyed in this study. Responses may vary depending on the geographical location as well as the sample size.

An overall limitation to this study is all surveys used in this study consist of self-report measures. Participants may under-report or exaggerate to minimize or intensify the results.

Another limitation related to the sample is that this sample focused on pre-service school counselors, and it is expected that there may be a difference between pre-service school counselors and school counselors already in the field. This difference may relate to practice and competency. Thus, responses in this study may only provide a starting point for considering whether such attitudes and attributions exist among practicing school counselors. Specifically, results cannot be generalized to counselors in practice or individuals in other areas of the helping profession. A parallel concern is the relatively high level of school counseling self-efficacy among the sample. The sample would have had limited opportunity to have developed counseling experience while in their programs and training. Their self-reported level of self-efficacy may be falsely elevated and not a realistic demonstration of their actual competence. This may limit discussion of this variable in relation to attitudes and attributions toward poverty.

Recommendations

Future research looking at the attitudes and attributions of pre service school counselors should take into account several of the methods, findings, and limitations of this study. First, this study looked closely at pre-service school counselors in the southeast region of the United States. Future research could be expanded to include pre-service school counselors from different regions, as well as school counselors who are already in practice. In addition, a comparison

study of pre-service school counselors and school counselors may bring forth information as to similarities and differences and how best to serve this population.

A second recommendation includes a qualitative study which examines in depth the attitudes, attributions, and self-efficacy of pre-service school counselors. In addition, a qualitative study to examine the attitudes, attributions, and self-efficacy of practicing school counselors. Future research done in a qualitative manner may help determine a deeper understanding of attitudes and attributions towards individuals living in poverty.

A third recommendation is to look more specifically at training programs for pre service school counselors and determine the level that poverty training is being integrated into programs and the impact it makes on individuals personal attitudes, attributions, and self-efficacy towards poverty.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to explore pre-service school counseling students' self-efficacy as it relates to their personal attitudes and beliefs of attributions of individuals living in poverty. Pre-service school counseling students were surveyed to explore each area. This study found that pre-service school counselors tend to hold negative attitudes towards individuals living in poverty. While these results align to past research looking at the general population or other groups, it is one of few studies looking specifically at school counseling students. It is believed that the results of the current study may assist in helping to acknowledge a needs based area and help grow a needed research base for working with individuals in poverty.

References

Addy,S., Engelhardt,W., & Skinner, C. (2013) *Basic facts about low-income children: Children under 18 years, 2011*.Retrieved: http://www.nccp.org/publications/pub_1074.html

Addy, S., & Wright, V. R. (2012). *Basic facts about low-income children, 2010: Children under age 18*. Retrieved from National Center for Children in Poverty: http://www.nccp.org/publications/pub_1049.html

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.

Amatea, E. S., & West-Olatunji, C. A. (2007). Joining the conversation about educating our poorest children: Emerging leadership roles for school counselors in high-poverty schools. *Professional School Counseling*, *11*(2), 81–89.

American Counseling Association. (2005). *ACA code of ethics*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Armstrong, A. (2010) Myths of poverty: Realities for students. *Education Digest*, 75(8), 49-53.

American School Counselor Association. (2005). *The ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

American School Counselor Association (2012). *The ASCA National Model: A framework for school counseling programs,* 2nd ed. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Atherton, C., & Gemmel, R. (1993). Measuring attitudes towards poverty: A new scale. *Social Work Research & Abstracts,* 29 (4), 28-30.

Awan, M., Malik, N., Sarwar, H., & Waqas, M. (2011). Impact of education on poverty reduction. *International Journal of Academic Research,* 3(1), 659-664.

Bandura, A. (1986). The explanatory and predictive scope of self-efficacy theory. *Journal of Clinical and Social Psychology,* 4, 359-373.

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), Encyclopedia of human behavior, 4, 71-81, New York: Academic Press.

Bandura, A. (1995). Self-efficacy. In A.S.R. Manstead & M. Hewstone (Eds.), Blackwell encyclopedia of social psychology (pp.453-454). Oxford: Blackwell.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Brinson, J. A., Brew, L., & Denby, R. (2008). Real scenarios and complementary lectures: A classroom training approach to increase counselor awareness, knowledge and skill. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 86*, 11-17.

Elliot, A. J., & Dweck, C.S. (2005). *Handbook of competence and motivation.* New York: Guilford Press.

Bodenhorn, N. & Skaggs, G. (2005). Development of the school counselor self-efficacy scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 38(1), 14-28.

Bodenhorn, N., Wolfe, E. W., & Airen, O. (2010). School counselor program choice and self-efficacy: Relationship to achievement gap and equity. *Professional School Counseling*, 13, 165-174.

Bullock, H. E. (1999). Attributions for poverty: A comparison of middle-class and welfare recipients attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29(1), 2059-2082.

Bullock, H. E., Williams, W. R., & Limbert, W. M. (2003). Predicting Support for Welfare Policies: The Impact of Attributions and Beliefs About Inequality. *Journal of Poverty*, doi:10.1300/J134v07n03_03

Burdette, A. M., & Hill, T. D. (2008). An examination of processes linking perceived neighborhood disorder and obesity. *Social Science and Medicine*, 67, 38–46.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling & Related Educational Programs. (2009). *2009 Standards*. Retrieved from http://www.cacrep.org/doc/2009%20Standards%20with%20cover.pdf

Campbell, C.A., & Dahir, C.A. (1997). *Sharing the vision: The National standards for school counseling programs.* Alexandria, VA: American School Counseling Association.

Cappella, E., Frazier, S., Atkins, M., Schoenwald, S., Glisson, C. (2008). Enhancing schools' capacity to support children in poverty: An ecological model of school-based mental health services. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research,* 35, 395-409.

Children's Defense Fund (2012). The state of America's children: Handbook. Retrieved from: http://www.childrensdefense.org/child-research-data-publications/data/soac-2012-handbook.pdf

Constantine, M. G. (2002). The intersection of race, ethnicity, gender, and social class in counseling: Examining selves in cultural contexts. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 30*, 210-215.

Cozzarelli, C., Wilkinson, A. V., & Tagler, M. J. (2001). Attitudes toward the poor and attributions for poverty. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*(2), 207–227

Cotton, K., & Wikelund, K. R. (1997). Expectation and student outcomes. *School Improvement Research Series*. Retrieved July 2003 from http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/sirs/4/cu7.html

Cutrona, C. E., Wallace, G., & Wesner, K. A. (2006). Neighborhood characteristics and depression: An examination of stress processes. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15, 188–192.

