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Abstract

The purpose of this article is to better understand the role of multicultural self-efficacy in school counselors’ development. To achieve this goal, a review of multicultural self-efficacy is broken into three subsections: (a) school counselor multicultural competency training, (b) school counselor self-efficacy, and (c) school counselor multicultural self-efficacy. After the review of each subsection, the author concludes with implications for school counselor educators, school counselors-in-training, and school counselors.

Keywords: school counselor, multicultural training, self-efficacy

Research in the area of multicultural competency training has grown substantially in the last decade. Liu et al. (2004) and Pope-Davis, Reynolds, Dings, and Nielson (1995) noted that much of the research on multicultural competency training has focused mostly on race and gender. In addition to research on multicultural competency training, research in the area of self-efficacy has expanded significantly over the last 40 years. Larson and Daniels (1998) noted that much of the research on self-efficacy has focused on counselor performance and training interventions. Research on multicultural competency is important in understanding school counselors’ competence and ability to perform multicultural related tasks, but it is equally important to understand their self-efficacy about accomplishing such multicultural tasks (Crook, 2010). As the United States becomes more culturally and economically diverse, the need to understand school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy becomes imperative (Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines, & Johnston, 2008).
The American School Counselor Association (ASCA; 2010) Ethical Standards for School Counselors requires school counselors to possess multicultural competency to address various cultural and developmental issues as they relate to and affect the school counselor, students, and all stakeholders. School counselors should create a learning environment that positively supports all students (ASCA, 2011). Moreover, ASCA (2011) noted the importance of school counselors working to address systemic inequities within schools. The Education Trust (2009) believes that school counselors, in conjunction with other school faculty, parents, and community members, can help to improve the quality of education and close the achievement gap.

The ASCA National Model (2012) expects school counselors to be competent in advocacy and systemic change to close the achievement gap. The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP; 2009, 2016) requires school counselors to be competent in addressing multicultural issues upon graduation. Similar to CACREP (2009, 2016) standards, Counselors for Social Justice (2011) called for the development of a curriculum to train counselors about the achievement gap as well as interventions and advocacy strategies to address the issue within schools and communities.

The author expects to address three questions related to school counselor development: (a) What aspects of multicultural competence training are helpful for school counselors?, (b) How does self-efficacy change over the course of development in school counselors?, and (c) In what ways does multicultural self-efficacy relate to school counselors’ ability to perform school counseling tasks?

To understand better about school counselor multicultural self-efficacy, the author will focus on previous literature on (a) school counselor multicultural competency training, (b) school counselor self-efficacy, and (c) school counselor multicultural self-efficacy. The purpose for each subsection is to understand what aspects are significant for training and experience purposes. Reviewing each subsection will provide a foundational understanding of the research topics. Understanding the literature associated with school counselor multicultural self-efficacy will aid school counselor educators in providing significant training and practica experiences to school counselors-in-training.

**School Counselor Multicultural Competency Training**

Multicultural competency consists of a counselor’s knowledge, beliefs and attitudes, and skills necessary to work effectively with diverse clients (Sue et al., 1982). Sue, Arrendondo, and McDavis (1992) added that the multicultural competencies of knowledge, beliefs and attitudes, and skills fall within three domains: (a) counselor’s awareness, (b) client’s worldview, and (c) culturally appropriate counseling interventions and techniques. In other words, multiculturally competent counselors will possess knowledge, beliefs and attitudes, and skills about their awareness of self, about the client’s worldview, and about effective culturally appropriate interventions and techniques that embrace the client’s worldview.

Holcomb-McCoy and Myers (1999) used Sue et al.’s (1982) and Sue et al.’s (1992) competencies as foundations in developing a survey of multicultural competencies and found five competency factors. Holcomb-McCoy and Myers surveyed 151 ACA members to determine multicultural competencies of their five factors (i.e., multicultural
knowledge, awareness, definitions, racial identity development, and skills). They found that counselors perceived themselves to be most competent with multicultural definitions and multicultural awareness and least competent with racial identity and multicultural knowledge. There was no significant difference between the CACREP and non-CACREP accredited counseling programs in terms of perceived multicultural competencies. Finally, Holcomb-McCoy and Myers found ethnicity to be the only significant demographic to influence multicultural knowledge, awareness, racial identity, and skills. This finding would suggest that ethnically diverse counselors perceived their multicultural competency to be highest when working with diverse clients.

