AN EXAMINATION OF COLLEGE CAREER COUNSELOR SELF-EFFICACY IN WORKING WITH INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH MULTICULTURAL COUNSELING COMPETENCE

by

Qin Hu

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of Utah
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Educational Psychology

The University of Utah

August 2017

The University of Utah Graduate School

STATEMENT OF DISSERTATION APPROVAL

The dissertation of **Qin Hu**

has been approved by the following supervisory committee members:

Karen Tao	, Chair	**5/4/2017**
		Date Approved
Sabine Klahr	, Member	**5/4/2017**
		Date Approved
Amy Jo Metz	, Member	**5/4/2017**
		Date Approved
Susan Morrow	, Member	**5/4/2017**
		Date Approved
Robert Zheng	, Member	**5/4/2017**
		Date Approved

and by **Anne Cook**, Chair/Dean of

the Department/College/School of **Educational Psychology**

and by David B. Kieda, Dean of The Graduate School.

ABSTRACT

The United States is a leader in internationalizing its higher education and has witnessed a tremendous increase in recruiting international students. International students, however, encounter a host of challenges, including language and cultural barriers. Additionally, many come to the United States with a need for strong career development and guidance. Due to the complexity of cultural, social, legal, and personal factors, college career counselors require adequate training and education to appropriately assist international students. Specifically, the need to develop career counselors' sense of efficacy and multicultural competence is paramount.

This study was conducted to assess college career counselors' perceived level of multicultural counseling competence and self-efficacy in working with international students, as well as the relationship between these two variables. Factors promoting cultural competence and counselor self-efficacy were also explored. In addition, using hierarchical linear regression analysis, this study explored the degree to which multicultural competence influences counselor self-efficacy above and beyond their training and experience.

A total number of 145 college counselors completed the online survey. Results suggest counselors rate themselves as possessing an average level of self-efficacy in working with international students, as well as moderate to high multicultural counseling competence. Graduate degree in counseling, counseling classes, on-the-job training, and

supervision were positively associated with higher counselor self-efficacy. Similarly, counselors who took more multicultural classes and attended more multicultural training reported higher multicultural counseling competence. Multicultural counseling competence was found to be significantly correlated with career counselors' self-efficacy in working with international students as well as a significant predictor of counselor self-efficacy.

The current study supports the importance of recruiting college career counselors with a graduate level of education in counseling. On-the-job training, supervision, and multicultural training were also crucial in counselors' perceived level of cultural competence and self-efficacy in working with international students. The findings of this study have important implications for career counselor recruitment, supervision, and training.

This dissertation is dedicated to the sojourning students and immigrants

all over the world

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to extend my thanks to my advisor and mentor, Dr. Karen Tao, for your continuous support and understanding in the last six years. Thank you for taking me on as your advisee. This dissertation would have been impossible without your guidance, feedback, patience, and "tough love." I also want to express my sincere gratitude to my committee members—Dr. Sabine Klahr, Dr. AJ Metz, Dr. Sue Morrow, and Dr. Robert Zheng, for your insights, experiences, and support.

Thank you, my colleagues and friends in the counseling psychology and school psychology programs at the University of Utah. I appreciate your taking your time to fill out my pilot survey and giving me your valuable feedback. Many thanks to Alex Kelly and Halley Brown. It was fun to be your cohort mate. I also want to express my thanks to the current and previous faculty and staff in the Department of Education. Thank you, Dr. Paul Gore, for supporting me through the proposal process. I appreciate your assistance, Dr. Ann Cook, through the application to the University Research Fellowship. Thank you, Ms. JoLynn Yates, for your administrative support along the way.

It has been extremely difficult and stressful to write my dissertation while completing my psychology internship. Thank you, Dr. Yan Li, for your inspiration, mentorship, and emotional support. Your unconditional love has transformed me. I have learned so much from you, Dr. Marvice Markus, Dr. Nahal Kaivan, and Kim Dubose. You inspired me to continue to engage in research, to move the world towards equity and

liberation.

My deepest gratitude to all the career counselors who participated in my study, as well as all the career center directors who forwarded my recruiting email. There would be no study without you. I also want to extend my heartfelt thanks to the few career counselors who contacted me after their participation to convey their feedback and encouragement. Hearing from you was a great motivation for me to complete the study. Nothing feels better than doing something that actually has an impact.

Finally, I want to thank my loving parents—Taogen Hu and Huizhen Gao. Thank you for your unconditional support in helping me fulfill my dreams, even though it means that we have to live on two different continents. I understand it has been a significant sacrifice for you. I am very grateful to have you in my life.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

American higher education institutions continue to experience rapid growth in enrolling international students. According to *The Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchang*e (Institute of International Education [IIE], 2015), nearly 975,000 international students were enrolled in American colleges and universities in the 2014-2015 academic year, an increase of 10% relative to the year prior. Over the last decade, the number of international students has increased approximately 40% and these students now constitute 4.8% of the entire American post-secondary education student body.

In the 2014-2015 academic year, the top four countries of origin for international students were China (31.5%), India (15.9%), Saudi Arabia (5.9%), and South Korea (5.8%; IIE, 2015). Students from these four countries comprised 59.1% of the entire international student population in the U.S. Among all the enrolled international students, 33.8% of them were pursuing Bachelor's degrees, 21.4% were in Master's programs, and 13.1% were working on doctoral or professional degrees. More than half of the international students were studying engineering (20.2%), business and management (20.2%), or math and computer science (11.6%; IIE, 2015).

Recruiting international students has become desirable for higher educational leaders for several reasons. First, global engagement is considered the new phase of

revolution in higher education (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009). Specifically, recruiting international students has become a worldwide trend as universities strive to adapt to globalization and internationalization. Universities and their students benefit from the diverse perspectives international students bring, the vibrant cultural environment on campus, as well as opportunities to develop intercultural competence and adaptation to globalization (Kostavera, 2006).

Secondly, there are significant financial gains to enrolling international students in public or private universities. For example, international students pay up to three times the cost of tuition of an in-state student (Lewin, 2012). This additional source of income supports the infrastructures of higher education institutions, as well as maintains and enlarges the size of faculty and support staff (Kostareva, 2006). On the national level, it was reported that international students contributed $30.8 billion to the U.S. economy in the 2014-2015 academic year through tuition and living expenses (IIE, 2015).

Finally, international students have also demonstrated successful academic performance; they attain higher overall grade point average (GPA) during their study compared to their domestic counterparts (Rienties, Beausaert, Grohnert, Niemantsverdriet, & Kommers, 2012). In addition, international graduate students have higher completion rates and have become an important student group that contributes to research in higher education (Le & Gardner, 2010). For example, in the early 2000s, international students were approximately 15% of all graduate enrollment (Bhandari & Chow, 2007), and today more than 60% of all graduate degrees are awarded to international students in the U.S. (Council of Graduate Schools, 2014). Science and technology fields have especially witnessed this dramatic change in enrolling and

graduating international students (Obst & Forster, 2005).

As the most popular international education destination, the U.S. and its higher education institutions are often the most attuned to the global perspectives, solid academic skills, research talents, and diverse cultures that international students bring (Hanassab & Tidwell, 2002; IIE, 2015). However, it is equally important for American universities to recognize their responsibility to meet international students' needs and expectations. More specifically, they need to consider how universities and colleges are expected to provide services for international students that assist them in their academic, career, and personal development.

Cultural Adjustment and Discrimination

International students often encounter common stressors all college students experience, such as academic performance, financial difficulties, career indecision, and relational conflict. By virtue of studying in a foreign country, however, international students also face additional challenges specifically associated with cultural adjustment. These acculturative stressors include language barriers, social isolation, lack of social support, cultural shock, racism, and discrimination (Reynolds & Constantine, 2007; Sodowsky & Lai, 1997).

In terms of academic performance, international students have to overcome additional language barriers and adjust to American classroom culture. Cultural factors, including knowledge base (what students already know), learning strategies (different approaches to complete academic tasks), and help-seeking behavior (e.g., asking professors for help vs. solving problems on their own), have a significant impact on

international students' academic performance in the United States. (Li, Chen, & Duanmu, 2010). For example, adapting to learning environments in which active participation in classroom discussions is expected is often a cultural shock for many international students, who are more used to the teacher-centered classroom environments, where students' main responsibility is to listen to the teachers (Rodrigues, 2005; Tardar, 2005).

Socially, both on campus and off campus, international students often experience lack of genuine and meaningful interactions with their American peers (Sia & Hayward, 2003). Social interests that focus on perceived similarities tend to prevent intercultural communication and interactions (Kostavera, 2006). For example, many domestic students who explicitly express favorable opinions of international students are also uninterested in developing friendships with this group of peers, possibly due to cultural prejudice (Ward, 2001). These attitudes, combined with other cultural differences (e.g., individual vs. collective cultures), may discourage international students from seeking friendships with their American peers (Sherry, Thomas, & Chui, 2010). Consequently, many international students experience social isolation and their meaningful social contacts are culturally and nationally homogeneous (Mori, 2000).

Although English proficiency and cultural adjustment are considered the most important factors that impact students' educational and social experiences (Yeh & Inose, 2003), some researchers emphasize other sociocultural and systemic factors affecting their interactions (i.e., racism, xenophobia, and discrimination; Sherry et al., 2010; Urban, 2012). For example, many international students from Asia, Africa, and South America have described the American campus culture as unsupportive, discriminatory, and hostile (Hanassab, 2006; Lee & Rice, 2007). International students' experiences of

discrimination may include being perceived as socially and intellectually incompetent (Spencer-Rodgers, 2001), being positioned as the "general other" (Urban, 2007), and experiencing hostility for exhibiting cultural symbols (e.g., wearing hijab; Lee & Rice, 2007). Many international students, especially Students of Color, also experience academic exploitation due to the lack of assertiveness, resources, and self-advocacy perceived by their professors and peers (Sherry et al., 2010).

These linguistic, cultural, and social barriers can often create a significant amount of distress, which manifests itself in a wide range of symptoms. Physiological and psychological problems, including high blood pressure, headaches, chronic digestive problems, inferiority, loneliness, sadness, worries, frustration, and helplessness, are not uncommon among international students (Mori, 2000). These difficulties are compounded by the distance from family, friends, and familiar social networks (Sherry et al., 2010; Zhao, Jindal-Snape, Topping, & Todman, 2008). This sense of disconnection can often result in mental health problems, such as depression, anxiety, somatization disorders, and mental health crises (e.g., Mori, 2000; Okazaki, & Utsey, 2004; Sumer, Poyrazli, & Grahame, 2008; Yeh & Inose, 2003).

Career Development Challenges

In addition to common career planning and transition problems experienced by domestic students, international students encounter unique challenges such as communication and acculturation issues (Reynolds & Constantine, 2007; Spencer-Rodgers, 2000). Mau (2001) compared American and Taiwanese international students' career decision making difficulty, and found that the international students in this study

experienced more career indecisiveness. Language proficiency continues to be the main barrier for international students to pursue their career aspirations and achieve their career goals (Lopez, 2002). Students who perceive their English proficiency as limited tend to avoid study fields and careers that require communication in English. They might instead choose STEM fields, regardless of their genuine career interests, because they perceive those fields as having lower requirements of English writing and speaking proficiency (Lopez, 2002).

Reynolds and Constantine (2007) were interested in understanding how acculturative distress (i.e., conflicts, isolation, confusion, and lack of confidence associated with adjusting to a foreign culture) impacts international students' career development. After surveying 261 African, Asian, and Latin American international students, they found that experiencing higher acculturative distress is significantly correlated with lower career inspirations and lower career outcome expectations. The results of this study also suggest that international students who experience higher acculturative distress might perceive themselves as less competent in academic and social settings. The combination of high distress and low confidence makes it difficult for these students to engage in and focus on effective career planning.

Racism and discrimination also encumber international students' career decision-making and development. Students who experience racism and discrimination are more aware of race- and ethnicity-related career barriers (Lopez, 2002; Reynolds & Constantine, 2007). They are hesitant to choose fields of study and occupations where their racial and ethnic group is underrepresented due to fear of discrimination and lack of support. Moreover, international students are a vulnerable group that is subject to changes

in political and social policies (Spencer-Rodgers, 2000). Regulations that are a result of protectionism and xenophobia often limit career options for those international students who wish to work in the United States (Crockett & Hays, 2011).

International Student Career Counseling Needs

Whereas studying in America is a significant financial investment for most international students, many of them sacrifice their social status and familiarity associated with living in their home country (Constantine, Anderson, Berkel, Caldwell, & Utsey, 2005). What many international students hope to gain from their investment is better future career opportunities, either in the United States, their home countries, or in other countries (Obst & Forster, 2007; Urban, 2012). Assisting international students achieve their career goals should become one of the main focuses of institutional efforts in supporting this student group. This focus of supportive efforts involves internationalized curriculum, more practice-oriented education, as well as customized on-campus support structures (Obst & Forster, 2007; Shen & Herr, 2004; Tidwell & Hanassab, 2007).

In terms of on-campus support structures, researchers have argued that traditional allocation of student support resources are not effectively meeting international student needs (Obst & Forster, 2007; Tidwell & Hanassab, 2007; Urban, 2012). Traditionally, universities spend most supportive resources for international students on helping them adjust to the American higher education environment (Popadiuk & Arthur, 2014). Indeed, international students benefit from assistance to overcome linguistic, personal, social, academic, and cultural difficulties in the process of adjusting to living in a new country (Reynolds & Constantine, 2007); however, in addition to meeting international students'

needs during their initial and middle stages of adjustment, universities are also responsible for assisting international students with career planning and school-to-work transition (Obst & Forster, 2007; Popadiuk & Arthur, 2014; Tidwell & Hanassab, 2007).

International students express strong needs for career development guidance (e.g., Bartram, 2008; Crockett & Hays, 2011). In a national survey with 1,397 international students, 80% of the current international students plan to find full-time employment in the United States after graduation (International Student Work Group [ISWG], 2014). Between 2014-2015, an increase of 13.8 % international students applied to work in the United States after graduation (IIE, 2015). Relatedly, many international students (n = 640) also indicated need for knowledge about immigration and visa requirements, as well as information about career planning and job-seeking skills (Tidwell & Hanassab, 2007).

Crockett and Hays (2011) conducted a literature review on the career counseling needs of international students. Three major areas of career counseling needs emerged from the literature: (a) career planning, (b) job search guidance, and (c) overcoming institutional and cultural barriers. International students who hoped to reside in the United States and those who planned to return to their home country expressed "a compelling need" to find jobs in the United States, either long term employment or short work experience (Spencer-Rogers, 2000, p. 42). Eighty percent of the international students wish to obtain work experience in the United States to acquire specialized skills, which will enhance their marketability in the future (ISWG, 2014; Spencer-Rogers, 2000; Spencer-Rogers & Cortijo, 1998). Consequently, in addition to general career planning activities (i.e., interest/skill/value assessment, information gathering, and decision making), international students express a strong need to attain specific information about

the U.S. occupational system related to their fields of study (Spencer-Rogers, 2000).