Dearing, E., Kreider, H., Simpkins, S., & Weiss, H.B. (2006). Family involvement in school and low-income children's literacy performance: Longitudinal associations between and within families. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98, 653-664.

DeNavas-Walt, C., Proctor, B. D., & Smith, J. C. (2012). *Income, poverty, and health insurance coverage in the United States:* 2011. U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/2012pubs/p60-243.pdf.

Do, D. P., Finch, B. K., Basurto-Davila, R., Bird, C., Escarce, J., & Lurie, N. (2008). Does place explain racial health disparities? Quantifying the contribution of residential context to the Black/White health gap in the United States. *Social Science and Medicine*, 67, 1258–1268.

Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1998). Attitude strength and function. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., pp. 269–322). Boston:McGraw-Hill.

Engle, P. L. &Black, M. M. (2008), *The effect of poverty on child development and educational outcomes*. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1136: 243–256.

Foss, L., Generali, M., & Kress, V. (2011). Counseling people living in Poverty: The CARE model. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling*, 50, 161-171.

Griffin, D., & Steen, S. (2011). A social justice approach to school counseling. *Journal for Social Action in Counseling and Psychology*, 3(1), 74- 85.

Groulx, J. G. (2001). Changing preservice teacher perceptions of minority schools. *Urban Education*, *36* (1), 60-92.

Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines, & Johnston. (2008). School counselors' multicultural self-efficacy: A preliminary investigation. *Professional School Counseling*.

Hurst, C. 2004. *Social Inequality*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Kennedy, E. (2010). Improving literacy achievement in a high-poverty school: Empowering classroom teachers through professional development. *Reading Research Quarterly,* 45, 384–387.

Kiser, L.J. (2007). Protecting children from the dangers of urban poverty. *Clinical Psychology Review,* 27(2), 211-225.

Komro, K.A., Flay, B.R., & Biglan, A. (2011). Creating nurturing environments: A science based framework for promoting child health and development within high-poverty neighborhoods. *Clinical Child Family Psychology Review*, 14, 111-134.

Lee, C. C. (2005). Urban school counseling: Context, characteristics, and competencies. *Professional School Counseling*, *8*(3), 184–188.

Lee, C. C. (Ed.). (2007). *Counseling for social justice* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Limbert, W. M., & Bullock, H. E. (2005). "Playing the fool": U.S. welfare policy from a critical race perspective. *Feminism and Psychology, 15*, 253-274.

Macartney, S. (2011). Child poverty in the United States 2009 and 2010: Selected race groups and Hispanic origin. American Community Surveys Briefs, ACSBR/ 10-05, U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/prod/2011pubs/acsbr10-05.pdf

Machen, S. M., Wilson, J. D., & Notar, C. E. (2005). Parental involvement in the classroom. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 32(1), 13-16. Retrieved from http://www.projectinnovation.biz/jip.

Merolla, D., Hunt, M., & Serpe, R. (2011). Concentrated disadvantage and beliefs about the causes of poverty: A multi-level analysis. University of California Press, 54 (2), 205-228.

McLoyd, V.C. (1998). Socioeconomic disadvantage and child development. *Am. Psychology*. 53:185-204.

Morgan, H. (2012). Poverty-stricken schools: What we can learn from the rest of the world and from successful schools in economically disadvantaged areas in the US. *Education,* 133 (2), 291-297.

Nasir, N., Jones, A., & McLaughlin, M. (2011). School connectedness for students in low-income urban high schools. *Teachers College Record,* 113 (8), 1755-1793.

Neynaber, J. S. (1992). Career dynamics of counselor trainee stereotyping: Bias toward physical ability, social class, gender, and race of clients. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo.

Ng, J., & Rury, J. (2006). Poverty and education: A critical analysis of the Ruby Payne phenomenon. Teachers College Record. Retrieved from http://www.tcrecord.org.

Noguera (2003). The trouble with black boys: The role and influence of environmental and cultural factors on the academic performance of African American males. *Urban Education*, 28, 431-459.

Ozkan, Y., Purutcuoglu, E., & Hablemitoglu, S. (2010). Interpersonal impact of the poverty on children. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 2 (6), 172-179.

Paisley, R O., & Hayes, R. L. (2003). School counseling in the academic domain: Transformations in preparation and practice. Professional School Counseling, 6, 198-204.

Payne, R. K. (2005). *A framework for understanding poverty*. Highlands, TC: Aha! Process Inc.

Qualtrics. (2010). Research software. Available at http://www.qualtrics.com

Rank, M.R. (2004). One nation, underprivileged: Why American poverty affects us all. Oxford: University Press.

Rodgers, H. R. and Payne, L. (2007), Child Poverty in the American States: The Impact of Welfare Reform, Economics, and Demographics. *Policy Studies Journal*, 35: 1–21.

Rose, M. and Baumgartner, F. R. (2013), Framing the Poor: Media Coverage and U.S. Poverty Policy, 1960–2008. *Policy Studies Journal*, 41: 22–53.

Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D., & Gannon-Rowley, T. (2002).Assessing ‘‘neighborhood effects’’: Social processes and new directions in research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28, 443–478.

Sanner, S., Baldwin, D., Cannella, K., Charles, J. & Parker, L. (2010) The impact of cultural diversity forum on students' openness to diversity. *Journal of Cultural Diversity*, 17, 56-61.

Smith, L., Mao, S., Perkins, S., & Ampuero, M. (2011). The relationship of clients' social class to early therapeutic impressions. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly*. 24(1), 15-27.

Sutton, J. & Fall, M. (1995) The relationship of school climate factors to counselor self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 73, 331-336.

Toporek, R. L. & Pope-Davis, D. B. (2005). Exploring the relationships between multicultural training, racial attitudes, and attributions of poverty among graduate counseling trainees. *Cultural Diversity and Mental Health*, *11*(3), 259-271.

Truscott & Truscott (2005). Differing circumstances, shared challenges: Finding common ground between urban and rural schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 87(2), 123.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2013). The 2013 Federal Poverty Guidelines. Retrieved from http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/13poverty.cfm.

Van Velsor, P., & Orozco, G. L. (2007). Involving low-income parents in the schools: Communitycentric strategies for school counselors. *Professional School Counseling: American School Counselor Association, 11*(1), 17-24. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=tfh&AN=27264339&site=ehostlive.