In 2004, Holcomb-McCoy and Day-Vines built upon Holcomb-McCoy and Myers’ (1999) work with counselors’ multicultural competence and examined the multicultural competencies of school counselors. They surveyed 209 ASCA members and found school counselors’ multicultural competencies to be multidimensional. They reported three factors for school counselors’ multicultural competencies: (a) multicultural terminology, (b) multicultural knowledge, and (c) multicultural awareness. Holcomb-McCoy and Day-Vines’ (2004) findings were consistent with two out of three multicultural competencies purposed by Sue et al. (1982) with multicultural terminology replacing multicultural skills. Holcomb-McCoy (2004) developed a multicultural competencies checklist that consisted of 51 competencies in seven domains. Holcomb-McCoy noted that the seven domains of (a) multicultural counseling, (b) multicultural consultation, (c) understanding racism and student resistance, (d) understanding racial and/or ethnic identity development, (e) multicultural assessment, (f) multicultural family counseling, and (g) social advocacy help school counselors to provide the best services to students, families, schools, and communities.

Holcomb-McCoy (2005) found that multicultural competency training improved school counselors’ multicultural awareness and terminology, but did not necessarily increase their multicultural knowledge. These findings supported Holcomb-McCoy’s (2001) earlier work that found elementary school counselors self-reported their multicultural training improved their multicultural awareness and terminology, but did not improve their multicultural knowledge. Holcomb-McCoy’s (2001, 2005) findings contradict Constantine et al.’s (2001) findings, which suggested that multicultural competency training significantly and positively predicted multicultural knowledge.

Packer-Williams, Jay, and Evans (2010) found that a little less than half (47%) of school counselors decided to integrate multicultural considerations into their school counselor programs because of their unique student body makeup. Furthermore, they found that multicultural competency training increased school counselors’ self-reported multicultural awareness and knowledge, findings which were inconsistent with Holcomb-McCoy (2001, 2005), Constantine et al. (2001), and Constantine and Yeh (2001), because they all found multicultural competency training to improve a different factor of multicultural competency training proposed by Holcomb-McCoy and Day-Vines (2004).

Cartwright, Daniels, and Zhang (2008) surveyed 31 graduate students in a counseling training program that infused multicultural competency training into all curriculum courses. The students self-reported their perceived multicultural competence and then assessed a videotaped counseling session for multicultural demonstrations (i.e., multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills). Cartwright et al. found a significant difference between the students’ perceived multicultural competence and their observed
multicultural competence in which students self-reported higher multicultural competence than the researcher observed.

Understanding students’ multicultural competence development is important to help them develop as professionals. Cates and Schaeffle (2009) compared multicultural competency (i.e., multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills) of 24 practicum students against 23 introduction to counseling students. Using a pre- and post-test of students in the two cohort groups, they found a significant difference between the groups with practicum students gaining more perceived multicultural competence than did introduction to counseling students. Students in a practicum course infused with multicultural competency training did experience a significant within-group increase in their perceived multicultural competencies as well. Moreover, they found no significant difference between practicum students and introduction to counseling students on their multicultural skills competence. Pope-Davis et al. (1995) noted that students’ self-reported multicultural competency increased as they gained more experience with diverse clients.

In summary, the findings of multicultural competency factors are inconsistent. Several studies found that multicultural training improves multicultural terminology and awareness, but does not increase multicultural knowledge (Holcomb-McCoy, 2001, 2005). However, some research has found that multicultural competency training improves multicultural awareness and knowledge (Constantine et al., 2001; Packer-Williams, Jay, & Evans, 2010). A few studies examined the relationship between multicultural competency training and specific multicultural groups. Of the research on multicultural competency training of specific multicultural groups, the findings suggest that the more multicultural competency training school counselors possess, the more likely they are to self-report higher levels of multicultural competence (Constantine, 2002). These findings are encouraging because of the tendency of counselors to self-report high on multicultural competencies in a socially desirable way (Sodowsky, Kuo-Jackson, Richardson, & Corey, 1998). School counselor educators can help to improve multicultural competency by infusing multicultural competency training into counseling and practicum courses (Cartwright et al., 2008) and during supervision sessions (Constantine & Yeh, 2001). In addition, school counselor educators can increase multicultural competency through requiring students to practice with diverse clients during practica (Cartwright et al., 2008). Understanding multicultural competency is important for school counselor development. Furthermore, understanding one’s sense of self-efficacy is also important to consider in relation to how it changes over the course of a school counselor’s development.