Secondly, many international students lack knowledge and skills related to the job search and interview process and often rely on career counselors to help them search for employment opportunities, writing their resumes, and preparing for interviews (Bikos & Furry, 1999). Finally, the majority of international students also face visa restrictions and cultural barriers as they seek employment in the United States. Accordingly, they benefit from assistance in understanding government policies, using campus resources, and engaging in networking activities (Bikos & Furry, 1999; Spencer-Rogers & Cortijo, 1998). As rules about work visas shift during the current political climate, the need for career counselors to be up to date on restrictions and regulations are increasingly vital (Wattles & Kavilanz, 2017).

To address these concerns, many international students rely on university resources to meet their career development needs. Recent data suggest that 65% of the international students expressed considerable need to participate in career-planning activities (ISWG, 2014) and 77% of them desire to speak with a career counselor (Spender-Rodgers, 2000). The career needs of international students are strong and considerably different than the career needs of domestic students. Tension emerges from the fact that career services that function based on the knowledge of how to help domestic students may not be suitable for international students (Olivas & Li, 2006).

Career Counseling With International Students

Addressing international students' needs requires additional knowledge and skills from college career counselors. First, immigration laws and policies are complicated.

These include having the necessary training and knowledge about conducting the appropriate procedures for attaining work authorization for students and recent graduates. For example, there are highly specific program-related issues career counselors must consider. These include the curricular practical training (CPT) and the optional practical training (OPT) programs. The CPT enables international students to gain work experience during their academic studies, including paid and unpaid internships that are required for students' degrees. Similarly, the OPT provides an opportunity for international students to work for 12-27 months after graduation from an undergraduate or graduate program. A recent survey found that 43% of college career counselor respondents reported little or no knowledge of CPT and OPT (ISWG, 2014).

Another challenge college career counselors experience while working with international students is how to help them obtain internship experiences and employment postgraduation. A recent survey found that as many as 70% of the international students had completed an internship or full-time work experience before coming to the United States. However, the percentage dropped to 29.4% when it came to successfully attaining work experience in the United States (ISWG, 2014). Even though counselors are making efforts to educate employers about the work authorization options and reduce misconceptions and biases about hiring international students, international students experience more difficulty finding employment than their domestic counterparts (ISWG). Invariably, career counselors may have less motivation to help international students seek employment due to low outcome expectations.

Furthermore, even though the majority of the international students prefer to work in the United States after graduation, many other students plan to return home or work in

another country. Effective counseling with students requires college career counselors to offer "proactive and global guidance and strategies to make experiences in the U.S. relevant to students' home countries (or other countries of interest) as well as to maintain and develop connections in other locations" (ISWG, 2014, p. 19). Even with the help of the Internet, it is still an extremely difficult task to provide job market information that is specific to each student's destination country (Spencer-Rogers, 2000).

Another major challenge is in learning about specific details for students who arrive from more than 180 countries. International students comprise one of the most diverse student groups on campus in terms of ethnicity, culture, language, religion, and socio-economic background (Spencer-Rodgers, 2001). Factors such as English proficiency, length of stay in America, acculturative distress, race and ethnicity, gender, religion, and experiences with discrimination have significant impact on their career aspirations, outcome expectations, decision-making, and help-seeking behavior (Lopez, 2002; Olivas & Li, 2006; Reynolds & Constantine, 2007). Understanding the cultural nuances and their impact on each individual student's career development is a complicated process. Given the complexity of international students' career development needs and the challenges college career counselors may encounter, it is crucial to explore concepts that are tied to career counselors' confidence and competence. In this study, we will explore two of the important concepts, counselor self-efficacy and multicultural counseling competence.

Counselor Self-Efficacy

Considering all the challenges in working with international students, it is reasonable for researchers to wonder how confident college career counselors feel about working with this student group. Understanding the process of gaining self-confidence in particular domains of behavior, such as providing counseling, can be examined through the lens of self-efficacy. Self-efficacy refers to the extent to which a person believes in their personal capability to successfully carry out desired behaviors or attain goals (Bandura, 1977). As the core concept of the social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1995), self-efficacy has been widely studied and proven to be a robust construct. It has been shown to have valuable applications across various psychological disciplines, including counseling, vocational, social, and educational psychology (Lent & Maddux, 1997). Bandura (1977) asserted that successful performance of any behavior is a result of self-efficacy beliefs, which denote cognitive representations of the task and the strength of confidence in successfully executing the desired behavior. These beliefs are assumed to affect individuals' goal-setting/planning behaviors, emotional reactions, the amount of effort they exert, and the likelihood to persevere when faced obstacles. Self-efficacy is conceptualized as a set of dynamic cognitive activities targeting at appraising a specific behavior, as opposed to a relatively stable personality trait.

In the field of counseling, counselor self-efficacy (CSE) can be defined as "a counselor's beliefs or judgments about his or her capacities to effectively counsel a client in the near future" (Larson & Daniels, 1998, p. 180). Researchers have consistently found robust relationship between counselors' self-efficacy and their counseling behaviors, their thought patterns, and their emotional state (Larson et al., 1992). Bandura (1982, 1986,

1989) asserted that self-efficacy affects a person's behavior through the mediating factors of cognitive, affective, and motivational processes. CSE, consequently, may impact counselors' goal setting behavior, initiation, stress level, perseverance when faced challenging client issues, and the effectiveness of their learning (Larson & Daniels, 1998).

Based on Bandura's original findings and theoretical foundation, researchers have established a solid understanding of the relationships between CSE and counselor performance, outcome expectancies, self-evaluation, and anxiety (e.g., Johnson & Seems, 1989; Larson et al., 1992; Meyer, 2012; Sipps, Sugden, & Faiver, 1988). High CSE was found to be related to higher counselor self-evaluation (e.g., Beverage, 1991; Larson et al., 1992), higher outcome expectancies (e.g., Sipps et al., 1988), and lower anxiety (e.g., Barbee, Scherer, & Combs, 2003; Larson et al., 1992; Meyer, 2012). In addition, positive relationships have been established between CSE and externally-rated counselor performance (Larson et al., 1992; Munson, Stadulis, & Munson, 1986; Watson, 1992). An overall consensus is that CSE is "the primary causal determinant of effective counseling action" (Larson & Daniels, 1998, p. 180).

Lower self-efficacy estimations, on the other hand, might lead to several behavioral consequences. Lower self-efficacy was found to be associated with the person's internalized attribution for failure (Kogut, 2016) and future avoidance of target behavior (Betz & Hackett, 1981). We can then infer that lower CSE might be related to internalized attribution for an unsuccessful session and avoidance of counseling certain clients in the future. In addition, counselors with lower CSE tend to experience dissatisfaction at work (Sesto, 2014), mild pessimism (De Graaf, 1996), and lower

occupational commitment (Rawls, 2009).

Specific to career counseling, career counseling self-efficacy captures a career counselor's belief that they can "perform the tasks necessary to successfully provide career counseling" (O'Brien & Heppner, 1996, p. 367). Based on literature review and the recommendations of the National Career Development Association (1985), O'Brien, Heppner, Flores, and Bikos (1997) assert that career counselor self-efficacy is built on 10 competencies, including the ability to (a) build a working relationship and rapport with a client; (b) conceptualize the presenting problems and understand the underlying issues; (c) set goals for career counseling; (d) apply career theory; (e) assess client interests, values, abilities, and limitations; (f) communicate assessment results to clients and integrate the results in the process of counseling; (g) assist the client in further career exploration independently; (h) assist decision making; (i) facilitate the process of implementing career decision; and (j) address special issues and work with clients from diverse populations.

Given the theoretical and empirical understanding of self-efficacy and CSE, career counseling self-efficacy is hypothesized to be related to both career counselor performance and client outcome (O'Brien et al., 1997). Increased career counseling self-efficacy is also associated with higher counselor outcome expectancy, as well as interests and engagement in career counseling (O'Brien & Heppner, 1996). A study with 24 master's and doctoral counseling psychology students revealed significant relationships between counselors' career counseling self-efficacy and their clients' perceived career decision-making independence, as well as between counselors' self-efficacy in building working alliances and their clients' career readiness (Heppner, Multon, Gysbers, Ellis, &

Zook, 1998).

Sources of Counselor Self-Efficacy

Based on these findings, we assert that college career counselors' self-efficacy in working with international students is an important factor that impacts the quality and outcome of their services with this unique student population. Moreover, understanding the sources of self-efficacy may provide insight in how to promote career counselor self-efficacy. According to social cognitive theory, there are four major sources of self-efficacy: performance accomplishments (mastery), vicarious experiences (modeling), verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal (Bandura, 1977).

Successful performance of a relevant task (performance accomplishments) is believed to be the most important source of self-efficacy information (Bandura, 1997), as the accomplishment convinces an individual that they have what it takes to achieve mastery of a skill. Vicarious experience, which Bandura (1962) describes as "learning by watching," serves as an instructional method that has been shown to increase an individual's self-efficacy. Bandura (1995) states that "seeing people similar to themselves succeed by perseverant effort raises observers' beliefs that they, too, possess the capabilities to master comparable activities" (p. 3).

Verbal or social persuasion refers to believable encouraging statements made by respected individuals (e.g., supervisor, professor). These statements enhance an individual's self-efficacy because they convey confidence in his or her capabilities. People who are verbally persuaded have the ability to successfully complete a task, are believed to be more likely to exert more effort than if they received negative feedback

that focuses on their shortcomings (Bandura, 1995). Finally, emotional or affective arousal refers to the emotional states that individuals use to judge their capabilities. For example, a person who experiences aversive emotions such as anxiety may interpret these cues as a sign that a task is too difficult for them. Similarly, a person who experiences a positive mood while engaged in a difficult task is more likely to perceive higher self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997).

Larson and Daniels (1998) reviewed counselor self-efficacy studies over the previous 15 years and summarized the variables that were correlated to and predictive of counselor self-efficacy. They categorized the sources of self-efficacy into *person variables*, which include stable person factors (personal characteristics, level of training, and experiences) and personal agency factors (anxiety, motivation, and outcome expectancy); *environment variables*, containing supervision and supportiveness in the work environment; and *counselor performance*.

Person Variables

Findings from previous research suggest that most stable personal characteristics, such as counselor age, race, achievement, and personality, are minimally related to their self-efficacy (Gordillo, 2015; Larson et al., 1992; Larson & Daniels, 1998; Schwartz, 2016); however, research has repeatedly found strong positive correlation between counselor experience and counselor self-efficacy (e.g., Logan, 2015; Melchert, Hays, Wiljanen, & Kolocek, 1996; Potenza, 1990). It must be noted, however, that this relationship reduced after counselors gained a more significant amount of experience (Larson & Daniels, 1998). The following studies demonstrate some of the individual-

based factors, such as length of experience, and its effects on self-efficacy.

Melchert and colleagues examined the self-efficacy level of 138 participants, which included master's students, doctoral students, and licensed psychologists. They found significant between-group differences among counselors with less than 1 year, 1-5 years, 5-10 years, and more than 10 years of experience (Melchert, Hays, Wiljanen, & Kolocek, 1996). After gaining 10 years of experience, counselors' self-efficacy level tended to plateau. Similarly, after surveying 60 licensed professional counselors, Adams (2013) found steady increase in CSE as counselors gain a few years of experience, with those who have 10 years or more experience reporting the highest level of self-efficacy.

Related to experience, a number of studies provide evidence to support the relationship between level of training and counselor self-efficacy (e.g., Larson et al., 1992; Lent et al., 2006; Rabaino, 2015; Sipps et al., 1988). For example, Sipps, Sugden, and Favier (1988) examined the self-efficacy level of 78 graduate students, and they found that more advanced trainees displayed higher efficacy expectations than did 1st and 2nd year trainees. Among 142 master's and doctoral counseling students, significant differences were noted between beginning and more advanced trainees on self-efficacy in five counseling areas – microskills, process, addressing difficult client behaviors, cultural competence, and awareness of values (Leach, Stoltenberg, McNeill, & Eichenfield, 1997). Melchert et al. (1996) reported that the trainees' level of training and amount of experience accounted for 43% of the total variance in their self-efficacy scores. Barbee, Scherer, and Combs (2003) reported similar findings. After surveying 113 practicum counseling students, they discovered 37% of the variability in CSE was explained by participants' early field experiences and graduate level course work. Martin and

colleagues reported that level of experience accounted for 33% of the variance in CSE. In sum, these studies suggest that training and experience are important factors that have significant impact on counselor self-efficacy (Martin, Easton, Wilson, Takemoto, & Sullivan, 2004).

Personal agency variables have also been examined as a predictor of self-efficacy. Personal agency is a term in social cognitive theory that denotes the cognitive, motivational, and affective processes within the counselors. These processes serve as the "executor of the counselors' actions with the clients" (Larson & Daniels, 1998, p. 189). Outcome expectancies, affective arousal, and self-evaluation have been the main personal agency variables that have been studies in the context of understanding CSE (Larson & Daniels, 1998; Meyer, 2012).

Outcome expectancies and positive affect (e.g., a sense of accomplishment) are found to be positively correlated with counselor self-efficacy (Iannelli, 2000; Larson et al. 1992; Larson et al., 1996; Sipps et al., 1988). The correlations between CSE and counselor negative affect, such as state and trait anxiety, emotional exhaustion, and depersonalization, are found to be negative and moderately strong (e.g., Alvarez, 1995; Daniels, 1997; Larson et al., 1992). A few studies have established moderate to strong positive relationships between CSE and counselor self-evaluation, which captures their judgment of their performance in recently completed sessions (e.g., Beverage, 1989; Daniels, 1997; Iannelli, 2000; Larson et al., 1992).

Environment Variables

Larson and Daniels (1998) made clear distinction between the perceived work environment (reported by counselor or their supervisor) and the objective environment. In terms of objective work environment, insignificant relationships were found between counselor self-efficacy and their geographical location, work setting, weekly client contact hours, time spent on management and planning, and problem difficulty (Larson et al., 1992; Larson et al, 1996; Schwartz, 2016; Sutton & Fall, 1995). Meyer (2012) found no significant difference in CSE between counseling students from cohort and noncohort programs. Tang et al. (2004) reported insignificant differences between counselor trainees enrolled in Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) and those who were in the non-CACREP programs.

One factor in the objective work environment domain that does have significant correlation with CSE, however, is semesters of supervision (e.g., Larson et al., 1992; Leach et al., 1997). A total of 321 counseling students, counselors, and psychologists participated in the study by Larson et al. (1992). People who have had 1 to 3 semesters, 4 to 6, and 7 to 17 semesters of supervision reported much higher CSE than their counterparts who had not been supervised. The average CSE level increased steadily as participants received more supervision, and the relationship plateaued when they had had 6 semesters of supervision. Schwartz (2016) surveyed 341 practicing psychologists in Michigan and found that those who received ongoing supervision experienced significantly higher CSE and counseling outcome expectancy than their counterparts.