Wakefield, M. A., Garner, D. L., Tyler, T., & Pehrsson, D. E. (2010). A Model for analyzing critical cultural domains in counselor development. Retrieved from https://counselingoutfitters.com/vistas/vistas10/Article_72.pdf

Williams, R.Z. (2003). Public relations and advocacy: Promoting the role of the school counselor. Alexandria, VA: American School Counselor Association.

Wolffe, R. (1996). Reducing perservice teachers' negative expectations of urban field experience. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 23(1), 99-106.

Wood, R.E., & Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 361- 384.

Yun, S. H., & Weaver, R. D. (2010). Development and validation of a short form of the attitude toward poverty scale. *Advances in Social Work, 11*(2), 174-187.

Zeichner, K.M. (1996). Educating teachers for cultural diversity. In S. Melnich & M. Gomez (Eds.), *Currents of reform in perservice teacher education* (133-175). New York: Teachers College Press.

Zeichner, K. M. (2003). The adequacies and inadequacies of three current strategies to recruit, prepare, and retain the best teachers for all students. *Teachers College Record*, 105 (3), 490-519.

APPENDIX A

ATTRIBUTIONS OF POVERTY SCALE

Attributions of Poverty Scale
(Bullock, Williams, & Limbert, 2001)

Please rate how important each of these reasons are for explaining why some people are poor in the United States and others are not. Please use the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all important as a cause of poverty.				Extremely important as a cause of poverty.

1. Structuralistic inequalities that don't give all people equal choices……1 2 3 4 5

2. Negative attitudes and anti-work mentality among the poor……...1 2 3 4 5

3. Unfortunate circumstances……...1 2 3 4 5

4. A capitalistic society in which the wealth of some is contingent upon the poverty of others……1 2 3 4 5

5. An unwillingness to work at a competitive level that is necessary to make it in the world 1 2 3 4 5

6. Sickness and disability.....1 2 3 4 5

7. Discrimination against minorities and the poor 1 2 3 4 5

8. A lack of motivation that results from being on public assistance 1 2 3 4 5

9. Not having the right contacts to find jobs.....1 2 3 4 5

10. An economic system that fosters competition over cooperation 1 2 3 4 5

11. Loose morals 1 2 3 4 5

12. Not inheriting money or property from relatives.....1 2 3 4 5

13. Being taken advantage of by the rich.....1 2 3 4 5

14. Lack of drive and perseverance 1 2 3 4 5

15. Being born into poverty 1 2 3 4 5

16. Corporate downsizing and U.S. companies relocating to foreign countries that can pay lower wages 1 2 3 4 5

17. Lack of motivation and laziness 1 2 3 4 5

18. Lack of money 1 2 3 4 5

19. The failure of society to provide good schools. 1 2 3 4 5

20. Being too picky and refusing to take lower paying jobs.....1 2 3 4 5

21. Just plain bad luck.....1 2 3 4 5

22. Low paying jobs with no benefits.....1 2 3 4 5

23. Lack of intelligence.....1 2 3 4 5

24. Lack of transportation. 1 2 3 4 5

25. A federal government which is insensitive to the plight of the poor 1 2 3 4 5

26. Lack of effort among the poor to improve themselves .....1 2 3 4 5.....

27. Being from a family without the resources to financially help at critical points in one's life.....1 2 3 4 5

28. A vicious cycle that perpetuates poor work habits, welfare dependency, laziness, and low self-esteem.....1 2 3 4 5.....

29. High taxes that take money away from the poor 1 2 3 4 5

30. Not having positive role models to teach children about adult drive and ambition 1 2 3 4 5

31. Prejudice and discrimination in the hiring process 1 2 3 4 5

32. A weak safety net that doesn't help people get back on their feet financially (i.e. low welfare benefits) 1 2 3 4 5

33. Lack of childcare.....1 2 3 4 5

34. The ability to save, spend, and manage money wisely 1 2 3 4 5

35. The break-up with families (e.g. increased divorce rate).....1 2 3 4 5

36. Not receiving a high school diploma 1 2 3 4 5

APPENDIX B

ATTITUDES ABOUT POVERTY

Attitudes about Poverty (Yun & Weaver, 2010)

Please select your level of agreement to the following statements using the following scale:
If you strongly agree, please circle SA.
If you agree, please circle A.
If you are neutral on the item, please circle N.
If you disagree, please circle D.
If you strongly disagree, please circle SD.

1. Welfare makes people lazy. SA A N D SD
2. An able-bodied person using food stamps is ripping off the system. SA A N D SD
3. Poor people are dishonest. SA A N D SD
4. People are poor due to circumstances beyond their control. SA A N D SD
5. Society has the responsibility to help poor people. SA A N D SD
6. Unemployed poor people could find jobs if they tried harder. SA A N D SD
7. Poor people are different from the rest of society. SA A N D SD
8. Poor people think they deserve to be supported. SA A N D SD
9. Welfare mothers have babies to get more money. SA A N D SD
10. Children raised on welfare will never amount to anything. SA A N D SD
11. Poor people act differently. SA A N D SD
12. Poor people are discriminated against. SA A N D SD
13. Most poor people are dirty. SA A N D SD

14. People who are poor should not be blamed for their misfortune. SA A N D SD

15. If I were poor, I would accept welfare benefits. SA A N D SD

16. Some "poor" people live better than I do, considering all their benefits. SA A N D SD

17. There is a lot of fraud among welfare recipients. SA A N D SD

18. Benefits for poor people consume a major part of the federal budget. SA A N D SD

19. Poor people generally have lower intelligence than nonpoor people. SA A N D SD

20. I believe poor people have a different set of values than do other people. SA A N D SD

21. I would support a program that resulted in higher taxes to support social programs for poor people. SA A N D SD

APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

Please select the appropriate option for the following questions

1. What is your gender?
____ Female ____ Male

2. What is your age? _____

3. What is your race/ethnicity?
____ White
____ Black or African American
____ American Indian or Alaskan Native
____ Asian
____ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
____ Hispanic or Latino
____ Other Race

4. What State do you currently live in? _____

5. How many credit hours of the school counseling program have you completed?
____ 0-9
____ 10-18
____ 19-28
____ 29-38
____ 39-48
____ 59- 68+

5. What is the socio-economic status of your family of origin? In other words, in which of the following SES do you consider yourself to have been raised?
____ Poverty level or below.
____ Just above the poverty level.
____ Lower middle class.
____ Middle class.
____ Upper middle class.
____ Upper class.