**School Counselor Self-Efficacy**

Bandura (1977) defined self-efficacy as “the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce the outcomes” (p. 193). In other words, Bandura believed self-efficacy related to one’s belief in her/his capacity to complete a desired task. Self-efficacy influences one’s thoughts, motivations, actions, affects, and the selection of her/his environment (Bandura, 1982). Therefore, self-efficacy might influence counselors in a way that limits their ability to function effectively in a counseling relationship.
Larson and Daniels (1998) defined counselor self-efficacy as “a counselor’s beliefs or judgments about his or her capacities to effectively counsel a client in the near future” (p. 180). Counselor self-efficacy related to two variables: counselor performance and counselor perspective. Larson and Daniels’ review of self-efficacy literature found that counselors’ self-reported levels of experience and supervision supports influenced their perceived counseling self-efficacy. In other words, counselors and counselors-in-training with no previous experience and no supervision reported having lower levels of counselor self-efficacy. These findings would suggest that self-efficacy is a significant attribute to counselors’ success in working with clients. Counselors who believe they are capable of completing a counseling session might be more likely to finish counseling programs and contribute to the success of their clients.

As counselors gain more experience conducting counseling sessions, their sense of self-efficacy increases (Larson & Daniels, 1998). Larson and Daniels (1998) noted that self-efficacy could increase through modeling, visual imagery, and role-plays. Similar to increasing counselor self-efficacy, counselor performance could increase through modeling, visual imagery, and role-plays. In other words, the more exposure novice counselors and counselors-in-training get to counseling sessions, the greater likelihood their counselor self-efficacy and counselor performance will increase. Larson et al. (1992) noted three factors significantly influenced counselor self-efficacy: (a) previous counseling degrees, (b) years of counseling experience, and (c) semesters/years of supervision.

Holcomb-McCoy, Gonzalez, and Johnston (2009) furthered the definition of self-efficacy to relate specifically to school counselors: “School counselor self-efficacy is a more specific conceptualization of self-efficacy that reflects a counselor’s perceived ability to carry out school counseling-related tasks” (p. 344).

Since its creation in 2003, the ASCA National Model has helped to change the profession of school counseling (ASCA, 2012). The school counseling profession has transformed drastically over the last decade (Erford, 2011). Erford (2011) noted that the transformation of the school counseling profession focused on closing the achievement gap through academic, career, and person/social development of all students. Bodenhorn and Skaggs (2005) noted that the redefining of the school counseling profession has limited school counselor educators’ opportunity to develop the field of school counselor self-efficacy.

Sutton and Fall (1995) surveyed the relationship between school climate and school counselors’ self-efficacy. They surveyed 316 elementary, middle, and high school counselors using the Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale and School Climate Scale. Sutton and Fall concluded that the school climate might influence school counselors’ self-efficacy. Much like Daniels and Larson’s (2001) findings about supervisory feedback, Sutton and Fall found that positive school climates increase school counselor self-efficacy and negative school climates decrease school counselor self-efficacy. In addition, they found that collegial support was the strongest predictor of school counselor self-efficacy, with administrative support being the most significant. Finally, school counselors who participated in duties and roles outside of their training reported a lower sense of self-efficacy.
Training