In respect to the perceived work environment, findings are mixed regarding the relationship between counseling trainees' self-efficacy and supervision style (as

perceived by trainees; e.g., Efstation, Patton, & Kardash 1990; Hanson, 2007; Johnson & Seems, 1989). Depending on their personality and level of experience, some trainees prefer supervision that focuses on addressing specific counseling tasks (Strauss, 1994), while others responded better to the interpersonal rapport with their supervisors (Hanson, 2007). Overall, counseling trainees are described as adaptive actors in using their cognitive resources to mediate their supervision experiences, so that they can develop their self-efficacy according to their cognitive translation of the supervisory environment (Larson & Daniels, 1998).

Counselors' perceptions of collegial and administrative support were found to have moderate positive correlation with self-efficacy (Larson et al., 1996; Sutton & Fall, 1995). Regression analyses of the data collected from 316 public school counselors indicated that staff support and administrator support were the strongest predictors of school counselor self-efficacy (Sutton & Fall, 1995). It contrasts to the insignificant relationships between objective environment and CSE, possibly because the interpersonal supportiveness at work contains verbal persuasion and other resources for self-efficacy development.

Counselor Performance

Counselor performance has been measured by trained rater's ratings and supervisor's perception of supervisee's performance. Early research (Beverage, 1989, Munson, Stadulis, & Munson, 1986; Watson, 1992) reported small to moderate positive correlations between CSE and trained raters' ratings. More recently, researchers used supervisor's evaluation of their supervisees' performance, and the positive relationships

between CSE and counselor performance have been well established (e.g., Iannelli, 2000; Kocarek, 2001; Larson et al., 1992). In his unpublished dissertation, for example, Iannelli (2000) found a significant positive relationship (r = .25) between supervisors' ratings of performance and their supervisees' CSE (n = 72). These findings provide strong support for Bandura's assertion that performance accomplishments are the most important source of self-efficacy.

Sources of Career Counseling Self-Efficacy

Compared to CSE, sources of career counseling self-efficacy (CCSE) have not progressed beyond theoretical understanding. Based on Bandura's social cognitive theory and the social cognitive career theory (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994), O'Brien and Heppner (1996) assert that career counselor self-efficacy comes from successful career counseling experience, modeling of successful career counseling, positive learning experience with professors and other professionals, and calm physiological states.

Theoretically, in the context of career counseling with international students, self-efficacy may be associated with: (a) successful completion of career counseling tasks with international students, for example, providing visa information to international students (performance accomplishments); (b) modeling supervisors or people who have more experience working with international students, for example, sitting in career counseling sessions with a supervisor (vicarious learning); (c) praise and encouragements received from supervisors and peers (verbal persuasion and encouragement); and (d) lower anxiety levels when counseling international students (emotional arousal).

Similar to counseling self-efficacy development, the limited research in career

counseling self-efficacy has found positive correlations between training, experience, and CCSE. In one of their original studies aimed at developing Career Counseling Self-Efficacy Scale (CCSES), O'Brien et al. (1997) examined the self-efficacy beliefs of 40 counseling students and 49 psychologists. They found increases in career counseling self-efficacy as students progressed in their programs. Significant positive correlations were also discovered between years of career counseling experience and CCSE among counseling students. Psychologists in this study reported significantly higher CCSE than counseling students, but there was not a linear relationship between their years of career counseling experience and their CCSE.

Using the same measure (CCSES), Heppner and colleagues (1998) followed 24 graduate students for 1 semester while they were completing their career counseling practica at a university counseling center. They witnessed significant increases between post and pretest results of students' CCSE. With a sample of 230 career counselors, Vespia and colleagues found significant positive relationships between CCSES scores and counselors' previous trainings and their perceived quality of training (Vespia, Fitzpatrick, Fouad, Kantamneni, & Chen, 2010). Different from the findings by O'Brien et al. (1997), Vespia et al. reported a significant correlation between CCSES and career counselors' years of counseling experience. This difference might be a result of different samples (career counselors vs. generalist psychologists).

In light of these findings on the general factors that promote career counselor self-efficacy, it seems important for career counselors to receive training/supervision, attain more counseling experience and accomplishments, as well as for the agency to create positive intrapersonal and interpersonal experiences at work. Research on career

counselors' self-efficacy with international students is lacking, but it is arguable that these general factors will have an impact on career counselors' self-efficacy in working with this client population, specifically. However, considering international students are an underrepresented group of individuals whose realities and experiences are considerably different from the majority group, understanding career counselor self-efficacy in working with international students requires a cultural framework.

Career theories have been criticized to be mainly based on masculine, Western European, middle-class, well-educated, and able-bodied values (Blustein, 2006; Cook, Heppner, & O'Brien, 2002; Fouad & Bingham, 1995; Young, Marshall, & Valach, 2007). These values, such as individuality, self-determination, and the separation between work and family (Vespia et al., 2010), might be vastly different from the values and realities experienced by many international students. Career counseling based on Western values, consequently, might be seen as irrelevant or unhelpful by international students who hold contrasting worldviews.

For example, 25 – 30% of the international students expressed that they rely on their families when it comes to career planning and decision making (ISWG, 2014). Accordingly, counselors who have biased preference for individuality and self-determination could see family involvement as problematic and challenge these students to be more autonomous (Pope et al., 1998). Authur and Popadiuik (2010) used a case of an Iranian Muslim female student to explain the importance of understanding international student's worldviews and intersectionality of identities. This student experienced the pressure to succeed in school and her career pursuit, while holding the expectation and pressure to marry in her mid-20s. Western-based values tend to assign

lower value to home, family, and individuals' relational needs, and higher value to pursuing a paid, professional, "men's" career (Authur & Popadiuik, 2010). These value discrepancies might create barriers preventing the clients from feeling understood and supported as an equal human being.

Indeed, using career counseling knowledge, assessment, and skills indiscriminately with international students, namely, ignoring the cultural context of these students, may result in inappropriate assessment (Fouad, 1995), as well as irrelevant and ineffective career counseling practice (Blustein, 2006; Fouad & Bingham, 1995). Based on Bandura's assertion that performance is the most important source of self-efficacy, ineffective practices rooted in cultural unawareness and lack of knowledge or skills related to working with international students may deter from counselors' sense of self-efficacy.

The need for multicultural training has been indicated by counselors themselves in the past (ISWG, 2014). Specifically, career counselors' multicultural knowledge and skills, which are under the umbrella of multicultural counseling competence, appear to be an important factor that affects their self-efficacy in working with international students. Similarly, researchers have long argued that multicultural competencies are essential to career counselors' self-efficacy in counseling under-represented groups (Vera & Speight, 2003; Vespia et al., 2010). Accordingly, there is a need for career development researchers and career counseling centers to further this investigation and examine how multicultural counseling competencies offer additional sources of career counselor self-efficacy above and beyond the general factors (training, supervision, experience, personal agency, and environment factors).

Multicultural Counseling Competence

Over the last 4 decades, multicultural counseling has brought forth revolutionary paradigm shift in counseling and become the "fourth force" in counseling and psychology (Pedersen, 1991). In 1982, Sue and colleagues were concerned that the monocultural (male, White, middle-class Euro-American) counseling theories and models had failed to meet the needs of increasingly diverse clients. In their position paper, Sue et al. (1982) proposed 11 characteristics of cultural competency in the area of cross-cultural beliefs/attitudes, knowledge, and skills. These competencies served as the foundation of cross-cultural counseling competence, which referred to the "sensitivity to and the appreciation of the history, current needs, strengths, and resources of minority communities" (p. 48). Later, Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis (1992) revised these standards and further built the matrix of multicultural counseling competence.

Sue and Sue (2013) defined multicultural counseling competence as:

> The ability to engage in actions or create conditions that maximize the optimal development of clients and client systems, …to function effectively in a pluralistic democratic society, and …develop new theories, practices, policies, and organizational structures that are more responsive to all groups. (p. 49)

These competences can be categorized into three domains (Sue et al., 1982; Sue et al., 1992; Sue & Sue, 1990, 2008, 2013). The first domain is therapist attitudes/beliefs, which captures the *awareness* dimension of the multicultural counseling competence model. Under this domain, mental health professionals are encouraged to explore their own assumptions, values, and possible biases that might emerge during counseling and affect the counseling process. The *knowledge* component emphasizes counselors' knowledge of and familiarity with clients' worldviews across diverse cultural groups. Counselors are expected to accept other worldviews in a nonjudgmental way. The third

competency is a therapist's culturally appropriate *skills*, which is manifested by their ability to determine and use universal and cultural-specific intervention strategies and provide a counseling process that is "consistent with the life experience and cultural values of clients" (Sue & Sue, 2013, p. 46).

Multicultural Career Counseling Competence

Multicultural competence has become one of the core components of counselor professional competence across many counseling specialties, including career counseling (Evans & Larrabee, 2002; Swanson, 1993; Young, Marshal, & Valach, 2007). Many researchers have pointed out that there exists an urgent need for career counselors to develop multicultural career counseling competencies (Flores, Lin, & Huan, 2005; Rush, 2010).

The National Career Counseling Association (NCCA, 2009) identifies multicultural competence as one of the minimum competencies of career counselors. The NCCA (2009) attempted to infuse multicultural counseling competence into career counseling training. They listed 19 minimum competencies for multicultural career counseling across 9 domains: 1) career development theory; 2) individual and group counseling skills; 3) individual and group assessment; 4) information, resources and technology; 5) program promotion, management and implementation; 6) coaching, consultation, and performance improvement; 7) supervision; 8) ethical/legal issues; and 9) research/evaluation.

When providing career counseling to clients from different cultural backgrounds, Flores and Heppner (2002) proposed that career counselors should develop competencies

in 1) building a strong working alliance, 2) recognizing that counselors are not the expert and maintaining "creative uncertainty," 3) assessing clients' racial identity and experiences with racism and other forms of oppression, 4) understanding clients' worldview and acculturation level, 5) extending clients' support network and providing resources, as well as 6) utilizing different format of counseling (e.g., groups, family sessions).

Development of Multicultural Counseling Competence

Recognizing the absolute importance of providing culturally competent counseling, scholars have devoted a great amount of effort to promote counselors' multicultural counseling competence (Arredondo, 2003; Sue et al., 1982; Sue, Ivey, & Pedersen, 1996). Sue et al. (1982) believed that the most important method for making multicultural training accessible to mental health professionals and effective at an early stage is to provide high-quality graduate-level multicultural courses. Since the introduction of the MCC model 3 decades ago, the development of the MCC model has provided the blueprint and theoretical framework for the multicultural component of counselor training (Chao, 2012). The MCC model is being operationalized through the incorporation of multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills into program curricula, practica, and student research experience (Cates, 2006).

Through the publication of the *Guidelines and principles for accreditation of programs in professional psychology*, the APA (1997) urged that counselor-training programs must have a "thoughtful and coherent plan to provide students with relevant knowledge and experiences about the role of cultural and individual diversity in

psychological phenomena" (p. 9) in both the science and practice of psychology. Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2001) has also incorporated multicultural counseling standards to enhance MCC training in master's training programs. Commitment to MCC training is required to be reflected in program's objectives and documented outcome. To meet these standards, most programs incorporate multicultural training in their curriculum and practicum, as documented with course syllabi, practicum evaluation forms, and student records of hours with diverse clients (Altmaier, 2003).

Multicultural courses generally have shown to be helpful in promoting trainees' MCC (Abreu & Atkinson, 2000). Two decades ago, D'Andrea, Daniels, and Heck (1991) conducted the earliest multicultural training effectiveness study. They found that attending a multicultural training workshop was related to increased multicultural competence. Similar findings on multicultural training effectiveness were also reported (Neville et al., 1996; Sodowsky, 1996).

Using a quasi-experimental method, researchers assigned a sample of 84 graduate students to attend either a multicultural counseling or a counseling foundations class (Castillo, Brossart, Reyes, Conoley, & Phoummarath, 2007). Fifteen weeks later, students who attended the multicultural class had significant greater gain in multicultural awareness compared to students who took the foundations class. However, students who took the multicultural classes did not report significant increase in multicultural knowledge and skills, despite these being identified as two of the course objectives.

The development of multicultural competence is a difficult and long process; researchers have pointed out that one multicultural counseling course is not sufficient to

train culturally competent counselors (Cates, 2006; Manese, 2001). Accordingly, counseling practica and internships that incorporate multicultural content throughout all areas of training experiences are considered crucial for counseling students to develop multicultural competence though intellectual and experiential learning (Arredondo & Arcineaga, 2001). This was demonstrated in a study with master's students (n = 47; Cate, 2006) in which those enrolled in a MCC infused practicum significantly increased their multicultural counseling awareness, knowledge, and overall competency compared to those who only received an introduction to MC counseling.

Based on these findings it appears that multicultural training in one's practicum is a vital aspect of developing multicultural competence. Additionally, after graduation, counselors are encouraged to seek out continuing education (workshops and classes) and professional development opportunities (e.g., conferences) to continue their MCC development. However, without the requirement from the licensing board, many counselors often lack incentive to go above and beyond their general counselor duties to engage in MCC development activities, given the additional time and money involved (Havens, 2003).

Multicultural Counseling Competence and Counselor Self-Efficacy

Research has supported the relationships between multicultural counseling competence and self-efficacy for counselors and counselor trainees. For example, Coleman (1998) examined the relationship between general and multicultural counseling effectiveness in a sample of 189 psychology students. Participants watched videotapes of two cross-cultural counseling vignettes, and then completed two inventories to measure

their cross-cultural counseling competency and counseling effectiveness. The results suggested that counselors who rated themselves as more culturally competent also reportedly higher counselor effectiveness than those who perceived lower cultural competence.

One study examining the relationship between self-efficacy and multicultural competence among counselors (n = 28) found a moderate and significant correlation (r = .30) between MCC and counselor self-efficacy (Haven, 2003). Another investigation with 378 school counselors examining school counselor MCC and self-efficacy in helping students who are recent immigrants found that MCC explained an additional 23% of the variance in counselor self-efficacy above and beyond the variance predicted by counselor demographics and years of experience (Na, 2012).

Specific to career counseling, one study looked at career counselors' multicultural competence through a national survey (n = 230). Their results suggest that surveyed career counselors believed that they possess above-average cultural competence (Vespia et al., 2010). The amount of multicultural training, training quality, years of counseling experience, and multicultural counseling experience were found to be positively related to counselor's self-rated multicultural competence. The results of this study also significantly linked career counselor multicultural competence to self-efficacy in working with diverse clients. A significant positive relation (r = .67) between counseling self-efficacy and multicultural counseling competence was found, suggesting the importance of multicultural competence training in promoting career counselor self-efficacy.