For the following please respond to the open-ended questions

1. When you become a school counselor, do you prefer to work in a Title-I school (high poverty) or a non-Title I school?

2. Discuss why you would prefer this type of school.

3. Discuss why you would prefer not to work at the opposite type of school.

APPENDIX D

SCHOOL COUNSELOR SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale

Below is a list of activities representing many school counselor responsibilities. Indicate your confidence in your current ability to perform each activity by circling the appropriate answer next to each item according to the scale defined below. Please answer each item based on your anticipated (or previous) ability or school(s).

Remember, this is not a test and there are no right answers.

Use the following scale:

1 = not confident,
2 = slightly confident,
3 = moderately confident,
4 = generally confident,
5 = highly confident.

Please circle the number that best represents your response for each item.

1. Advocate for integration of student academic, career, and personal development into the mission of my school.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Recognize situations that impact (both negatively and positively) student learning and achievement.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Analyze data to identify patterns of achievement and behavior that contribute to school success.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Advocate for myself as a professional school counselor and articulate the purposes and goals of school counseling.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Develop measurable outcomes for a school counseling program which would demonstrate accountability.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Consult and collaborate with teachers, staff, administrators and parents to promote student success.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Establish rapport with a student for individual counseling.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Function successfully as a small group leader.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Effectively deliver suitable parts of the school counseling program through large group meetings such as in classrooms.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Conduct interventions with parents, guardians and families in order to resolve problems that impact students' effectiveness and success.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Teach students how to apply time and task management skills.	1	2	3	4	5

12. Foster understanding of the relationship between learning and work.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Offer appropriate explanations to students, parents and teachers of how learning styles affect school performance.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Deliver age-appropriate programs through which students acquire the skills needed to investigate the world of work.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Implement a program which enables all students to make informed career decisions.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Teach students to apply problem-solving skills toward their academic, personal and career success.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Evaluate commercially prepared material designed for school counseling to establish their relevance to my school population.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Model and teach conflict resolution skills.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Ensure a safe environment for all students in my school.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Change situations in which an individual or group treats others in a disrespectful or harassing manner.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Teach students to use effective communication skills with peers, faculty, employers, family, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Follow ethical and legal obligations designed for school counselors.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Guide students in techniques to cope with peer pressure.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Adjust my communication style appropriately to the age and developmental levels of various students.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Incorporate students' developmental stages in establishing and conducting the school counseling program.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I can find some way of connecting and communicating with any student in my school.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Teach, develop and/or support students' coping mechanisms for dealing with crises in their lives – e.g., peer suicide, parent's death, abuse, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Counsel effectively with students and families from different social/economic statuses.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Understand the viewpoints and experiences of students and parents who are from a different cultural background than myself.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Help teachers improve their effectiveness with students.	1	2	3	4	5

31. Discuss issues of sexuality and sexual orientation in an age appropriate manner with students.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Speak in front of large groups such as faculty or parent meetings.	1	2	3	4	5
33. Use technology designed to support student successes and progress through the educational process.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Communicate in writing with staff, parents, and the external community.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Help students identify and attain attitudes, behaviors, and skills which lead to successful learning.	1	2	3	4	5
36. Select and implement applicable strategies to assess school-wide issues.	1	2	3	4	5
37. Promote the use of counseling and guidance activities by the total school community to enhance a positive school climate.	1	2	3	4	5
38. Develop school improvement plans based on interpreting school-wide assessment results.	1	2	3	4	5
39. Identify aptitude, achievement, interest, values, and personality appraisal resources appropriate for specified situations and populations.	1	2	3	4	5
40. Implement a preventive approach to student problems.	1	2	3	4	5
41. Lead school-wide initiatives which focus on ensuring a positive learning environment.	1	2	3	4	5
42. Consult with external community agencies that provide support services for our students.	1	2	3	4	5
43. Provide resources and guidance to school population in times of crisis.	1	2	3	4	5

Bodenhorn, N., & Skaggs, G. (2005). Development of the school counselor self-efficacy scale.

Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 38(1*),* 14-28.

APPENDIX E

INSTITIUATIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

AUBURN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD for RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

RESEARCH PROTOCOL REVIEW FORM

For Information or help contact **THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH COMPLIANCE**, 115 Ramsay Hall, Auburn University
Phone: 334-844-5966 **e-mail:** hsubjec@auburn.edu **Web Address:** http://www.auburn.edu/research/vpr/ohs/

Revised 03.26.11 – DO NOT STAPLE, CLIP TOGETHER ONLY. Save a Copy

1. **PROPOSED START DATE of STUDY:** June13, 2013

PROPOSED REVIEW CATEGORY (Check one): FULL BOARD EXPEDITED ✔ EXEMPT

2. **PROJECT TITLE:** Self-efficacy as it Relates to Attributions and Attitudes toward Poverty Among Pre-service School Counselors

3. Jamie Carney	Professor	SERC	334-844-2885	carneljs@auburn.edu
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR	**TITLE**	**DEPT**	**PHONE**	**AU E-MAIL**

2084 Haley Center, SERC	844-7677	
MAILING ADDRESS	**FAX**	**ALTERNATE E-MAIL**

4. **SOURCE OF FUNDING SUPPORT:** ✔ Not Applicable ☐ Internal ☐ External Agency:_____ ☐ Pending ☐ Received

5. **LIST ANY CONTRACTORS, SUB-CONTRACTORS, OTHER ENTITIES OR IRBs ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PROJECT:**

6. **GENERAL RESEARCH PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS**

6A. Mandatory CITI Training

Names of key personnel who have completed CITI:

Jamie S. Carney ✔
Sarah Kitchens ✔

CITI group completed for this study:
☐ Social/Behavioral ☐ Biomedical

PLEASE ATTACH TO HARD COPY *ALL* CITI CERTIFICATES FOR *EACH* KEY PERSONNEL

6B. Research Methodology

Please check all descriptors that best apply to the research methodology.

Data Source(s): ✔ New Data Existing Data
Will recorded data directly or indirectly identify participants?
☐ Yes ✔ No
Data collection will involve the use of:
☐ Educational Tests (cognitive diagnostic, aptitude, etc.)
Interview / Observation
☐ Physical / Physiological Measures or Specimens (see Section 6D)
✔ Surveys / Questionnaires
Internet / Electronic
Audio / Video / Photos
Private records or files

The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this document for use from: 6/16/13 to 6/15/14
Protocol # 13-223 EX 1306

6C. Participant Information

Please check all descriptors that apply to the participant population.