Johnson, Baker, Kopala, Kiselica, and Thompson (1989) found that self-efficacy increases in pre-practicum counselors-in-training. They conducted an experiment with four pre-practicum groups to understand if participating in counseling helps increase counselor self-efficacy. They had participants complete a self-efficacy pre-test to determine groups: low self-efficacy with no counseling, high self-efficacy with no counseling, low self-efficacy with counseling, and high self-efficacy with counseling. After 4 weeks of counseling, Johnson et al. found that the low self-efficacy groups (i.e., with and without counseling) showed increased scores of self-reported self-efficacy. They found, however, that the counseling groups (i.e., low self-efficacy with counseling and high self-efficacy with counseling) did not show significant difference in their self-reported self-efficacy than the no counseling groups (i.e., low self-efficacy without counseling and high self-efficacy without counseling). These findings seem to contradict Larson and Daniel’s (1998) findings that suggested modeling would increase counselor self-efficacy. Johnson et al. noted that counselors-in-training come into counseling training programs with differences in their level of counseling self-efficacy.

Much like Johnson et al.’s (1989) findings, Sipps, Sugden, and Favier (1988) found that training level contributed significantly to perceived self-efficacy in counselors-in-training. Sipps et al. assessed the relationship between counselors-in-training’s ability to respond to clients and their self-efficacy. They had 78 counseling students watch a videotaped counseling session while completing a response category sheet (see Hill, 1978 for categories) then completed a self-efficacy questionnaire. Sipps et al. found that counselors-in-training possessed greater self-efficacy when using basic counseling skills with a client and less self-efficacy when intending to bring about change within a client. These findings are similar to other research that suggested exposure increases counselor self-efficacy.

Experience

The differences in self-reported counselor self-efficacy are consistent in Larson et al.’s (1999) findings. Larson et al. evaluated counselor self-efficacy in pre-practicum students using videotapes and role-plays. They broke 67 counseling students into two groups: 37 watched a video of a counseling session and 30 participated in a role-play counseling session. After the intervention, Larson et al. had participants complete the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory. For the role-play group, they found participants’ self-reported self-efficacy changed depending on their perception of the session. In other words, the counseling students who perceived their session outcome as a poor performance self-reported lower levels of counselor self-efficacy. On the other hand, counselors-in-training who perceived their session outcome as a good performance self-reported higher levels of counselor self-efficacy. In addition, Larson et al. found a modest increase in counselor self-efficacy after watching the videotapes. This finding might suggest that videotapes modeling effective counseling sessions might increase the likelihood of effective role-plays, which in turn might successfully increase a trainee’s counselor self-efficacy. These findings supported Larson et al.’s (1992) claims that more exposure to counseling-related activities might increase counselor self-efficacy.

Lent, Hoffman, Hill, Treistman, and Singly (2006) found similar results to Larson et al. (1999). Lent et al. surveyed 110 novice counselors-in-training and clients about
counselor self-efficacy and session quality. After a session, Lent et al. had counselors-in-training and clients both complete the Counselor Activity Self-Efficacy questionnaire (contains a general version for counselors and a client-specific version for clients) and a Session Evaluation Scale. They found a positive relationship between counselor self-efficacy and session quality. In other words, the counselors-in-training and clients who perceived the counselor as possessing high levels of self-efficacy were more likely to evaluate the session positively. These findings coincide with Larson et al.’s (1999) claims that perceived session outcome influenced counselors-in-training’s self-efficacy.

Supervision

Daniels and Larson (2001) studied how performance feedback influenced counselors’ self-efficacy and counselors’ anxiety in counselors-in-training. They surveyed 45 counselors-in-training in clinical psychology, counseling psychology, counselor education, school counseling, and marriage and family counseling programs in the Midwest. The participants for this study had on average less than one full semester of supervised practicum experience. Daniels and Larson found that performance feedback altered perceived counselor self-efficacy. In addition, performance feedback influenced self-reported anxiety in participants. Daniels and Larson concluded that positive performance feedback (e.g., “You did a nice job summarizing the content of the session”) decreased self-reported counselor anxiety and increased self-reported self-efficacy. On the other hand, negative performance feedback (e.g., “You did not accurately capture the client’s emotions during the session”) increased self-reported anxiety and decreased self-reported self-efficacy. In other words, counselors-in-training changed their sense of self-efficacy in regards to the performance feedback they received.