To summarize, it is hypothesized that multicultural counseling competence is a key factor that impacts career counselors' self-efficacy in working with diverse clients,

including international students. As counselors and counseling students gain more multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills, they are likely to become more self-efficacious in providing effective counseling (Na, 2010). It is expected that career counselors' multicultural counseling competence will positively impact their self-efficacy in working with international students, and the impact is above and beyond general sources of self-efficacy (e.g., experience and training, etc.).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

International students express unique career counseling needs, which often present challenges for college career counselors. Given that college career counselors have the ethical responsibility to provide quality career services and effective career interventions to students from various backgrounds and cultural groups, it is important to understand their perceptions of their level of efficacious and multicultural competence in their work with international students. To date, there has not been an assessment of college career counselors' self-efficacy in working with international students. Additionally, this study is also focused on identifying factors that promote career counselors' self-efficacy in this area. Extensive research has established relationships between counselor self-efficacy and graduate level training, experience, self-evaluation, and other personal and environmental factors. Another aim of this study is to apply social cognitive theory to examine whether or not these factors serve as the sources of career counselor self-efficacy.

This study also proposes that multicultural counseling competence is an essential component of career counselor self-efficacy in working with international students. The

role of multicultural counseling competence has been highlighted in enhancing career counselors' self-efficacy in working with a diverse client population. However, college career counselors' multicultural competency has not been previously investigated and particularly with the international student population. To respond to this dearth of research, the second major component of this study is to evaluate college career counselors' multicultural counseling competence and explore the function of training, experience, and supervision in enhancing such competence. Finally, this study also examines the independent and combined effects of multicultural counseling competence on self-efficacy. In sum, the three main research questions of this study are as follows:

1. What are the levels of self-efficacy and multicultural counseling competence of college career counselors working with international students?
2. What factors are associated with career counselor self-efficacy and multicultural counseling competence?
3. What is the relationship between counselor multicultural counseling competence and their self-efficacy in working with international students?

The study's hypotheses are as follows and are organized by overarching predictors, including participants' graduate education and training, personal agency factors, work environment and multicultural counseling training. They were followed by the hypothesis regarding the relationship between multicultural counseling competence and counselor self-efficacy in working with international students.

Graduate Education and Training

- Hypothesis 1a: Counselors with a graduate level education in counseling will have a significantly higher level of perceived multicultural competence and self-efficacy related to working with international students than counselors who received a degree in a noncounseling related field.
- Hypothesis 1b: Counselors' years of experience, number of counseling classes taken, on-job training received, and amount of supervision received will be positively associated with perceived self-efficacy in working with international students.
- Hypothesis 1c: The number of multicultural classes taken and multicultural training participants' received will be significantly associated with self-reported multicultural competence.

Personal Agency

- Hypothesis 2a: There will be a significant negative relationship between counselor self-efficacy and their anxiety about working with international students.
- Hypothesis 2b: There will be a significant positive relationship between counselor self-efficacy and their perceived success in counseling international students and value placed on being effective when helping international students.

Work Environment

- Hypothesis 3a: Perceived support within participants' work environment will have a positive significant relationship with counselor self-efficacy.
- Hypothesis 3b: The percentage of racial minority and international students on their caseload will positively impact the level of counseling self-efficacy.

Multicultural Competence and Counselor Self-Efficacy

- Hypothesis 4a: Perceived multicultural competence will be positively and significantly associated with self-efficacy in working with international students.
- Hypothesis 4b: Perceived multicultural counseling competence will account for a significant amount of variance in self-reported self-efficacy above and beyond what is accounted for by training and experience.

CHAPTER 2

METHODS

Participants

The participants for this study were college career counselors who work at 4-year universities in the United States. Results of a power-analysis indicated that a minimum sample size of 85 was needed to detect a correlation with medium effect size (.50) when power is set at .80, alpha at .05 (Cohen, 1992). At least 97 participants were needed to detect the same effect when there are six predictor variables in a multiple regression analysis (Cohen, 1992). By the time the online survey was closed, we received 204 responses. After a closer examination, 59 of the responses were eliminated because they missed data necessary for analysis, including questions assessing their counselor self-efficacy or multicultural competence. At the end, the total sample size of this study was 145.

The recruitment email (Appendix B) addressed the inclusion criteria for the participants of this study. Participants for this study were required to be career counselors providing one-on-one career counseling/advising to students. In order to ensure that the participants of this study were representative of the national career counselor population, I specifically noted in the recruitment email that career counselors who have not worked with international students were also encouraged to take the online survey. However,

college career center staff whose main job responsibilities were administrative tasks, networking with employees, and/or organizing career fairs, were not appropriate participants.

Measures

Background Questionnaire

A background questionnaire was designed to collect information in the following areas: participants' (a) identity demographics, (b) educational background, (c) training and supervision in career counseling, (d) multicultural education and training, (e) personal agency factors, and (f) environmental variables.

Information regarding age, gender, race/ethnicity, and nation of origin was collected for descriptive purposes. As for educational background, counselors were asked about the level of their highest degree attained, their fields of study, and whether they obtained a graduate level degree in counseling-related fields (e.g., counseling psychology, mental health counseling, school counseling). Participants' level of career counseling experience was assessed by asking participants the number of years of experience they had as a career counselor.

With respect to level of training and supervision in career counseling, counselors were asked three questions about the number of credits they had taken in counseling-related topics, including the amount of on-the-job training they received and the amount of supervision they received. Similarly, the level of multicultural education and training was assessed by asking counselors how many credits they received from taking multicultural related classes as well as the number of hours of diversity training they had

completed. The helpfulness of these education and training experiences in counseling and multicultural issues was also evaluated by the counselors using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from *Extremely helpful* to *Not helpful at all*.

Three personal agency factors related to counselor self-efficacy level were also measured in this study. They included: 1) counselors' perceived previous success in working with international students, 2) the level of anxiety they experience when working with this population, and 3) level of perceived importance for them to be effective in helping international students. In terms of environmental factors that may influence counselor self-efficacy in working with international students, participants were asked to rate their perceptions of support received in their work environment, as well as the level of consultation available if they have questions about helping international students.

Career Counseling Self-Efficacy Scale (CCSES)

The CCSES is the only published assessment tool that measures career counselor self-efficacy. In this study, the CCSES was used to assess college career counselor self-efficacy level. The instruction was modified to fit counselors' engagement with international students.

Based on literature review and the recommendations of the National Career Development Association (1985), O'Brien and colleagues (1997) assert that career counselor self-efficacy is built on 10 competencies, including to (a) build a working relationship and rapport with a client; (b) conceptualize the presenting problems and understand the underlying issues; (c) set goals for career counseling; (d) apply career

theory; (e) assess client interests, values, abilities, and limitations; (f) communicate assessment results to clients and integrate the results in the process of counseling; (g) assist the client in further career exploration independently; (h) assist decision making; (i) facilitate the process of implementing career decision; and (j) address special issues and work with clients from diverse populations.

The CCSES consists of 25 questions that assesses the strength of counselors' beliefs in their ability to successfully demonstrate competencies in these 10 research-supported areas in career counseling. Each statement is measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not confident*) to 5 (*highly confident*). Factor analysis results suggest that these 25 questions load on four subscales: Therapeutic Process and Alliance Skills (10 questions); Vocational Assessment and Interpretation Skills (6 questions); Multicultural Competency Skills (6 questions); and Current Trends in the World of Work, Ethics, and Career Research (3 questions).

The CCSES demonstrated robust psychometric properties when piloted with graduate counseling students and career psychologists (O'Brien et al., 1997). The instrument demonstrated moderate to high internal consistency (.93 with graduate students and .90 with psychologists) and strong test-retest reliability. The test-retest reliability estimate was .86 for the total score, which was significant at $p < .01$. Criterion validity was reinforced by an increase in CCSES scores after completing a career counseling course. With respect to construct validity, convergent validity was supported by correlations between CCSES scores and years of career counseling experience. The lack of statistical significance between the CCSES total score and years of personal counseling experience, personal counseling self-efficacy, and research self-efficacy, on

the other hand, provides evidence for discriminant validity (O'Brien et al., 1997).

Given the purpose of this study to measure career counselors' self-efficacy in working with international students, the CCES was slightly modified. Participants were asked to answer each question based on how they currently feel about working with their international student clients. The instructions were provided above the CCSES questions on the Qualtrics survey, with "currently" and "international student clients" underscored.

Multicultural Competence Inventory (MCI)

The Multicultural Competence Inventory (Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin, & Wise, 1994) is a 40-item self-report instrument designed to measure multicultural counseling competency constructs. The theoretical framework of this measure was largely informed by the awareness-knowledge-skills multicultural competence model (Sue et al., 1992), as well as American Psychological Association Division 17's multicultural competence guidelines.

The MCI was developed using exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, and tests of factor congruence between two original studies (Sodowsky et al., 1994). The first study collected responses from 640 counseling students and mental health counselors. Exploratory factor analysis results suggest that four factors emerged and they accounted for 36.1% of the total variance. The four-factor solution also yielded more robust factor structure compared to the two- and three-factor models. The four factors were named: Multicultural Awareness scale (10 items), Multicultural Counseling Knowledge scale (11 items), Multicultural Counseling Skills scale (11 items), and Multicultural Counseling Relationship scale (8 items). Each item is rated on a 4-point

Likert-type scale (1 = *very inaccurate*, 4 = *very accurate*). In their original study, the full MCI scale showed a mean Cronbach's alpha of .87, while the Cronbach's alpha for each subscale was .88, .83, .65, and .79, respectively.

Criterion validity was supported by the increased MCI scores ($p < .05$) reported by social work graduate students who had received multicultural training compared to those who had not (Walters & Wheeler, 2000). Another study yielded slightly different findings. Sodowsky, Kuo-Jackson, Richardson, and Corey (1998) found that scores on the Multicultural Awareness, Multicultural Counseling Knowledge, and Multicultural Counseling Skills subscales increased with diversity training, but Multicultural Relationship scores did not. In addition, convergent validity of the MCI was supported by a moderately high correlation of the MCI and Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge-Skill Scale full scales (Sodowsky, 1996).

After it was published, several studies used the MCI and provided evidence to support the validity of the MCI (e.g., Cumming-McCann, 1999; Menapace, 1998). The MCI has become one of the most widely used multicultural counseling competence measures (Hunt, 2004). There is a body of research that utilized the MCI to measure the MCC of counseling trainees, mental health counselors, and psychologists (e.g., Johnson & Williams, 2015; Ottavi, Pope-Davis, & Dings, 1994), as well as to understand the psychometric properties of MCC measures (e.g., Constantine & Ladany, 2000).

Procedures

After attaining approval from the University of Utah Institutional Review Board (IRB# 82062), a list containing all 4-year universities in the United States was obtained.

The list included more than 2,000 schools, and every one in five universities was selected to ensure random selection. I then obtained the emails of the university's career center directors from their website. A recruitment email, which included the purpose of this study, institutional review board approval information, and a link to the data collection webpage, was sent to the directors (Appendix B). Career center directors were encouraged to distribute this email to their career counselors. A reminder email was sent out two weeks later to remind career center directors about the research opportunity. After a month, 67 responses were collected. The same process was repeated twice until an adequate number of complete responses were received (i.e., 145 useable responses).

Data Analysis

Frequencies and percentages were used to analyze nominal variables, including participants' gender, race, nation of origin, educational background, and the perceived usefulness of the training they have received. Means, standard deviations, and ranges were calculated for career counselors' age, amount of training and supervision received, multicultural education and training experiences, psychological factors, environmental variables, as well as the dependent variables (i.e., CCSES and MCI scale scores). To determine whether there were significant differences in counselor self-efficacy and multicultural competence between counselors who do and who do not hold a graduate degree in counseling (Hypothesis 1a), one-way ANOVA tests were conducted to compare these two groups.

In order to measure the effects of the individual and contextual factors on career counseling self-efficacy and multicultural competence, linear regression analyses were

conducted. Pearson's correlational coefficients were first calculated to examine the bivariate relationships between independent and dependent variables. There were two primary dependent variables in this study – career counselors' perceptions of self-efficacy in working with international students and their perceived multicultural competence.

To examine factors that impact counselor self-efficacy, 10 independent variables were selected based on Bandura's social cognitive career theory. They were: 1) counselor's year of experience, 2) the number of counseling classes taken, 3) the amount of on-the job-training (i.e., hours received), 4) hours of supervision received, 5) level of anxiety experienced when working with international students, 6) perceived successful experiences working with international students, 7) counselors' perceived level of importance to improve their effectiveness in working with this student population, 8) perceived supportiveness of work environment, 9) percentage of racial-ethnic minority students on a counselor's caseload, and 10) percentage of international students on a counselor's caseload. They were organized into three categories: training and supervision (Hypothesis 1b), personal agency (Hypotheses 2a and 2b), and work environment (Hypotheses 3a and 3b).

Correlational coefficients were also used to assess the relationships between career counselors' multicultural counseling competence and 1) their number of classes taken, and 2) hours of multicultural training received (Hypothesis 1c). Hypothesis 4a was tested by calculating the relationship between participants' perceived sense of career counselor self-efficacy and multicultural counseling competence.

Finally, Hypothesis 4b was tested by using hierarchical linear regression to

evaluate the degree to which multicultural competence and general training/experience predicted counselor self-efficacy. In the first step of the hierarchical linear regression analysis, independent variables related to counselor experience, education, and training were entered into the regression equation to predict CCSES scores. Counselors' multicultural competence level, as measured by MCI scores, was then entered into the equation in the second step of the hierarchical regression model. The hypothesis was tested by observing the R^2 change after adding the MCI scores. Changes in each independent variable's contribution to the prediction model were also examined.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Participant Demographics

The participants in this study consisted of 145 career counselors or advisors working in career centers of 4-year universities across the country. Eighty percent of the participants (n = 116) identified as female and 20% (n = 29) identified as male. In terms of race and ethnicity, 82.1% of the sample (n = 119) identified as White, 6.2% (n = 9) identified as African American, and 4.1% (n = 6) were Asian American. One of the participants identified as Hispanic and 10 counselors (6.9%) identified as multiracial, including Caribbean multiracial and multiethnic. The majority of the sample (96.6%, n = 140) were born in the United States, while five of the counselors (0.4%) were born in another country and had come to the United States as international students. Of these five counselors, three came to the United States to pursue undergraduate education and two of them came to the United States for graduate school. On average, these participants had lived in the United States for 10 years.

The age of the participants ranged from 24 to 66, with a mean of 38.42 (SD = 11.36). Their years of experience working as a career counselor ranged from 3 months to 36 years (M = 7.85, SD = 7.73). In regard to the participants' educational background, the majority of the sample attained postgraduation education. 86.9 % of the sample (n = 125)

reported that their highest level of education was a master's degree, 2.8 % (*n* = 4) held doctoral degrees, and 3 participants (2%) held professional degrees (1 MD, 1 JD, and 1 EdD). The remaining sample (*n* = 12, 8.3%) had attained Bachelor's degrees; some participants were working on their master's degree at the time of the survey. Approximately half of the sample (*n* = 75; 51.7%) held a graduate degree in counseling, while nearly half (*n* = 70; 48.3%) did not. Among the career counselors who did not hold a graduate degree in counseling, nearly half of them held degrees in education (*n* = 33, 47.1%), 20 % had degrees in business and management (*n* = 14), followed by psychology (*n* = 5; 7.1%), communication (*n* = 4; 5.7%), and public policy/administration (*n* = 4; 5.7%).