✔ Males ✔ Females ✔ AU students

Vulnerable Populations

Pregnant Women/Fetuses ☐ Prisoners
☐ Children and/or Adolescents (under age 19 in AL)

Persons with:

☐ Economic Disadvantages ☐ Physical Disabilities
☐ Educational Disadvantages ☐ Intellectual Disabilities

Do you plan to compensate your participants? ☐ Yes ✔ No

6D. Risks to Participants

Please identify all risks that participants might encounter in this research.

☐ Breach of Confidentiality* ☐ Coercion
☐ Deception ☐ Physical
☐ Psychological ☐ Social
✔ None ☐ Other:

*Note that if the investigator is using or accessing confidential or identifiable data, breach of confidentiality is always a risk.

Received JUN 05 2013 Compliance

Do you need IBC Approval for this study? ☐ No ☐ Yes - BUA #_____ **Expiration date** _____

FOR OHSR OFFICE USE ONLY

DATE RECEIVED IN OHSR: 6.5.13 **by** CB
DATE OF IRB REVIEW: 6-16-13 **by** CC
DATE OF IRB APPROVAL: _____ **by** _____
COMMENTS:

PROTOCOL # 13.223 EX 1306
APPROVAL CATEGORY: 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2)
INTERVAL FOR CONTINUING REVIEW: 3 yrs

7. PROJECT ASSURANCES

PROJECT TITLE: Self-Efficacy as it Relates to Attributions and Attitudes toward Poverty Among Pre-Service School Counselors

A. PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR'S ASSSURANCES

1. I certify that all information provided in this application is complete and correct.
2. I understand that, as Principal Investigator, I have ultimate responsibility for the conduct of this study, the ethical performance this project, the protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects, and strict adherence to any stipulations imposed by the Auburn University IRB.
3. I certify that all individuals involved with the conduct of this project are qualified to carry out their specified roles and responsibilities and are in compliance with Auburn University policies regarding the collection and analysis of the research data.
4. I agree to comply with all Auburn policies and procedures, as well as with all applicable federal, state, and local laws regarding the protection of human subjects, including, but not limited to the following:
   a. Conducting the project by qualified personnel according to the approved protocol
   b. Implementing no changes in the approved protocol or consent form without prior approval from the Office of Human Subjects Research
   c. Obtaining the legally effective informed consent from each participant or their legally responsible representative prior to their participation in this project using only the currently approved, stamped consent form
   d. Promptly reporting significant adverse events and/or effects to the Office of Human Subjects Research in writing within 5 working days of the occurrence.
5. If I will be unavailable to direct this research personally, I will arrange for a co-investigator to assume direct responsibility in my absence. This person has been named as co-investigator in this application, or I will advise OHSR, by letter, in advance of such arrangements.
6. I agree to conduct this study only during the period approved by the Auburn University IRB.
7. I will prepare and submit a renewal request and supply all supporting documents to the Office of Human Subjects Research before the approval period has expired if it is necessary to continue the research project beyond the time period approved by the Auburn University IRB.
8. I will prepare and submit a final report upon completion of this research project.

My signature indicates that I have read, understand and agree to conduct this research project in accordance with the assurances listed above.

Jamie S. Carney		May 22, 2013
Printed name of Principal Investigator	**Principal Investigator's Signature (SIGN IN BLUE INK ONLY)**	**Date**

B. FACULTY ADVISOR/SPONSOR'S ASSURANCES

1. By my signature as faculty advisor/sponsor on this research application, I certify that the student or guest investigator is knowledgeable about the regulations and policies governing research with human subjects and has sufficient training and experience to conduct this particular study in accord with the approved protocol.
2. I certify that the project will be performed by qualified personnel according to the approved protocol using conventional or experimental methodology.
3. I agree to meet with the investigator on a regular basis to monitor study progress.
4. Should problems arise during the course of the study, I agree to be available, personally, to supervise the investigator in solving them.
5. I assure that the investigator will promptly report significant adverse events and/or effects to the OHSR in writing within 5 working days of the occurrence.
6. If I will be unavailable, I will arrange for an alternate faculty sponsor to assume responsibility during my absence, and I will advise the OHSR by letter of such arrangements. If the investigator is unable to fulfill requirements for submission of renewals, modifications or the final report, I will assume that responsibility.
7. I have read the protocol submitted for this project for content, clarity, and methodology

Printed name of Faculty Advisor / Sponsor	**Signature (SIGN IN BLUE INK ONLY)**	**Date**

C. DEPARTMENT HEAD'S ASSSURANCE

By my signature as department head, I certify that I will cooperate with the administration in the application and enforcement of all Auburn University policies and procedures, as well as all applicable federal, state, and local laws regarding the protection and ethical treatment of human participants by researchers in my department.

Everett Martin	Nancy Evans	May 22, 2013
Printed name of Department Head	**Signature (SIGN IN BLUE INK ONLY)**	**Date**

Signature Authority for Dr. E. Davis Martin, Jr.

8. **PROJECT OVERVIEW: Prepare an abstract that includes:**
(400 word maximum, in language understandable to someone who is not familiar with your area of study):

I.) A summary of relevant research findings leading to this research proposal:
(Cite sources; include a "Reference List" as Appendix A.)
II.) A brief description of the methodology,
III.) Expected and/or possible outcomes, and,
IV.) A statement regarding the potential significance of this research project.

I. Poverty is a growing epidemic in the United States. Currently there are 46.2 million people living in poverty in America (DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, & Smith, 2012). Children make up 24 percent of the total population and represent 34 percent of all individuals living in poverty (Addy & Wight, 2012). At the beginning of the century, more than 12 million American children lived in poverty; as of 2010 this number has increased to 15.7 million (Macartney, 2011). These numbers serve to highlight the reality that many educators, counselors and other professionals will be working with students and families dealing with poverty (Alaimo, Olsen & Frongillo, Jr., 2001). However, there is a paucity of research examining these attitudes among pre-service school counselors. Due to the limited research in the counseling literature that addresses the issues of working with low-income students and families, there is a need to gain further information on the issue of socia class.

II. The purpose of this study is to examine the attitudes, attributions and self-efficacy of pre-service school counseling graduate students' attitudes toward persons living in poverty. This will include how these variables relate to each other, with specific consideration of school counselor self-efficacy as it relates to attributions and attitudes towards persons living in poverty. This study proposes to include graduate students in school counseling programs. The methodology will include using survey measures to measure the identified variables Group comparisons will include comparisons across the demographic variables of gender, age, and socioeconomic background.