Supervisory feedback is important to counselor development (Daniels & Larson, 2001). Leach and Stoltenberg (1997) researched self-efficacy and counselor development from the integrated developmental supervision model (e.g., Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Delworth, 1998; Stoltenberg & Delworth, 1987; and Stoltenberg, 1981). They surveyed 142 counselors-in-training and found a difference in the self-reported counselor self-efficacy between the first two levels of the integrated developmental model. Leach and Stoltenberg only evaluated the differences between the first two levels: level one trainees are highly motivated and anxious and lack a complex understanding of counseling. For level two trainees, “motivation begins to fluctuate in this level due to a greater understanding of counseling, more difficult client cases, and insecurity regarding their skills” (Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997, p. 115). Leach and Stoltenberg found that level two trainees reported greater levels of self-efficacy on microskills, process issues, and working with difficult client behaviors than did level one trainees. Furthermore, these findings are consistent with previous research (i.e., Johnson et al., 1989; Larson & Daniels, 1998; Larson et al., 1992) that suggested more experience and exposure to counseling and counseling-related behaviors will increase counselors-in-training’s self-efficacy.

In summary, school counselor self-efficacy suggested a greater likelihood of increased self-reported self-efficacy through gaining more exposure to counseling-related activities. This evidence confirmed Larson et al.’s (1992) findings that suggested (a) previous counseling degree, (b) counseling experience, and (c) semesters/years of supervision as significant factors in counselor self-efficacy. Counselor educators can help
to improve self-efficacy by integrating interventions such as modeling, visual imagery, and role-plays into counseling and practicum courses (Larson & Daniels, 1998) and during supervision sessions (Daniels & Larson, 2001; Leach & Stoltenberg, 1997). Understanding self-efficacy in counselors is important in developing competent counselors. Furthermore, school counselors’ self-efficacy is also important because of the many different roles they play within a school (ASCA, 2012). Sutton and Fall (1995) found similar results of school counselors as did Easton, Martin, and Wilson (2008) and Larson and Daniels (1998). School counselor training was one factor that influenced school counselor self-efficacy. The school climate was the biggest predictor of school counselors’ self-efficacy. Further research should look at how years of school counselor experience relates to school counselor self-efficacy as well as how the transformed school counseling profession has influenced the development of school counselor self-efficacy. As the U.S. school system becomes more culturally and economically diverse, it is important that school counselors are competent and efficacious in addressing such multicultural issues (Holcomb-McCoy, 2004). Therefore, the following section details literature on school counselor multicultural self-efficacy.

School Counselor Multicultural Self-Efficacy

To this point, literature on multicultural competency training suggested school counselors have three competency areas: (a) multicultural terminology, (b) multicultural knowledge, and (c) multicultural awareness. Multicultural competency research suggested that multicultural training improves multicultural competency in multicultural terminology and awareness (Holcomb-McCoy, 2001, 2005), and multicultural knowledge and awareness (Constantine et al., 2001; Packer-Williams et al., 2010). Furthermore, Cartwright et al. (2008) noted that one way to improve multicultural competency is to increase student exposure to diverse groups. Multicultural training in courses and practica (Cartwright et al., 2008) and multicultural supervision (Constantine & Yeh, 2001) helps improve multicultural competency.

Much like multicultural competency, counselor self-efficacy improves over time (Larson et al., 1992). Larson et al. (1992) found (a) training, (b) experience, and (c) supervision to play intricate roles in increasing counselor self-efficacy. Melchart, Hays, Wiljanen, and Kolocek (1996) found that training is the most significant component of increasing self-efficacy. School counselor self-efficacy is a rather new research area with limited knowledge to this point (Bodenhorn & Skaggs, 2005). Sutton and Fall (1995) found that the school climate and collegial support were the most significant factors in school counselor self-efficacy. Research suggests that self-efficacy increases quickly throughout counselors’ training (regardless of counseling type; Easton et al., 2008). Understanding the relationship between school counselor multicultural competency and school counselor self-efficacy is important to help school counselor meet the needs of diverse schools.