Descriptive Statistics

Education, Training, and Supervision

Several questions were asked to assess counselors' individual experiences that could impact their perceived self-efficacy and multicultural competence. In terms of the number of counseling-related credits received, the responses (*n* = 128) ranged from 0 to 160, with mean of 31.48 (*SD* = 33.81). After recoding the responses into quartiles, 17.2% of the sample (*n* = 22) reported having taken 0 credits, 37.5% (*n* = 48) fell within the 1 to 25 credit range, 16.4% (*n* = 21) reported 26 to 50 credits, 24.2% (*n* = 31) took 51-75 credits, and 4.7% (*n* = 6) reported receiving more than 75 credits. Counselor's perception of the usefulness of the counseling-related classes they had taken were reported on a 5-point Likert scale with *1 = Extremely useful* to *5 = Not useful at all*. The mean score for the usefulness of counseling classes was 2.17 (*SD* = 1.00), which indicates participants

perceived their counseling classes as being moderately to very useful.

In respect to the amount of on-job training counselors received, the responses (n = 104) ranged from 0 to 2000 (M = 212.39; SD = 411.41) suggesting there was a significant variation in responses. Careful analysis of the frequency of responses and categorizing the data resulted in the following groups: 13.6% of the sample (n = 14) reported not receiving any on-the-job training, 21.4% (n = 22) reported receiving 1-25 hours of training, 20.4% (n = 21) fell within the range of 26-50 hours, 2.9% (n = 3) were within the 51-75 hour range, 12.6% (n = 13) received 76-100 hours of training, and 29.1% (n = 30) had more than 100 hours of training. The mean score of counselors' perceived helpfulness of training was 1.57 (SD = 0.76).

The number of hours of on-the-job supervision counselors received ranged from 0 to 2000 hours (n = 117), with a mean of 90.29 hours (SD = 241.65). Again, there was a large variation in responses. The frequencies of results recoded into quartiles are as follows. Thirty-three participants (28.2%) reported that they did not receive any supervision, 41 counselors (35.0%) received 1-25 hours of supervision, 19 respondents (16.2%) fell within the 26-50 hour range, 2 people (1.7%) received 51-75 hours of supervision, 5 people (4.3%) fell within the 76-100 hour range, and 17 (14.1%) counselors received more than 100 hours of supervision. The usefulness of supervision was rated by 115 counselors, resulting in a mean score of 1.92 (SD = 0.98). Table 1 provides the frequencies of counselors' ratings of the usefulness of counseling classes, training, and supervision.

In the multicultural education and training area, we asked two questions regarding the number of credits of diversity-related classes participants had taken and the number

of hours of multicultural training they had received. Counselors' answers to the first question ranged from 0 to 150 credit hours, with the mean of 7.18 (*SD* = 14.72). The majority (94.4%, *n* = 134) of the sample reported that they had taken 18 credits or less. In terms of their perceived usefulness of the multicultural classes they had taken, counselors' ratings resulted a mean of 2.11 (*SD* = 0.94), which indicated they found their classes very useful.

The number of hours of diversity training ranged from 0 to 2000 hours, with a mean of 48.44 (*SD* = 209.00). Responses were divided into quartiles as follows: 17.8% (*n* = 21) of the sample reported 0 hours of multicultural training, 39.8% (*n* = 47) received 1-10 hours of training, 17.8% (*n* = 21) received 11-20 hours of training, 4.2% (*n* = 5) reported 21-30 hours, 7.6% (*n* = 9) were within the 31-40 hour range, 1.78% (*n* = 2) reported 41-50 hours of training experience, and 11.0% (*n* = 13) received more than 50 hours of training. On average, counselors reported they believed the multicultural training they received as very useful (*M* = 2.10, *SD* = 0.91). Table 2 demonstrates the frequencies and percentage of ratings of the usefulness of their multicultural classes and training.

Personal Agency Factors

This study also examined psychological factors that might contribute to career counselors' self-efficacy, including their (a) perceived success in working with international students, (b) the level of anxiety they experience when working with this population, and (c) their perceived importance for them to be effective in helping these students. Table 3 illustrates the frequencies these psychological factors. Participants were asked to reported their perceived successful experiences in working with international

students on a 5-point Likert scale, from 1 (*Strongly agree*) to 5 (*Strongly disagree*). The mean for their perceived success was 1.86 (*SD* = 1.05), suggesting overall high confidence in their success. Counselors' anxiety was self-rated on a 4-point Likert scale, from 1 (*Extremely Anxious*) to 4 (*Not Anxious at All*). The mean score for counselor anxiety was 3.30 (*SD* = 0.72), indicating relatively low levels of anxiety on average. Counselors' perceived importance in being effective when working with international students, resulted in a mean score of 1.14 (*SD* = 0.42).

Work Environment Variables

Participants were asked four questions regarding variables in their work environment that might influence career counselor's self-efficacy level. The first question assessed counselors' perceived supportiveness of their working environment on a 5-point Likert Scale (*M* = 1.46; *SD* = 0.87). The second question asked counselors about the availability of people at work for consultation if they had questions about international students. Using a similar 5-point Likert scale, counselors' ratings resulted in a mean score of 1.69 (*SD* = 0.95). Table 4 illustrates the frequencies of the first two questions regarding the contextual factors.

The third and fourth question assessed the percentage of minority students and international students on the counselors' workload. Some counselors did not provide numerical responses (e.g., "not many"). These responses were not included in the analysis. At the end, 133 valid responses were included in this study. The percentage of minority students on counselors' workload ranged from 1% to 100%, (*M* =35.53; *SD* = 22.70). The percentage of international student clients ranged from 0% to 85%, and the

mean was 15.18 (*SD* = 15.40).

Self-Efficacy and Multicultural Competence

Table 5 provides the descriptive statistics of counselor self-rated self-efficacy in working with international students and their perceived multicultural competence, as well as the descriptive statistics of the subscales scores. Career counselors' self-efficacy in working with international students was measured with the Career Counseling Self-Efficacy Scale (CCSES), which has 25 questions categorized into four subscales. The maximum total score of CCSES is 125, and the mean total score in this study was 93.74 (*SD* = 16.53). The total score of each individual participant ranged from 42 to 125. The mean total score of the Multicultural Competence Inventory (MCI), which was used to measure counselor perceived level of multicultural competence, was 122.39 (out of 160; *SD* = 15.15; *range* = 88 – 160)

ANOVA Results

We hypothesized that counselors who received a graduate level of education in counseling would report higher levels of multicultural competence and self-efficacy in working with international students than those who did not. Table 6 presents the mean and standard deviation of the CCSES and MCI total and subscales of both groups.

A one-way ANOVA test was conducted to compare the difference between self-efficacy reported by the two groups based on education level. Three assumptions of ANOVA were examined before discussing the results. The first is the assumption of independence. This assumption was met because the design of this study made sure that

data were randomly and independently sampled. The second assumption is regarding normality of the dependent variable – in this case, the CCSES scores. Normality tests resulted in an insignificant score (Shapiro-Wilk = .98; p = .07), as well as acceptable (between -1 to 1) skewness (-.45) and kurtosis (= .19). Only one of the subscales scores (multicultural skills) yielded an insignificant normality test result (Shapiro-Wilk = .98, p = .09), suggesting that the other three subscale scores are significantly deviant from normal distribution. However, ANOVA is usually considered robust to the assumption of normality because it focuses on the means (Kirk, 2008). Even though normality is an underlying assumption for ANOVA, nonnormal data work almost as well as normal data. Consequently, I utilized ANOVA to test the between-group differences in all subscale scores, but I excluded subscale scores from correlational and regression analyses. Finally, the equality of variance assumption was examined using the Levene's test. The result (Levene's = 2.12, p = .15) suggests that the variances between the two groups do not significantly differ.

The result of the one-way ANOVA (F [1, 143] = 9.83, p = .002) suggests that there exist significant differences in self-efficacy between counselors who have a graduate degree in counseling and those who do not. Table 7 provides results of the ANOVA analysis. Among the four subscales, there exist significant between-group differences in Therapeutic Process (F [1, 143] = 14.68, p = .000) and Alliance and Multicultural Competency Skills (F [1, 143] = 5.00, p = .027). The between-group differences in Vocational Assessment and Interpretive Skills (F [1, 143] = 2.95, p = .088), as well as in Current Trends in the World of Work, Ethics, and Research (F [1, 143] = 3.01, p = .085), were not significant.

The second part of Hypothesis 1a addressed how attaining graduate degrees in counseling might influences career counselors' multicultural competence. The normality of the dependent variables was also tested before the ANOVA. The total score of the MCI resulted an insignificant Shapiro-Wilk score (= 0.988, p = .242), as well as acceptable (between -1 to 1) skewness (= .114) and kurtosis (= -.554). Two of the sub-scales scores – Multicultural Awareness (Shapiro-Wilk = .988, p = .252) and Multicultural Knowledge (Shapiro-Wilk = .987, p = .178) had insignificant normality test results, as well. The null hypothesis of the homogeneity of variance was retained (Levene's = .911, p = .342), suggesting that the variances between the two groups do not significantly differ.

Table 8 illustrates the statistics of the ANOVA for the MCI and the four subscale scores between the two comparison groups. The result of the one-way ANOVA (F [1, 143] = 8.46, p = .004) suggests significant differences in self-perceived multicultural competence between counselors who have a graduate level counseling degree and those who do not. Among the four subscales, there exist significant between-group differences in Multicultural Counseling Skills (F [1, 143] = 22.98, p = .000) and Multicultural Counseling Knowledge (F [1, 143] = 5.07, p = .026). Multicultural Awareness (F [1, 143] = 1.55, p = .215) and Multicultural Counseling Relationship scores (F [1, 143] = .83, p = .363), on the other hand, did not experience significant between group differences.

Correlational Analysis Results

It was predicted that there would be significant correlations between participants' years of experience, number of counseling classes taken, on-the-job training received, and amount of supervision received and their self-efficacy in working with international students (Hypothesis 1b). Results indicate partial support for this hypothesis, including demonstration that counselor self-efficacy is significantly related to the number of counselor credits ($r = .26$, $p < .01$), amount of on-the-job training ($r = .20$, $p < .05$), and amount of supervision ($r = .26$, $p < .01$). The years of experience of career counseling is not significantly related to counselor self-efficacy ($r = .15$, $p > .05$). The usefulness of counseling classes was significantly related to counselor self-efficacy ($r = .22$, $p < .05$). Neither the helpfulness of on-job-training ($r = .17$, $p > .05$) nor the helpfulness of supervision ($r = .10$, $p > .05$) was significantly correlated to self-efficacy.

I predicted that there would be significant positive relationships between 1) the number of multicultural classes participants took, 2) the amount of multicultural training they received, and their self-reported multicultural competence (Hypothesis 1c). This hypothesis was also partially supported. The MCI total score was significantly positively correlated with the number of multicultural classes ($r = .275$, $p < .01$) and the amount of multicultural training received ($r = .304$, $p < .01$). Correlations between MCC and the usefulness of multicultural classes training were also examined. The MCI total score was also statistically significantly related to counselors' ratings of the usefulness of the multicultural classes they took ($r = .54$, $p < .01$) and the helpfulness of the multicultural training they received ($r = .41$, $p < .01$).

In terms of the effects of personal agency variables (Hypothesis 2a and 2b), this

study found that counselor self-efficacy in working with international students was significantly positively related to counselors' perceived successful experiences ($r = .33$, $p < .01$) and their perceived importance in being effective with this population ($r = .20$, $p < .05$). There was a statistically significant negative relationship between counselor self-efficacy and their anxiety experience when working with international students ($r = -.33$, $p < .01$). It means that the more anxious career counselors feel when they work with international students, the less efficacious they perceive themselves to be and vice versa.

As for the environmental factors that might have an impact on counselor self-efficacy, I expected that the perceived supportiveness of work environment would have a positive relationship with counselor self-efficacy (Hypothesis 3a and 3b). I also expected counselors who had a higher percentage of racial minority and international students on their caseload would report higher self-efficacy in working with international students. The results suggest that counselors' perceived supportiveness of work environment does not significantly correlate with self-efficacy ($r = .079$, $p = .347$). The percentage of racial minority students on a counselor's caseload was significantly related to their self-reported efficacy in working with international students ($r = .197$, $p = .023$), while the percentage of international students on their caseload was not ($r = .069$, $p = .430$). Thus, this hypothesis was only partially supported.

It was predicted that there would be a significant and positive relationship between career counselors' self-efficacy in working with international students and their perceived multicultural competence (Hypothesis 4a). These two variables, as measured by the modified CCSES and MCI, were significantly associated ($r = .702$, $p < .001$). The adjusted R^2 suggests that the MCI total score accounts for 49.0% of the variance in

CCSES total score.

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Results

The second part of the fourth and last hypothesis (Hypothesis 4b) proposed that college career counselors' multicultural counseling competence would account for a significant amount of variance in self-reported self-efficacy over and above what is accounted for by other individual and environmental variables. This hypothesis was tested using hierarchical multiple regression analysis. Among all the individual and environmental variables this study assessed, three of them (years of experience, percentage of international students on caseload, and supportiveness of working environment) did not demonstrate significant relationship with counselor self-efficacy in working with international students. Another variable (percentage of racial minority students) did correlate significantly with counselor self-efficacy; however, the predicting model became unstable after entering this fourth variable due to a small sample size. At the end, three predictor variables: (a) counseling credits taken, (b) hours of on-job training, and (c) amount of supervision received were selected. These variables were entered into the equation in the first step, followed by the MCI total score as the second step in the regression equation. The total score of the modified CCSES served as the dependent variable.

Three assumptions of multiple regression were examined to ensure the appropriateness of using parametric tests. First of all, the assumption of independent errors was tested by examining the standardized residuals. In this case, the standardized residuals ranged from -2.82 to 2.05, and they were within the -3 to 3 range. The mean of

standardized residual was 0. There was no indication of autocorrelation among the errors. P-P plots of regression standardized residual showed that the observed values were along the line of expected values, despite some minor variability. Secondly, Cook's distance ranged from 0 to 0.074 and was within the range of -1 to 1. The last assumption tested was the absence of multicollinearity. Grimm and Yarnold (1995) suggest that correlation between any of the two independent variables that is greater than .8 would be considered problematic. An examination of the correlation matrix of all the predictor variables confirms that none of the correlations was greater than .48. It suggested that multicollinearity is not a concern in this test. All the results of assumption tests supported the appropriateness of using multiple regression analysis.

Table 9 compares the two models that were entered into the hierarchical regression analysis. In the first model, three independent variables – counseling credits, amount of on-job training, and amount of supervision received, were entered simultaneously. This model accounts for 11.8% of the total variance in counselor self-efficacy ($F = 3.939$, $p = .011$). After entering the MCI total score, the second model resulted in a R^2 change of .400, which was statistically significant ($F = 23.402$, $p = .000$).