III. This study may provide some context for examining the variables that contribute to attitudes concerning persons living in poverty, with specific consideration of how individual's beliefs about social justice and equality contribute to these attitudes. This can contribute to the body of knowledge on the culture of poverty. In addition, the study will provide some base knowledge about the attitudes of pre-service school counselors.

IV. This research has the potential of contributing to the growing body of research on attitudes toward persons living in poverty. This includes consideration of the variables that contribute to these attitudes and the maintenance of these attitudes. This research also has the potential of contributing to programs that prepare professionals, primarily school counseling programs, potentially increasing awareness and knowledge about attitudes toward persons living in poverty among pre-service professionals in these areas.

9. **PURPOSE.**
a. Clearly state all of the objectives, goals, or aims of this project.

The purpose of this study is to examine the attitudes of pre-service school counseling students' attitudes towards persons living in poverty. The primary goal is to determine how the variables of: attitudes toward persons living in poverty (lower socioeconomic status), attributions toward poverty, and school counselor self-efficacy. This will include consideration of how school counselors' self-efficacy; school counseling skill and practice perceived competency, relates to attitudes and attributions toward persons living in poverty or lower socioeconomic status.
This will allow for a global investigation of attitudes toward persons living in poverty with specific comparisons of comparisons across demographic data (i.e., gender, age, socioeconomic backgrounds).

b. How will the results of this project be used? (e.g., Presentation? Publication? Thesis? Dissertation?)

The results from this study may be disseminated thru presentations and publications.

10a. **KEY PERSONNEL.** Describe responsibilities. Include information on research training or certifications related to this project. **CITI is required. Be as specific as possible.** (Attach extra page if needed.) *All non AU-affiliated key personnel must attach **CITI certificates of completion.***

Principle Investigator Sarah Kitchens **Title:** _____ **E-mail address** seo0003@auburn.edu
Dept / Affiliation: SERC/ Counselor Education

Roles / Responsibilities:

Individual: Sarah Kitchens **Title:** PhD Student **E-mail address** seo0003@auburn.edu
Dept / Affiliation: SERC/ Counselor Education

Roles / Responsibilities:

Individual: _____ **Title:** _____ **E-mail address** _____
Dept / Affiliation: _____

Roles / Responsibilities:

Individual: _____ **Title:** _____ **E-mail address** _____
Dept / Affiliation: _____

Roles / Responsibilities:

Individual: _____ **Title:** _____ **E-mail address** _____
Dept / Affiliation: _____

Roles / Responsibilities:

Individual: _____ **Title:** _____ **E-mail address** _____
Dept / Affiliation: _____

Roles / Responsibilities:

11. **LOCATION OF RESEARCH. List all locations where data collection will take place.** (School systems, organizations, businesses, buildings and room numbers, servers for web surveys, etc.) **Be as specific as possible. Attach permission letters in Appendix E.**
(See sample letters at http://www.auburn.edu/research/vpr/ohs/sample.htm)

Students will be recruited from courses in the Special Education, Rehabilitation and Counseling Department in the College of Education at Auburn University and the School Counseling Program in the College of Education at Liberty University.

12. PARTICIPANTS.

a. Describe the participant population you have chosen for this project.

Check here if there is existing data; describe the population from whom data was collected & include the # of data files.

The participant population used for recruitment in this study will be gathered from graduate students enrolled in courses in the Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling Department in the College of Education at Auburn University and graduate students enrolled in courses in the School Counseling Program in the College of Education at Liberty University. Faculty permission to recruit from courses has been obtained. This will include only participants who are 19 yrs. or older.

b. Describe why is this participant population is appropriate for inclusion in this research project. (Include criteria for selection.)

This study proposes to examine attitudes and attributions towards persons living in poverty among graduate students. A secondary goal is to examine these attitudes and attributions as they relate to self-efficacy.

c. Describe, step-by-step, all procedures you will use to recruit participants. *Include in Appendix B a copy of all e-mails, flyers, advertisements, recruiting scripts, invitations, etc., that will be used to invite people to participate.*
(See sample documents at http://www.auburn.edu/research/vpr/ohs/sample.htm.)

Students will be recruited from courses in the Special Education, Rehabilitation and Counseling Department in the College of Education at Auburn University and the School Counseling Program in the College of Education at Liberty University. Consent from faculty members teaching identified courses have been obtained. The identified courses address issues related to training on counseling rela skills. Faculty who have provided consent to participate have identified that the focus of this study is related to their course and course content. The Principal Investigator teaches in the SERC department and will not be collecting data in any course for which she is serving as an instructor or supervising students (e.g., internship).
At Liberty, data collection will include in class data collection when approved, and data collection online for courses that do not have the opportunity to do in class collection (distance education course
In courses where consent has been approved the instructor has agreed to allow one of the following:
1. The investigators involved in data collection (not principal investigator) to come in at the end of class (last 25 minutes). Course instructors will not be present to prevent coercion. Investigators will tell potential participants that they are being asked to participate in a study, that participation will take 15-20 minutes, that participation is not linked to their current class and is volunta Survey packets will be disseminated & potential participants will be asked to review the informational letter (Appendix B) and if they choose to participate they can complete the provided surveys and return the surveys in the provided envelope. Those choosing not participate can return the surveys, not completed, in the provided envelope.
2. In classes that are distance education the survey will be emailed out to all class members via Survey Monkey. The email will tell potential participants that they are being asked to partici In a study, that participation will take 15-20 minutes, participation is not linked to their current class and is voluntary. Potential participants will be asked to review the informational letter (Appendix B) the beginning of the survey and if they choose to participate they can complete the provided survey. Those choosing not participate can delete the email.

What is the minimum number of participants you need to validate the study? 45 X 500

Is there a limit on the number of participants you will recruit? ☐ No ☒ Yes – the number is 500

Is there a limit on the number of participants you will include in the study? ☐ No ☐ Yes – the number is _____

No Compensation

d. Describe the type, amount and method of compensation and/or incentives for participants.
(If no compensation will be given, check here .)

Select the type of compensation: ___ Monetary ___ Incentives
___ Raffle or Drawing incentive (Include the chances of winning.)
___ Extra Credit (State the value)
___ Other

Description:

13. PROJECT DESIGN & METHODS.

a. Describe, step-by-step, all procedures and methods that will be used to consent participants.
(☐ Check here if this is "not applicable"; you are using existing data.)