In one of the first studies of its kind, Holcomb-McCoy, Harris, Hines, and Johnston (2009) assessed the factors associated with school counselor multicultural self-efficacy. They surveyed 181 ASCA members using their newly developed School Counselor Multicultural Self-Efficacy Scale. Holcomb-McCoy et al. found multicultural self-efficacy to consist of six factors: (a) knowledge of multicultural concepts, (b) using
data and understanding systemic change, (c) developing cross-cultural relationships, (d) multicultural counseling awareness, (e) multicultural assessment, and (f) application of racial and cultural knowledge of practice. They concluded that more multicultural competency training courses help to increase school counselor multicultural self-efficacy.

Owens, Bodenhorn, and Bryant (2010) found that years of school counseling experience, not necessarily training, was a significant predictor of all three-school counselor multicultural competency areas. Owens et al. surveyed 157 ASCA members using the Multicultural Counseling Competence and Training Survey-Revised and School Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (SCSE). They found that years of experience was the only significant variable to predict all three school counselor multicultural competency areas. Therefore, they concluded that years of experience might best increase school counselor multicultural self-efficacy. These findings somewhat coincide with Larson et al. (1992) who found experience to be a predictor of counselor self-efficacy. In addition, Larson et al. (1992) noted that training and supervision were significant predictors of counselor self-efficacy. Constantine and Yeh (2001) found that supervision was a significant predictor of school counselor multicultural self-efficacy.

In summary, practicing school counselors’ multicultural self-efficacy was consistent with the findings in multicultural competency training and self-efficacy. However, much like the findings in multicultural competency training and self-efficacy, the findings in school counselor multicultural self-efficacy were broad. Multicultural self-efficacy findings coincide with Larson et al.’s (1992) findings that (a) training, (b) experience, and (c) supervision were significant predictors of counselor self-efficacy. These findings were consistent with school counselor multicultural self-efficacy. Holcomb-McCoy et al. (2009) found that more multicultural competency training was a significant predictor of school counselor multicultural self-efficacy, where Owens et al. (2010) found that school counseling experience was a significant predictor of school counselor multicultural self-efficacy.

Conclusion

This article sought to address three questions: (a) What aspects of multicultural competence training are helpful for school counselors?, (b) How does self-efficacy change over the course of development in school counselors?, and (c) In what ways does multicultural self-efficacy relate to school counselors’ ability to perform school counseling tasks? In general, a common finding for this research topic was that training and experience significantly predict multicultural competency and self-efficacy.

In answering the first question, it appears the number of multicultural competency courses is important for school counselors (Constantine, 2001; Constantine et al., 2001; Constantine & Yeh, 2001) and school counselors-in-training (Constantine, 2002). Infusing multicultural competency training into counseling courses and practica is also helpful for school counselors (Cartwright et al., 2008; Cates & Schaeffle, 2009). Additionally, school counselor educators should be cautious in interpreting self-reported multicultural self-efficacy research because of multicultural social desirability (Fisher, Matthews, Robinson, Sharon, & Burke, 2001; Sodowsky et al., 1998). Sodowsky et al. (1998) noted that respondents to self-reported multicultural competency measures might
report higher levels of competence to appear as competent as possible, which can be problematic because of the potential inaccuracy in responses.

In answering the second question, research on school counselors suggests that the school climate and support are important for school counselor self-efficacy (Sutton & Fall, 1995). In addition, school counselors’ training, experiences, and supervision increase self-efficacy (Larson et al., 1992). As school counselors gain more progress in their training and gain more experiences with school counseling activities, the higher their self-reported self-efficacy. Supervision feedback is also another way to increase school counselors’ self-efficacy (Daniels & Larson, 2001).

In answering the final question, it appears that a school counselor’s multicultural self-efficacy directly relates to one’s ability to perform school counseling-related tasks. As Packer-Williams et al. (2010) noted, multicultural integration in school counseling programs depends on the school counselor’s multicultural competency. School counselors with higher multicultural self-efficacy expressed increased (a) knowledge of multicultural concepts, (b) use of data and understanding of systemic change, (c) development of cross-cultural relationships, (d) multicultural counseling awareness, (e) multicultural assessment, and (f) application of racial and cultural knowledge of practice (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2009).