Each predicting variable's contribution was also examined. In the first model, counseling credit was the only variable that made significant unique contribution to the model ($\beta = .217$, $p = .037$). The beta coefficients for on-job training and supervision did not reach statistical significance, even though both variables significantly correlate with counselor self-efficacy. After adding the MCI total scores into the second model, none of the variables in the first model made significant contribution. The beta coefficient for MCI total score reached statistical significance at the .001 level.

Table 1

Frequencies of Perceived Usefulness of Education and Training

Counselor Ratings	Frequency	Percentage
Counseling Classes (*n* = 124)		
Extremely Useful	39	26.9%
Very Useful	38	26.2%
Moderately Useful	35	24.1%
Slightly Useful	11	7.6%
Not Useful At All	1	0.7%
Training (*n* = 130)		
Extremely Helpful	73	50.3%
Very Helpful	43	29.7%
Moderately Helpful	12	8.3%
Slightly Helpful	1	0.7%
Not Helpful At All	1	0.7%
Supervision (*n* = 115)		
Extremely Helpful	46	31.7%
Very Helpful	43	29.7%
Moderately Helpful	18	12.4%
Slightly Helpful	5	3.4%
Not Helpful At All	3	2.1%

Table 2

Frequencies of Perceived Usefulness of Multicultural Classes and Training

Counselor Ratings	Frequency	Percentage
Multicultural classes (*n* = 117)		
Extremely Useful	34	23.4%
Very Useful	45	31.0%
Moderately Useful	31	21.4%
Slightly Useful	5	3.4%
Not Useful At All	2	1.4%
Multicultural Training (*n* = 126)		
Extremely Useful	36	24.8%
Very Useful	50	34.5%
Moderately Useful	34	23.4%
Slightly Useful	4	2.8%
Not Useful At All	2	1.4%

Table 3

Frequencies of Perceived Success, Anxiety, and Importance to Be Effective Related to Working With International Students (n = 145)

Counselor Ratings	Frequency	Percentage
Success		
Strongly Agree	60	41.4%
Somewhat Agree	68	46.9%
Neutral	12	8.3%
Somewhat Disagree	4	2.8%
Strongly Disagree	1	0.7%
Anxiety		
Extremely Anxious	1	0.7%
Moderately Anxious	19	13.1%
Slightly Anxious	60	41.4%
Not Anxious	65	44.8%
Importance to be Effective		
Strongly Agree	128	88.3%
Somewhat Agree	15	10.3%
Neutral	1	0.7%
Somewhat Disagree	1	0.7%
Strongly Disagree	0	0%

Table 4

Frequencies of Perceived Supportiveness of Work Environment and Availability of Consultation (n = 145)

Counselor Ratings	Frequency	Percentage
Supportiveness		
Strongly Agree	101	69.7%
Somewhat Agree	31	21.4%
Neutral	7	4.8%
Somewhat Disagree	2	1.4%
Strongly Disagree	4	2.8%
Availability of Consultation		
Strongly Agree	78	53.8%
Somewhat Agree	48	33.1%
Neutral	7	4.8%
Somewhat Disagree	10	6.9%
Strongly Disagree	2	1.4%

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Levels of Counselor Self-Efficacy and Multicultural Competence

Scales	Mean	*SD*	Range
CCSES Total Score	93.74	16.53	42-125
Therapeutic Process and Alliance	40.20	6.40	23-50
Vocational Assessment and Interpretive Skills	21.92	5.81	6-30
Multicultural Competency Skills	20.86	5.03	7-30
Current Trend in the World of Work, Ethics, and Research	10.65	2.64	3-15
MCI Total Score	122.39	15.15	88-160
Multicultural Counseling Skills	34.61	5.42	23-44
Multicultural Awareness	28.77	4.83	17-40
Multicultural Counseling Relationship	26.11	3.59	13-32
Multicultural Counseling Knowledge	33.06	5.11	20-44

Note. CCSES = Career Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale; MCI = Multicultural Competency Inventory

Table 6

Descriptive Data of CCSES Scores by Graduate Degree in Counseling

Scales	With Graduate Degree in Counseling		Without Graduate Degree in Counseling		Total	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
CCSES Total Score	97.77	14.30	89.41	17.72	93.74	16.53
Therapeutic Process and Alliance	42.08	5.35	38.19	6.84	40.20	6.40
Vocational Assessment and Interpretive Skills	21.07	6.04	21.07	6.04	21.92	5.81
Multicultural Competency Skills	21.75	4.62	19.90	5.32	20.86	5.03
Current Trend in the World of Work, Ethics, and Research	11.01	2.48	10.26	2.76	10.65	2.64
MCI Total Score	125.84	14.10	118.70	15.45	122.39	15.15
Multicultural Counseling Skills	36.66	4.52	32.53	5.56	34.61	5.42
Multicultural Awareness	29.25	4.64	28.26	5.00	28.77	4.83
Multicultural Counseling Relationship	26.37	3.68	25.83	3.49	26.11	3.59
Multicultural Counseling Knowledge	33.97	4.87	32.09	5.20	33.06	5.11

Note. CCSES = Career Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (range of scores = 25-125)
MCI = Multicultural Competence Inventory (range of scores = 40-160)

Table 7

One-Way ANOVA for the CCSES Between Groups With and Without Graduate Degree in Counseling

		df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
CCSEC Total Score	Between Groups	1	2529.91	2529.91	9.83	.002
	Within Groups	143	36796.13	257.32		
	Total	144	39326.04			
Therapeutic Process and Alliance	Between Groups	1	549.10	549.10	14.68	.000
	Within Groups	143	5350.11	37.41		
	Total	144	5899.20			
Vocational Assessment and Interpretive Skills	Between Groups	1	98.40	98.40	2.95	.088
	Within Groups	143	4771.76	33.37		
	Total	144	4870.17			
Multicultural Competency Skills	Between Groups	1	123.47	123.47	5.00	.027
	Within Groups	143	3530.49	24.69		
	Total	144	3653.96			
Current Trend in the World of Work, Ethics and Research	Between Groups	1	20.704	20.70	3.01	.085
	Within Groups	143	982.36	6.870		
	Total	144	1003.06			

Note. CCSES = Career Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale

Table 8

One-Way ANOVA for the MCI Between Groups With and Without Graduate Degree in Counseling

		df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*p*
MCI Total Score	Between Groups	1	1845.81	584.56	8.46	.004
	Within Groups	143	31188.78	25.44		
	Total	144	33034.59			
Multicultural Counseling Skills	Between Groups	1	584.56	35.93	22.98	.000
	Within Groups	143	3638.03	23.20		
	Total	144	4222.59			
Multicultural Awareness	Between Groups	1	35.93	35.93	1.55	.215
	Within Groups	143	3317.55	23.20		
	Total	144	3353.49			
Multicultural Counseling Relationship	Between Groups	1	10.75	10.74	.83	.363
	Within Groups	143	1845.49	12.91		
	Total	144	1856.23			
Multicultural Counseling Knowledge	Between Groups	1	129.01	129.01	5.07	.026
	Within Groups	143	3627.43	25.37		
	Total	144	3756.44			

Note. MCI = Multicultural Competency Inventory

Table 9

Hierarchical Linear Regression Predicting CCSES Scores From Counseling Credits, On-Job Training, Supervision, and MCI Scores

	Step 1			Step 2		
Variables	*B*	*SE B*	*β*	*B*	*SE B*	*β*
Counseling Credits	3.11	1.59	.217*	.19	1.13	.063
On-the-Job Training	1.18	1.14	.111	.95	.79	.131
Supervision	1.34	1.24	.158	.34	.85	.023
MCI Total Score				.81	.08	.669***
R^2	.118			.518		
F	3.939*			23.402***		

Note. CCSES = Career Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale
MCI = Multicultural Competency Inventory
*. Significance at the 0.05 level
***. Significance at the 0.001 level

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this exploratory study was to assess college career counselors' self-efficacy in working with international students and its relationship with counselors' multicultural counseling competency. Factors that promote counselor self-efficacy and their multicultural counseling competency were also explored. The results of this study have valuable implications in identifying ways to improve college career counselors' self-efficacy and multicultural competence, with the eventual goal to improve the effectiveness of university career counseling services to international students. Below, I will summarize the important findings of this study and describe some of the implications of these findings related to career counselor self-efficacy and multicultural competence.

Findings Regarding Counselor Self-Efficacy

This is the first known study to specifically examine career counselors' self-efficacy in working with international students. The college career counselors who participated in this study reported self-efficacy levels in working with international students ranging between *moderately confident* to *very confident* (M = 3.75 on a 5-point Likert scale). The results of this study were slightly lower than the Career Counselor Self-Efficacy Scale (CCSES) ratings (M = 4.26) reported by a national sample of 179

career counselors (Vespia et al., 2010). However, the CCSES ratings reported in this study were higher than the career counseling self-efficacy ratings reported by trainees. In a separate survey with 81 master's level counseling students, Gilliam (2012) reported mean of 3.44 on CCSES compared to the current mean of 3.75. Almost identically, a total number of 24 doctoral and master's students reported an average CCSES rating of 3.44 before they participated in their career counseling practicum (Heppner et al., 1998).

It appears that college career counselors, as a whole, feel reasonably self-efficacious in working with international students. However, there is significant variability in counseling self-efficacy among career counselors based on their education levels. The results of this study suggest that, compared to their counterparts, career counselors who have a graduate degree in counseling reported significantly higher self-efficacy in working with international students. To date, there has not been a published study examining college career counselors' educational background and how it impacts their counseling self-efficacy. Given the current findings of the impact of having a graduate degree in counseling on counselor self-efficacy, efforts to recruit counselors with graduate level of education in counseling (e.g., career counseling, school counseling, and counseling psychology) are clearly warranted.

Other educational and training factors, including the number of counseling classes, amount of on-job training, and amount of supervision, were shown to be related to counselor self-efficacy in working with international. Similarly, Vespia et al. (2010) found a significant relationship between the CCSES scores and the amount of training (r = .29) for a sample of 179 career counselors. Another study surveyed 218 Italian career counselors and found the amount of previous career counseling training was significantly

correlated with career counselor self-efficacy in three important career counseling areas – Problem Understanding (r = .41), Educational Counseling (r = .46), and Career Choice/Indecision (r = .25; Soresi, Nota, & Lent, 2004). Supported by current findings and previous research, career centers might want to invest in recruiting counselors who received comprehensive education and training in counseling and/or career counseling, as well as providing supervision and ongoing training for their counselors.

The current study found an insignificant correlation between counselors' years of experience and their self-efficacy in working with international students. This insignificant finding is discrepant from what Vespia et al. (2010) found in their study, which indicated a moderate association (r = .23; n = 179) between the years of experience and the CCSES. However, a study with Italian counselors (n = 218) also reported insignificant correlations (rs ranging from .02 to -.16) between years of experience and career counseling self-efficacy (Soresi et al., 2004). Soresi and colleagues (2004) further reported that the correlation between training and career counseling self-efficacy did not change after the effects of years of experience were partialed out. The educational background of participants may explain the discrepant findings of the three studies. College career counselors who participated in this study are very similar to those who participated in the study by Soresi et al.; they came from various educational backgrounds and many of them did not receive graduate level of counselor education. The study by Vespia et al., however, had a sample of professional career counselors, who received much more rigorous training in counseling. The results of the current study supports claims put forth by Soresi et al. that higher career counseling self-efficacy is associated with the amount of training, and this relationship is independent of counselors'

years of counseling experience.

Broadening the results of the current study to comparison with mental health counseling, the relationships between experience, training, supervision, and counselor self-efficacy (CSE) have been widely studied. Researchers have repeatedly found strong positive correlation between counselor experience and CSE in their beginning stage of counselor development (Larson & Daniels, 1998), but this relationship tends to plateau after about 10 years of experience (e.g., Adams, 2013; Melchert et al., 1996). Counselor training, on the other hand, has been shown to have significant correlation with CSE (e.g., Bentley, 2007; Friedlander & Snyder, 1983; L. M. Larson et al., 1992; Melchert et al., 1996; Rushlau, 1998; Sipps et al., 1998; Tang et al., 2004). Consistent with our findings, several researchers have found a positive relationship between the amount of clinical supervision and counselor self-efficacy (Cashwell & Dooley, 2001; Hams, 2007; Larson et al., 1992).

The findings of the current study support previous research in asserting that the relationship between counselor experience and CES is not strictly linear, and it has much to do with counselor training. In other words, counselors tend to feel more self-efficacious as they gain more experience in the beginning stage of their career, but their self-efficacy is not going to automatically increase if they cease to engage in on-going training after a few years of practicing. Adams (2013) asserted that counselor experience only has a significant impact on CSE when combined with previous and ongoing training. The current study joins her in supporting the importance of continuous counselor training in promoting counselor self-efficacy.

This study also explored personal agency factors that might impact counselors'

level of self-efficacy in working with international students. Personal agency variables, including previous success and perceived importance to help international students, were shown to be positively correlated with counselor self-efficacy. Perceived anxiety while working with international students and counselor self-efficacy were found to be negatively correlated. These results provide additional support for the assumptions of the social learning theory (Bandura, 1995) and its assertion that self-efficacy is correlated with performance accomplishment and emotional arousal. These results are also consistent with previous findings that outcome expectancies and sense of accomplishment are positively correlated to counselor self-efficacy (Larson et al. 1992; Sipps et al., 1988), while counselor anxiety is negatively correlated with counselor self-efficacy (e.g., Alvarez, 1995; Daniels, 1997). The findings stress the importance to promote counselors' perceived importance in helping international students, increase counselor performance achievement, and address their anxiety level.

Findings Regarding Multicultural Counseling Competence

The second focus of this study was to examine the level of multicultural counseling competence (MCC) of career counselors working with international students. The results of this study indicate that they believe most statements that describe competent multicultural counseling behavior are somewhat accurate in describing their counseling behavior (M = 3.06 on a 4-point Likert scale). To date there has only been one published study that examined career counselors' multicultural counseling competence. Using the California Brief Multicultural Competence Scale (CBMCS), Vespia et al. (2010) assessed career counselors' multicultural competence. Results revealed above-

average self-reported scores, including awareness of cultural barriers, multicultural knowledge, effective skills to work with clients from various groups, and sensitivity to issues that are beyond race and ethnicity (e.g., sexuality and disability).

Based on the self-report data, college career counselors seem to perceive themselves as culturally competent in providing counseling to diverse clients. Career counselors who hold a graduate degree in counseling reported significantly higher MCC than their counterparts. The number of multicultural classes and hours of diversity-related training were found to have significant correlations with career counselor MCC. Similarly, Vespia et al. (2010) found that the amount of multicultural training was positively related to career counselor's self-rated multicultural competence. These results also join a large number of previous studies (e.g., Abreu & Atkinson, 2000; Beck, 2001; Cates, 2006; D'Andrea et al., 1991) in supporting the necessity to provide multicultural training to all counseling students and practicing counselors. Receiving graduate level of education and training in counseling seems to be an important booster of career counselor multicultural competence. This is possibly because counselors who have a graduate degree in counseling are more likely to be have taken a required multicultural course compared to counselors who came from a different educational background. However, developing multicultural counseling competence is an ongoing and complex process; taking one multicultural course or two is not sufficient to train culturally competent counselors (Cates, 2006; Manese, 2001). In addition, clients' social and cultural contexts are constantly changing. For example, many minority students, including international students, are being significantly impacted by President Trump's policies. Accordingly, it is crucial for career centers to incorporate ongoing multicultural education and training

throughout all areas of counselor training and continued education experiences in order to help them develop and solidify multicultural competence.