Students from the identified courses in SERC and at Liberty will be recruited during the end of their course sessions (last 25 minutes). Consent from faculty instructing these courses has been obtained. Students in the distance education courses will be mailed the informational letter and link to the study.
2. During recruitment the investigators will tell potential participants that they are being asked to participate in a study, that participation will take about 15-20 minutes, that participation is not linked to their current class and is voluntary. The instructor of the participating course will be asked to leave the room during data collection to not create coercion.
3. Survey packets will be disseminated and potential participants will be asked to review the informational letter and if they choose to participate they can complete the provided surveys and return the surveys in the provided envelope. Those choosing not to participate can return the surveys, not completed, in the provided envelope. In the distance education classes students will be provided the informational letter and link to the survey measures. Students choosing to complete the survey after reviewing the informational consent letter will be provided a link to the survey measures.
4. The survey packets will include the informational letter, a demographic measure, and three survey measures: Attitudes toward Poverty (Yun & Weaver, 2010), Attributions of Poverty Scale (Bullock, Williams, & Limbert, 2001), and School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (Bondenhorn & Scaggs, 2005). Survey measures will be randomly ordered so not to create a presentation bias.
5. In class participants will be able to return the surveys (completed or not completed) in a provided envelope. A box will be provided to allow the potential participants to return their surveys in the provided box. Distance education students who choose to participate will simply complete and submit their responses online.
6. All data will be analyzed in an aggregate manner. This data is anonymous and no identifying data will be collected.
All participants will be provided an informational consent document that will specify that participation is voluntary and is not linked to their current course or status in their program. Participants will be told that they can choose to participate by returning the surveys (in the survey packet) completed in the provided envelope or completing the survey in email form. Students will also be told that if they choose not to participate they can simply return the survey forms, not completed, in the provided envelope or delete the email. Course instructors will be asked to leave the room during data collection to not create coercion to participate.

b. Describe the procedures you will use in order to address your purpose. Provide a step-by-step description of how you will carry out this research project. Include specific information about the participants' time and effort commitment. (*NOTE: Use language that would be understandable to someone who is not familiar with your area of study. Without a complete description of all procedures, the Auburn University IRB will not be able to review this protocol. If additional space is needed for this section, save the information as a .PDF file and insert after page 6 of this form.*)

1. Students from the identified courses in SERC and at Liberty will be recruited during the end of their course sessions (last 25 minutes). Consent from faculty instructing these courses has been obtained. Students in the distance education courses will be mailed the informational letter and link to the study.
2. During recruitment the investigators will tell potential participants that they are being asked to participate in a study, that participation will take about 15-20 minutes, that participation is not linked to their current class and is voluntary. The instructor of the participating course will be asked to leave the room during data collection to not create coercion.
3. Survey packets will be disseminated and potential participants will be asked to review the informational letter and if they choose to participate they can complete the provided surveys and return the surveys in the provided envelope. Those choosing not to participate can return the surveys, not completed, in the provided envelope. In the distance education classes students will be provided the informational letter and link to the survey measures. Students choosing to complete the survey after reviewing the informational consent letter will be provided a link to the survey measures.
4. The survey packets will include the informational letter, a demographic measure, and three survey measures: Attitudes toward Poverty (Yun & Weaver, 2010), Attributions of Poverty Scale (Bullock, Williams, & Limbert, 2001), and School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (Bondenhorn & Scaggs, 2005). Survey measures will be randomly ordered so not to create a presentation bias.
5. In class participants will be able to return the surveys (completed or not completed) in a provided envelope. A box will be provided to allow the potential participants to return their surveys in the provided box. Distance education students who choose to participate will simply complete and submit their responses online.
6. All data will be analyzed in an aggregate manner. This data is anonymous and no identifying data will be collected.

13c. List all data collection instruments used in this project, in the order they appear in Appendix C.
(e.g., surveys and questionnaires in the format that will be presented to participants, educational tests, data collection sheets, interview questions, audio/video taping methods etc.)

1. Demographic Questionnaire: This measure developed by the investigators simply present questions pertaining to age, major, gender, family socioeconomic background, and race/cultural identity. There are also two open-ended reflection questions about poverty.
2. Attributions of Poverty Scale (Bullock, Williams, & Limbert, 2001): This 36-item scale measures attributions and beliefs about poverty and presents with 3 factors; individualistic, structuralistic, and fatalistic.
3. Attitudes toward Poverty (Yun & Weaver, 2010): This 21-item measures degree of agreement with statements about poverty and persons who are livir in poverty.
4. School Counselor Self Efficacy (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005): This 43-item measures the school counselors confidence to perform activities in a school setting.

d. Data analysis: Explain how the data will be analyzed.

All data will be entered and analyzed in an aggregate manner. Multiple regression will be used to assess the relationship across variables. While comparisons will be made across demographic data the data will not be collected nor analyzed in a manner that would allow for the identification of individual participants.

14. RISKS & DISCOMFORTS: List and describe all of the risks that participants might encounter in this research. ***If you are using deception in this study, please justify the use of deception and be sure to attach a copy of the debriefing form you plan to use in Appendix D.*** *(Examples of possible risks are in section #6D on page 1.)*

There will be no risks or discomforts in this research.

15. **PRECAUTIONS.** Identify and describe all precautions you have taken to eliminate or reduce risks as listed in #14. If the participants can be classified as a "vulnerable" population, please describe additional safeguards that you will use to assure the ethical treatment of these individuals. ***Provide a copy of any emergency plans/procedures and medical referral lists in Appendix D.***

If using the Internet to collect data, what confidentiality or security precautions are in place to protect (or not collect) identifiable data? Include protections used during both the collection and transfer of data.
(These are likely listed on the server's website.)

The results of the survey will be anonymous; no personal identifying information will be requested. SurveyMonkey, the survey hosting service, encrypts answers and will not enable cookies on your computer's hard drive. Responses will be combined with other responses and reported in a group format.

16. **BENEFITS.**
    a. **List all realistic direct benefits participants can expect by participating in this specific study.**
    (Do not include "compensation" listed in #12d.) Check here if there are no direct benefits to participants.

    There may be no direct benefits for the participants.

    b. **List all realistic benefits for the general population that may be generated from this study.**

    This study potentially can contribute to a greater understanding of attitudes toward persons living in poverty. This can include understanding the variables that contribute to these attitudes and the status of these attitudes and attributions among pre-service school counselors. In addition, the study may expand our understanding of these attitudes among pre-service professionals in counseling, thus potentially contributing to pedagogical and practice training.