Implications

Multicultural self-efficacy is an emerging research area whose early findings suggest that training and experience contribute to high self-reported multicultural self-efficacy. Research suggests there are several ways to improve multicultural self-efficacy. School counselor educators, school counselors-in-training, and school counselors can work together to improve multicultural self-efficacy.

School Counselor Educators

School counselor educators can provide school counselors-in-training with opportunities in courses and practica to help improve multicultural self-efficacy. Carwright et al. (2008) suggested that exposure to multicultural issues is a helpful way to increase multicultural self-efficacy, which can be achieved in the classroom through modeling for students how to address multicultural issues in a counseling session, having students role-play multicultural issues with classmates, or visually guiding students through a multicultural issue and then discussing implications.

School counselor educators can also use practicum experiences as a format for exposing students to multicultural issues (Cartwright et al., 2008; Owens et al., 2010). Requiring practicum students to obtain school data will provide them with firsthand opportunities to observe multicultural issues. Disparaging school data will encourage practicum students to advocate on behalf of students, schools, and public arenas to increase equity for all people (Ratts, Dekruyf, & Chen-Hayes, 2007). In addition, these opportunities for practicum students are a great format for school counselor educators to model multicultural self-efficacy through support and helping practicum students address such multicultural issues. Furthermore, these experiences help model for school counselors-in-training how to create and maintain a positive multicultural environment, supportive of the school’s mission statement (Sutton & Fall, 1995).
School counselor educators can also integrate multiculturalism into supervision in a way to promote multicultural-self-efficacy. School counselor educators can work with practicum supervisors to ensure that multicultural discussions occur during site supervision. Furthermore, school counselor educators should work to incorporate discussions about diversity issues throughout supervision in a way to provides supervisees with feedback about their multicultural self-efficacy.

Finally, school counselor educators can stay current on multicultural topics by attending conferences such as the ASCA conference, the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision biennial conference as well as their regional biennial conferences, and the American Counseling Association annual conference. School counselor educators will learn approaches, interventions, and techniques of how to work with culturally diverse populations.

**School Counselors-in-Training**

School counselor educators can provide school counselors-in-training with opportunities to engage in multicultural self-efficacy development; however, school counselors-in-training should also seek out such development opportunities. Larson et al. (1992) suggested that (a) training, (b) experiences, and (c) supervision are significant predictors of increased self-efficacy. Therefore, school counselors-in-training should take every advantage to embrace multicultural opportunities. School counselors-in-training can do social justice programs for classroom assignments they can later implement into a school counseling program. In addition, school counselors-in-training could attend conferences and seminars related to multicultural competency training.

Supervision should be a format that school counselors-in-training use to explore and role-play multicultural issues (Constantine & Yeh, 2001). School counselors-in-training can use the supervision relationship to develop further their multicultural self-efficacy: (a) knowledge of multicultural concepts, (b) using data and understanding systemic change, (c) developing cross-cultural relationships, (d) multicultural counseling awareness, (e) multicultural assessment, and (f) application of racial and cultural knowledge of practice (Holcomb-McCoy et al., 2009). This exploration and performance feedback will help to provide school counselors-in-training with information about their current state of multicultural self-efficacy development.

**School Counselors**

Much like school counselors-in-training, school counselors can also seek out opportunities for continued multicultural self-efficacy development. School counselors can use continued education to improve multicultural self-efficacy through attending seminars, conferences, and workshops about multicultural issues. Furthermore, they can develop relationships with other school counselors as a form a peer consultation.

In addition to peer consultation, school counselors should seek out individual supervision as another way to improve multicultural self-efficacy. Supervision could be through the university or an agency. The benefits of supervision with university faculty could be twofold, in which school counselors continue to develop multicultural self-efficacy as well as establish university-to-school partnerships that should help to address relevant multicultural issues.
School counselors should also work to create a supportive school climate (Sutton & Fall, 1995). They should work with administration on developing a school counseling program that promotes multiculturalism through eliminating barriers to academic, career, and personal/social development (ASCA, 2012). The ASCA National Model is a framework school counselors can use to help create a comprehensive school counseling program that promotes equity for all stakeholders (ASCA, 2012).
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