The current study also found that the quality of multicultural classes and multicultural workshops were significantly correlated with counselor MCC, and these relationships were moderately strong (r = .54 and r = .41 respectively). The quality of counseling training and supervision experiences, on the other hand, was not significantly related to counselor perceived self-efficacy in working with international students. It might suggest that the quality of general training in counseling does not have a significant impact on counselors' self-efficacy in successfully counseling a particular student group. The quality of multicultural training, however, seems to have a much more significant influence on counselor multicultural counseling competence. The data of this study suggest that providing high quality multicultural training is especially important as each opportunity will likely have a significant impact on counselor MCC.

Multicultural Counseling Competence and Counselor Self-Efficacy

One of the central questions this study strives to answer is whether or not there is a relationship between career counselors' self-efficacy in working with international students and their perceived multicultural cocounseling competence (MCC). The results of the current study suggest that these two variables have a strong correlation. This finding is consistent with Vespia and her colleagues' (2010) finding of a strong correlation (r = .67) between the CCSES and the California Brief Multicultural Competence Scale scores. Being aware of the limitation of self-report data, Vespia and colleagues also adopted a coding system to rate career counselors' qualitative responses

to questions about their career counseling practices with diverse clients. The relationship between externally-rated MCC and CCSES was much less marked (r = .21), but still statistically significant. Despite the limitations, the findings of our study support the idea that college career counselors who perceive themselves as culturally competent tend to feel more self-efficacious when working with international students.

This study also found that MCC is a significant factor in predicting counseling self-efficacy in working with international students. The addition of MCI scores significantly improved the prediction of counselor self-efficacy. After entering MCI scores into the model, none of the factors that were significantly correlated with CCSES (general counseling training, education, and supervision) remained as significant predictors. Although, these results might suggest that there are merits in recruiting counselors with more counselor education/training, investing in counselor multicultural competence appears to have more of a robust effect on career counselors' future self-efficacy in helping international students.

Unfortunately, there are not similar studies with career counselors to compare these results to; however, a study that examined school counselor self-efficacy in working with new immigrant students found that multicultural awareness had significant effects on school counselors' perceived self-efficacy, and it explained more of the variance than counseling experience and demographic factors alone (Na, 2012). These findings stress the importance of developing multicultural competence in any counselor's process of becoming efficacious in working with clients who are new to this country.

Implications on Counselor Recruitment and Training

The findings of the current study have a few important implications for practice and for universities. As American higher education institutions are increasing their efforts in recruiting international students, university support staff face growing challenges in meeting these students' needs during their sojourns. College career counselors have the ethical and professional responsibilities to effectively help international students overcome barriers to their career development. However, it is a complex process to become efficacious and competent in assisting international students, as they are an extremely diverse group of students whose experiences are vastly different in terms of cultural adjustment, language ability, career development, and encounter of racism and discrimination (e.g., Reynolds & Constantine, 2007; Urban, 2012).

To become more efficacious in working with international students, the findings of this study suggest that it is important for career counselors to receive graduate level of education and training in counseling, including career counseling, school counseling, mental health counseling, and/or counseling psychology. Among the college career counselors who participated in this study, only about half of them hold a graduate degree in counseling, and many of them never received any supervision or training. There seems to be great room for improvement in terms of recruiting career counselors with more education and training in counseling, as well as providing on-the-job training and supervision. Ideally, university career counseling centers would want to recruit career counselors from career counseling master's programs. However, the reality is that there are few accredited career counseling programs in the United States. Currently, there are only seven Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational

Programs (CACREP) accredited career counseling programs in the country (CACREP, 2017). Whereas these programs are valuable in providing solid career counselor education and training, they are not able to meet the national demand for college career counselors.

Graduate training in other counseling-related fields might be a good temporary substitute for specific education in career counseling. Programs in mental health counseling, school counseling, and counseling psychology provides series of classes in counseling theories, counseling skills, career counseling, multicultural issues, and adult/adolescent development. In addition, graduates from these programs may have a solid understanding of how to build a working relationship with clients, how to more accurately assess student needs, the importance of providing emotional support, as well as the value of understanding individuals from holistic perspectives. They might be well aware of their ethical responsibilities, and see career counseling as a social justice advocate in promoting career development of individuals of all backgrounds (Flores & Heppner, 2002; National Career Development Association, 2009). Most counseling programs also require practicum experiences where students practice counseling in a supervised environment. Counselors who have completed counseling practica are likely to have received feedback on their work compared to career counselors who came from noncounseling backgrounds. These experiential components of training are important in the process of developing career counselor self-efficacy and multicultural competence (Larson & Daniels, 1998; Vespia et al., 2010).

In terms of recruiting well-trained career counselors, universities and career centers face a few challenges, including reduced budgets (National Association of

Colleges and Employers [NACE], 2011) and counseling graduates' preference of personal counseling over career counseling (Schaub, 2012). Universities might want to invest more resources in career centers, as career services are a very valuable resource for students, including international students, to move into the best possible workplaces where they can fully utilize what they have learned in school. Career centers might also want to become more creative in recruiting career counselors. For example, they can promote their services and create practicum opportunities to mental health counseling and school counseling students, in order to increase students' interests in becoming college career counselors. Career centers can even work with the counseling program in their universities to create master's in career counseling programs to specifically train career counselors.

In respect to career counselor preparation, university career centers might want to establish streamlined training and supervision plans to bring career counselors onboard and address their lack of knowledge/experience in career counseling. Career centers are strongly encouraged to develop a policy manual that includes structured training for new counselors. For example, each counselor may be required to complete a 3-month intensive training period and 1 year of supervised experience. Career centers might want to establish a leadership position, such as a training director, to oversee training and preparation of new counselors. College career counselors who do not hold a graduate degree in counseling are encouraged to take graduate level classes in counseling. Many universities offer free or subsidized classes to their employees. Career centers may benefit from encouraging their employees to take classes related to counseling and multicultural issues. Currently, approximately 25% of all college career cousnelors are

certified career counselors (Schaub, 2012). Career centers might want to sponsor their employees who are not licensed to take classes towards being licensed as career counselors. For example, many career counselor certificate programs adopt recommended competencies outlined by the National Career Development Association (NCDA). These certificate programs require 1 to 6 classes, which include career counseling theory, organizational behavior and administration, career development in special populations, vocational assessment, and resource development. These classes might be great opportunities for college career counselors to promote their competence and self-efficacy. Career center should also provide on-going training and opportunities for all staff to engage in continued education. In-depth presentation on career theories, updated information about the job market and government policies, as well as effective career assessment tools and interventions, are some of the many topics that can benefit career counselor self-efficacy development.

The findings of the current study also suggest that multicultural competence is a factor that has significant impact on counselor self-efficacy, which appears to have a greater influence than training and education. This finding continues to support the importance of promoting career counselors' multicultural counseling competence in the context of an increasingly pluralistic society. The present study confirms the importance of multicultural education and training in promoting counselor multicultural counseling competence. Both quantity and quality of such educational experiences are impactful on counselor perceived cultural competence. It seems important for career centers to show their commitment to promoting the multicultural competence of all staff. With this commitment, many activities can be placed on their routine work schedule. These

activities may include weekly multicultural case conferences, monthly multicultural colloquia, multicultural conversation time or book/movie club among staff, as well as monthly conversations with other offices on campus, such as the international center, LGBTQ center, and counseling center. Career centers can also periodically evaluate their counselors' multicultural competence by distributing surveys to clients or invite students to participate in focus groups where they can give feedback about their experiences in career counseling.

An important aspect of enhancing counselor multicultural competence is promoting counselors' multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills through first-hand clinical experiences. The results of the current study suggest that career counselors who see a large percentage of racial and ethnic minority students tend to report higher self-efficacy levels. As such, increasing career counselors' exposure to working with more diverse students seems to be very important.

This study highlights some concerning trends, including the low number of career counselors who had received multicultural classes or the low hours of diversity or multiculturally related training. Accordingly, a great deal of effort needs to be made in providing multicultural training to career counselors. With the exception of counselors who received a master's or doctoral degree in counseling, most counselors have not been required to take any multicultural classes. Again, career centers must begin to consider the prior training of their career counselors. With counselors who do not have a graduate degree in counseling, it might be important to help these counselors seek out opportunities to take multicultural classes. Ongoing opportunities for counselors to receive multicultural education and training are also vital in promoting MCC. Because

the results of this study suggest that the quality of multicultural training is significantly related to MCC level, it seems important to ensure that the multicultural training is perceived as helpful to career counselors. Organizers of such training can distribute evaluation forms to receive feedback on the strengths and areas of improvement of the training. Career centers can also invite their staff, other campus offices, and counseling programs to recommend reputable multicultural counseling consultants and trainers.

Implications on Promoting CSE in Working With International Students

Findings of this study continue to support promoting counselor self-efficacy in working with international students from the social cognitive theory perspectives. Performance accomplishment, vicarious learning, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal are all important sources of self-efficacy in helping international students. Developing training programs that focus on these sources of self-efficacy might be a promising approach to improve career services with international students. Specific components of such programs might include shadowing counselors who are more experienced in working with international students (vicarious learning), assigning less complicated cases to trainees first to promote their sense of competence (performance accomplishment), supervisors providing verbal encouragement to supervisees (verbal persuasion), and teaching relaxation skills to help trainees manage their anxiety (emotional arousal).

In terms of environmental factors, only about half of the counselors strongly agree that they can seek consultation when they have questions about working with international students. This number is almost 70% when it comes to the participants who

found their working environment to be overall supportiveness within the career center. It seems that many career centers do not have regular communication and interaction with other offices. Many career centers around the country, especially in universities that have a more significant international student representation, do collaborate with other offices in student affairs. It might be beneficial for more university career centers to enhance their partnership with other campus offices and organizations, such as the international students and scholars offices or international centers, counseling centers, and identity centers.

More specifically, international students and scholars offices (ISSOs) can provide information to career center staff about visa requirements, curricular practical training (CPT), optional practical training (OPT), and international students' experiences with cultural adjustment and career development. Career centers may also benefit from collaborating with ISSOs in delivering regular programs to students on the topics of OPT, CPT, and the job-search process. Presenting on career services at the international student orientation might be a great venue to connect with international students and make them aware of the resources available. Partnership with university counseling centers can also create valuable opportunities for all counselors to integrate counseling theories and practices to promote holistic understanding of international students, as well as to design effective intervention programs to address international students' challenges. International students, overall, tend to underutilize counseling services (Mori, 2000). Career counselors are often on the frontline of working with international students and are more likely to recognize students who would benefit from mental health counseling and refer them to the counseling center. Relatedly, counseling center staff also play an

important role in referring international students to career counseling to address career development needs. Finally, other campus offices, including women's centers, centers for multicultural affairs, and the LGBTQ center, have valuable insights of how other salient cultural factors could be impacting international students. Conversations on these topics will increase career counselors' awareness and knowledge of students from various cultural groups' different realities. They might also enhance counselors' ability to advocate international students in overcoming cultural barriers, discrimination, and oppression that exist in their career development.

Universities may also consider establishing an office or a committee (e.g., International Student Success Committee, International Student Engagement Committee) that organizes institutional efforts to best support their international students. Many international centers or international students and scholars offices spend most of their resources on ensuring all international students are meeting legal requirements (e.g., issuing I-20, CPT, and OPT), and subsequently have limited resources to promote international student academic, career, and personal development. The coordination of efforts involving a career center, academic affairs, counseling center, international center, and residential life would maximize resources to help all international students achieve their personal, academic, and career goals. Several universities, including the University of Washington, University of Michigan, and Ohio State University, have established similar structures. These efforts are typically initiated by student affairs administrators and involve commitment and collaboration from various offices.

Limitations

This exploratory study has several limitations. One major limitation is the self-report nature of all the data collected in this study. The use of self-report MCC measures is a challenging issue in assessing MCC, yet has been the approach most cultural competence studies utilize (Huey, Tilley, Jones, & Smith, 2014). Constantine and Ladany (2000) suggest that MCC measures are actually assessing counselors' perceived multicultural competence, as opposed to their actual performance in cross-cultural counseling. They also found that, after controlling for social desirability, the scores of self-report MCC measures (including MCI) were no longer correlated with counselors' conceptualization ability of multicultural cases. Additionally, there is need for studies on multicultural counseling competence that also consider client outcomes, training approaches that increase cultural competence, and how MCC is distinguished from general counseling competencies (Huey et al., 2014). Consequently, the findings of the present study are limited in accurately depicting career counselors' MCC.

In addition, most of the independent variables in this study, including the number of counseling and multicultural class credits and the amount of supervision and training received, were based on participants' retrospective estimation. This led to an extremely wide distribution, which was addressed by grouping responses into quartiles. However, this method still poses a number of potential errors and an inaccurate measure of counselors' experience and training.

The second limitation is the use of revised CCSES to measure counselor self-efficacy in working with international students. Because there is no available published assessment tool specifically designed to measure self-efficacy in working with

international students, I revised the CCSES by prompting career counselors to answer these questions based on their experiences working with international students. Consequently, the CCSES scores collected in this study may not precisely reflect college career counselors' self-efficacy when working with international students, due to the lack of examination of the reliability and validity of using this method.

Moreover, due the exploratory nature of this study, there is not an established theoretical model to guide the research efforts. There might be important factors that promote counselor self-efficacy or MCC that were not examined by this study, or we might be missing potential relationships (e.g., mediation, moderation) among different factors. For example, external reward, such as the opportunity of being promoted if the counselor exhibits high competence in working with international students, might serve as a moderator between counselor training/experience and their self-efficacy. Namely, the correlation between training and self-efficacy might not exist when there is external reward, as counselors with less training might make more effort to become self-efficacious in working with international students. Furthermore, without solid theoretical guidance, this study has relied on correlational analysis, which does not inform us on the direction of the influence. More specifically, we do not know if MCC predicts CSE or if it is vice versa.

Recommendations for Future Research

The present study explored and confirmed the relationship between college career counselors' multicultural competence and their self-efficacy in working with international students. Factors such as graduate level of education in counseling, on-the-

job general training, supervision, and training in diversity-related issues have been found to correlate with counselors' self-efficacy and MCC. These findings shed light on how to make conscious efforts to help college career counselors improve their self-efficacy in working with international students.

To solidify and deepen the understanding of these issues, it would be beneficial to conduct qualitative studies to further examine counselors' perception of their work with international students, as well as the barriers they experience in improving their self-efficaciousness in this area. To address the limitation of self-report measures, face-to-face interviews, qualitative questionnaires, and external ratings on counselors' answers to efficacy and competence related questions might provide a more accurate assessment of career counselors' self-efficacy and MCC. Researchers can also analyze qualitative data to identify the themes in counselor responses to questions, comparing the narratives based on counselors' training, education, and experience. The findings of these studies can better capture the impact of education and training in promoting counselor self-efficacy and MCC.