17. PROTECTION OF DATA.

a. **Will data be collected as anonymous?** ☒ Yes ☐ No *If "YES", skip to part "g".*
("Anonymous" means that you will not collect any identifiable data.)

b. **Will data be collected as confidential?** ☐ Yes ☐ No
("Confidential" means that you will collect and protect identifiable data.)

c. **If data are collected as confidential, will the participants' data be coded or linked to identifying information?**
■ **Yes** (If so, describe how linked.) **No** ■

d. **Justify your need to code participants' data or link the data with identifying information.**

e. **Where will code lists be stored?** (Building, room number?)

f. **Will data collected as "confidential" be recorded and analyzed as "anonymous"?** ☐ Yes ☐ No
(If you will maintain identifiable data, protections should have been described in #15.)

g. **Describe how and where the data will be stored (e.g., hard copy, audio cassette, electronic data, etc.), and how the location where data is stored will be secured in your absence. For electronic data, describe security. If applicable, state specifically where any IRB-approved and participant-signed consent documents will be kept on campus for 3 years after the study ends.**

All data is anonymous and no individual participant can be identified. Surveys will be kept in the office of the Principal Investigator (2016 Haley) in a locked file cabinet. Once all data has been entered the data will be maintained electronically on the computer of the Principal Investigator. The surveys will be shredded once data has been entered.

h. **Who will have access to participants' data?**
(*The faculty advisor should have full access and be able to produce the data in the case of a federal or institutional audit.*)
Dr. Jamie Carney & Sarah Kitchens

i. **When is the latest date that confidential data will be retained?** (Check here if only anonymous data will be retained. X)
May 1, 2014

j. **How will the confidential data be destroyed?** (*NOTE: Data recorded and analyzed as "anonymous" may be retained indefinitely.)*
There is no confidential data.

PROTOCOL REVIEW CHECKLIST

All protocols must include the following items:

1. Research Protocol Review Form (All signatures included and all sections completed)

(Examples of appended documents are found on the OHSR website: http://www.auburn.edu/research/vpr/ohs/sample.htm)

2. **Consent Form or Information Letter** and any Releases (audio, video or photo) that the participant will sign.

3. **Appendix A**, "Reference List"

4. **Appendix B** if e-mails, flyers, advertisements, generalized announcements or scripts, etc., are used to recruit participants.

5. **Appendix C** if data collection sheets, surveys, tests, other recording instruments, interview scripts, etc. will be used for data collection. Be sure to attach them in the order in which they are listed in # 13c.

6. **Appendix D** if you will be using a debriefing form or include emergency plans/procedures and medical referral lists (A referral list may be attached to the consent document).

7. **Appendix E** if research is being conducted at sites other than Auburn University or in cooperation with other entities. A **permission letter** from the site / program director must be included indicating their cooperation or involvement in the project. NOTE: If the proposed research is a multi-site project, involving investigators or participants at other academic institutions, hospitals or private research organizations, a letter of **IRB approval** from each entity is required prior to initiating the project.

8. **Appendix F** - Written evidence of acceptance by the host country if research is conducted outside the United States.

FOR FULL BOARD REVIEW, NUMBER ALL PAGES, INCLUDING APPENDICES

APPENDIX F

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

AUBURN
UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF
SPECIAL EDUCATION,
REHABILITATION, AND COUNSELING

(NOTE: DO NOT AGREE TO PARTICIPATE UNLESS IRB APPROVAL

INFORMATION WITH CURRENT DATES HAS BEEN ADDED TO THIS DOCUMENT.)

INFORMATION LETTER

for a Research Study entitled

Self- Efficacy as it Relates to Attributions and Attitudes towards Poverty Among Pre-Service School Counselors

You are invited to participate in a research study to examine attitudes and beliefs about poverty.
The study is being conducted by Dr. Jamie Carney & Sarah Kitchens in the Auburn University Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling. You were selected as a possible participant because you are a graduate student in school counseling and are age 19 or older.

If you decide to participate in this research study, you will be asked to complete a series of surveys and a demographic measure. Your total time commitment will be approximately 20 minutes.
There are no risks associated with participation in this study.

Your participation in this study is totally voluntary. If you choose to participate you will be asked to complete the measures in an online survey. Completing and submitting the survey will indicate your consent to participate. The total time for your participation will be approximately 20 minutes. Once submitted online you will be unable to withdraw from the study because survey results are not individually identifiable. Your decision about whether or not to participate will not jeopardize your future relations with Auburn University, and the Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Counseling.

If you have questions about this study, *please ask them now or* contact Dr. Jamie Carney at 334-844-2885 or carnejs@auburn.edu or Sarah Kitchens at 334-844-7676 or seo0003@auburn.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Human Subjects Research or the Institutional Review Board by phone (334)-844-5966 or e-mail at hsubjec@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu.

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED, YOU MUST DECIDE IF YOU WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT. IF YOU DECIDE TO PARTICIPATE, PLEASE CLICK ON THE LINK BELOW.

YOU MAY PRINT A COPY OF THIS LETTER TO KEEP.

Dr. Jamie Carney, Investigator *Sarah Kitchens*, Co-Investigator June 18, 2013

The Auburn University Institutional Review Board has approved this document for use from June 16, 2013 to June 15, 2016. Protocol #13-223 EX 1306.

2084 Haley Center, Auburn, AL 36849-5222; Telephone: 334-844-7676; Fax: 334-844-7677
www.auburn.edu/serc

APPENDIX G

CONSENT TO USE SCSE

DELETE REPLY REPLY ALL FORWARD

mark as unread

Bodenhorn, Nancy <nanboden@exchange.vt.edu>
Tue 6/11/2013 12:17 PM

To: Sarah Kitchens;

- You forwarded this message on 6/11/2013 2:23 PM.

2 attachments

Hi Sarah, you have my permission to use the SCSE in your dissertation study if it continues to meet your needs.
I have attached two versions of the scale – the one labeled "with factors" is for your use to identify which items go with each factor, and the other one is what should be used with the participants.

Good luck with the study – it sounds interesting!
Nancy

Nancy Bodenhorn
Associate Director, Office of Academic Programs
School of Education
Virginia Tech

From: Sarah Kitchens [mailto:seo0003@tigermail.auburn.edu]
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2013 3:52 PM