Studies that examine the process (interactions between counselor and client in the session) of career counseling might also be valuable, as suggested by several scholars (e.g., Heppner & Heppner, 2003). There is much to be learned about the differences in career counseling process that are related to cultural perspectives and counselor self-efficacy (Heppner & Heppner, 2003). Process research provides opportunities for both the counselors and the clients to express how they experienced their interactions and what they view as helpful in career counseling. These examinations and findings are necessary in the process of understanding the mechanism of effective career counseling. Studies

that move beyond multicultural competence and look at intercultural communication and competence (the ability to understand cultures, especially between two people from different nations of origin), might provide additional insights related to interactions between American counselors and international students in career counseling.

Furthermore, employing outcome-focused studies would provide valuable information the impact of self-efficacy and cultural competence on actual client outcome, such as better clarity of their career problems and higher confidence in their career decisions. Independent researchers can evaluate specific international student career outcomes and compare them with their counselors' MCC and self-efficacy. For accountability purposes, career counseling centers can also consider following the trajectory of international students, including people who have graduated, to learn more about the kinds of employment students receive following counseling services. For currently enrolled students, periodic program evaluation can also offer ongoing updates on whether students are getting their needs met through career counseling.

There appears to be an urgent need to provide career counseling that works for international students specifically. In addition to promoting individual career counselors' self-efficacy and multicultural competence, designing, implementing, and evaluating evidence-based career counseling programs are also invaluable activities. It will also be important for these structured and manualized programs to undergo rigorous investigation to yield empirical data that support their efficacy and effectiveness. The potential outcome of such studies will be the delivery of quality training for career counselors and, ultimately, quality interventions to international students in individual or group settings.

Conclusion

The United States and its higher education institutions have greatly benefited from recruiting international students. Many universities have incorporated global engagement and internationalization into their long-term strategic plans. Promoting international students' academic, career, and personal success is a university's responsibility, as well as a benefit to the students and to the country. The success of international students has direct impact on the country's research, economy, and innovation across many industries. As this study demonstrates, college career counselors, in particular, play a very important role in helping international students achieve their optimal career potential. Furthermore, the findings also provide important implications for the vital stakeholder relationships among counselors, career centers, universities, and their international students. The findings highlight the importance of graduate training in counseling, supervision, multicultural training, as well as organizational collaboration and support, to promote competence and efficacy. It is hoped that this study will be followed by future research and systemic efforts to enhance college career counseling services for the international student population.

APPENDIX A

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH
75 South 2000 East Salt Lake City, UT 84112 | 801.581.3655 | IRB@utah.edu

IRB: IRB_00082062

PI: Qin Hu

Title: An Examination of College Career Counselor Self-efficacy in Working with International Students and Its Relationship with Multicultural Counseling Competence

Date: 9/28/2015

Thank you for submitting your request for approval of this study. On 9/28/2015, a designated IRB member has determined that your study is exempt from further IRB review, under **Exemption Category 2**. Note the following delineation of categories:

- Categories 1-6: Federal Exemption Categories defined in 45 CFR 46.101(b)
- Categories 7-11: Non-Federal Exemption Categories defined in University of Utah IRB policy at http://irb.utah.edu/_pdf/IGS - Exempt Research 090113.pdf

You must adhere to all requirements for exemption described in University of Utah IRB policy (http://irb.utah.edu/_pdf/IGS - Exempt Research 090113.pdf). This includes:

- All research involving human subjects must be approved or determined exempt by the IRB before the research is conducted.
- All research activities must be conducted in accordance with the Belmont Report and must adhere to principles of sound research design and ethics.
- Orderly accounting and monitoring of research activities must occur.

Ongoing Submissions for Exempt Projects

- **Continuing Review:** Since this determination is not an approval, the study does not expire or need continuing review. This determination of exemption from continuing IRB review only applies to the research study as submitted to the IRB. You must follow the protocol as proposed in this application
- **Amendment Applications:** Substantive changes to this project require an amendment application to the IRB to secure either approval or a determination of exemption. **Investigators should contact the IRB Office if there are questions about whether an amendment consists of substantive changes.** Substantive changes include, but are not limited to
  - Changes that increase the risk to participants or change the risk:benefit ratio of the study
  - Changes that affect a participant's willingness to participate in the study
  - Changes to study procedures or study components that are not covered by the Exemption Category determined for this study (listed above)
  - Changes to the study sponsor
  - Changes to the targeted participant population
  - Changes to the stamped consent document(s)
- **Report Forms:** Exempt studies must adhere to the University of Utah IRB reporting requirements for unanticipated problems and deviations: http://irb.utah.edu/submit-application/forms/index.php
- **Final Project Reports for Study Closure:** Exempt studies must be closed with the IRB once the research activities are complete: http://irb.utah.edu/submit-application/final-project-reports.php

If you have questions about this, please contact our office at 581-3655 and we will be happy to assist you. Thank you again for submitting your proposal.

APPENDIX B

RECRUITMENT EMAIL

Dear Career Center Directors,

My name is Qin Hu and I am a doctoral student in University of Utah's Counseling Psychology program. Under the guidance of Dr. Karen Tao, I am currently recruiting participants for my dissertation study. This study will examine college career counselors' self-efficacy in working with international students and its relationship with counselor multicultural counseling competency. Through this study, we hope to gain a deeper understanding of career counselors' self-perceived multicultural competence and self-efficacy in working with international students, as well as the implications for college career counselor on-the-job training.

I would like to ask for your help in forwarding the participation request below to ALL the career counselors/advisors who work directly with students at your center (including those who might not have worked with international students). This research has been approved by the University of Utah Institutional Review Board (IRB# 82062). If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me at qinhu317@gmail.com or Dr. Karen Tao at k.tao@utah.edu. I greatly appreciate your time and consideration of this request.

Sincerely,
Qin Hu, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate
University of Utah

Dear Career Counselors/advisors,

My name is Qin Hu and I am doctoral student in the counseling psychology program at the University of Utah. I am currently conducting a study for my dissertation focused on understanding college career counselors' self-efficacy in working with international students and its relationship with counselor multicultural counseling competency. Given that this is a new and unexplored area of research, your participation will be crucial in assessing counselors' current level of self-efficacy and multicultural competence, as well as understanding how to help counselor improve their confidence in assisting international student clients.

Participation includes a 10-15 minute survey that consists of a brief demographic questionnaire and two short measures. **To participate in the study the following criteria must be met:** (a) currently working as a career counselor; (b) 18 years of age or older. ALL career counselors who meet these criteria are encouraged to participate, even if you might not have worked with international students.

If you would like to participate in this study, please click on the link below and you will be directed to an online consent form:

https://educationutah.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_559J7kaRDARhWoB

This research has been approved by the University of
Utah Institutional Review Board (IRB# 82062). If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me at qinhu317@gmail.com or Dr. Karen Tao at k.tao@utah.edu. I greatly appreciate your time and consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Qin Hu, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate
University of Utah

APPENDIX C

CONSENT LETTER

Consent Document

BACKGROUND

You are being asked to take part in a research study. Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully. Ask us if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether you want to volunteer to take part in this study.

This research study is designed to examine college career counselors' self-efficacy in working with international students and its relationship with their multicultural counseling competence. The data from this research will be used to measure career counselors' level of self-efficacy in working with international students, their multicultural competence, the relationship between the two, and how training/supervision might affect their self-efficacy and multicultural competence. This study is the primary investigator's dissertation and will help her meet the requirement of graduation. The results of this study might also be used for publication.

STUDY PROCEDURE

By clicking the "continue" button below, you agree to volunteer to participate in this study, and you will be directed to an online questionnaire. Your participation will take approximately 20 minutes.

RISKS

The risks of this study are minimal. You might feel unfamiliar with some of the questions due to lack of experience of working with diverse clients and it might cause you some discomfort.

BENEFITS

We cannot promise any direct benefit for taking part in this study. However, it is hoped that the findings of this study will have implications for college career counselor on-job training and future research. Exploring factors that promote counselor self-efficacy and multicultural counseling competence is important as they might lead to better counselor performance and client outcome.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Your participation is anonymous. Data from this survey will be stored in a password-protected computer and can only accessed by the primary investigator. Your confidentiality will be safely maintained.

PERSON TO CONTACT

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, you may contact

Qin Hu
1721 Campus Center Drive SEAC 3220
Salt Lake City UT 84112-8914
801/581-7148
U0690901@utah.edu

APPENDIX D

BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. Other. Please specify _____
   d. Prefer not to answer

2. What is your age?

3. Please specific your race/ethnicity. (Please select all that apply)
   a. African American or Black
   b. Asian or Asian American
   c. Hispanic or Latino/a
   d. Native American or American Indian
   e. Pacific Islander or Alaska Native
   f. White or Caucasian
   g. Other. Please specify _____

4. What is your highest degree of education?
   a. Associate's
   b. Bachelor's (e.g. B.S., B.A.)
   c. Master's (e.g. M.A., M.S., M.Ed.)
   d. Doctoral Degree (Ph.D., Psy.D., Ed.D.)
   e. Other. Please specify _____

5. What is the filed of study (e.g. education, business) was your degree/ were your degrees in? (please include all post-secondary degrees)

6. Do you have a graduate level of degree in counseling (e.g. Master's in mental health, career, or school counseling)?
   a. Yes
   b. No

7. Were/ Are you an international student?
   a. Yes
   b. No

7.a. What level of education did you first pursue in the U.S.?
   a. Elementary and middle school
   b. High school
   c. Undergraduate
   d. Graduate school

7.b. How many years ago did you come to the U.S.?

8. How many years have you worked as a career counselor?

9. How many credit hours of classes have you taken in counseling related topics?

10. How would your rate the usefulness of these counseling-related classes to your current work as a career counselor?
    a. Extremely useful
    b. Very useful
    c. Moderately useful
    d. Slightly useful
    e. Not at all useful
    f. Not applicable

11. How many hours of on-job training in career counseling have you received?

12. How do you perceive the helpfulness of the on-job training?
    a. Extremely helpful
    b. Very helpful
    c. Moderately helpful
    d. Slightly helpful
    e. Not at all helpful
    f. Not applicable

13. How many hours of supervision in career counseling have you received before you started providing career counseling independently?

14. How do you perceive the helpfulness of supervision you have received?
    a. Extremely helpful
    b. Very helpful
    c. Moderately helpful
    d. Slightly helpful
    e. Not at all helpful
    f. Not applicable

15. How many credit hours of multicultural counseling, cross cultural, and/or diversity-related classes have you taken, if any?

16. How would you rate the usefulness of these multicultural counseling, cross cultural, and/or diversity-related classes to your current work as a career counselor?
    a. Extremely useful
    b. Very useful
    c. Moderately useful
    d. Slightly useful
    e. Not at all useful
    f. Not applicable

17. How many hours of multicultural counseling, cross cultural, and/or diversity-related training have you received in addition to your coursework (e.g. workshops, continuing education)?

18. How do you perceive the helpfulness of the multicultural counseling, cross cultural, and/or diversity-related training you have received?
    a. Extremely helpful
    b. Very helpful
    c. Moderately helpful
    d. Slightly helpful
    e. Not at all helpful
    f. Not applicable

19. In the last year, what percentage of your clients were minority students (in terms of race/ethnicity, disability status, sexual orientation, and nation of origin)?

20. In the last year, what percentage of your clients were international students (i.e. students who are on a student visa)?

21. I have had successful experiences working with international students in career counseling.
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Somewhat agree
    c. Neither agree nor disagree
    d. Somewhat disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

22. When I work with international students in career counseling,
    a. I feel extremely anxious.
    b. I feel moderately anxious.
    c. I feel slightly anxious.
    d. I do not feel anxious.

23. It is important for me to be able to effectively help international students in career counseling.
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Somewhat agree
    c. Neither agree nor disagree
    d. Somewhat disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

24. I perceive my work environment and colleagues as supportive.
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Somewhat agree
    c. Neither agree nor disagree
    d. Somewhat disagree

e. Strongly disagree

25. When I have questions about how to best assist an international student client, there are people or departments that I can seek consultation from.
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Somewhat agree
    c. Neither agree nor disagree
    d. Somewhat disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

26. If applicable, please list departments or offices where you seek consultation about international student questions (e.g., other career counseling colleagues; supervisor; International Student Services office on campus).
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Somewhat agree
    c. Neither agree nor disagree
    d. Somewhat disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

APPENDIX E

CAREER COUNSELOR SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

Below is a list of activities regarding counseling. Indicate your confidence in your current ability to perform each activity according to the scale defined below. Please answer each item based on how you **currently** feel now about working with **international student clients**, not on your anticipated (or previous) ability.

	Not Confident	Slightly Confident	Moderately Confident	Very Confident	Highly Confident
1. Select an instrument to clarify a career client's abilities.	○	○	○	○	○
2. Provide support for a client's implementation of his/her career goals.	○	○	○	○	○
3. Assist a client in understanding how his/her non-work life (e.g., family leisure, interests, etc.) affects career decisions.	○	○	○	○	○
4. Understand special issues related to gender in career decision-making.	○	○	○	○	○
5. Develop a therapeutic relationship with a career client.	○	○	○	○	○
6. Select an instrument to clarify aspects of a career client's personality which may influence career planning.	○	○	○	○	○
7. Explain assessment results to a career client.	○	○	○	○	○
8. Terminate counseling with a career client in an effective manner.	○	○	○	○	○
9. Understand special issues related to ethnicity in the workplace.	○	○	○	○	○
10. Understand the special issues that lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients may have in career decision-making.	○	○	○	○	○

	Not Confident	Slightly Confident	Moderately Confident	Very Confident	Highly Confident
11. Provide knowledge of local and national job market information and trends.	○	○	○	○	○
12. Choose assessment inventories for a career client which are appropriate for the client's gender, age, education, and cultural background.	○	○	○	○	○
13. Assist the career client in modulating feelings about the career decision-making process.	○	○	○	○	○
14. Apply knowledge about current ethical and legal issues which may affect the career counseling process.	○	○	○	○	○
15. Understand special issues present for lesbian, gay, and bisexual clients in the workplace.	○	○	○	○	○
16. Communicate unconditional acceptance to a career client.	○	○	○	○	○
17. Select an instrument to assess a career client's interests.	○	○	○	○	○
18. Select an instrument to clarify a career client's values.	○	○	○	○	○
19. Understand special issues related to gender in the workplace.	○	○	○	○	○
20. Understand special issues related to ethnicity in career decision-making.	○	○	○	○	○

	Not Confident	Slightly Confident	Moderately Confident	Very Confident	Highly Confident
21. Listen carefully to concerns presented by a career client.	○	○	○	○	○
22. Synthesize information about self and career so that a career client's problems seem understandable.	○	○	○	○	○
23. Help a career client identify internal and external barriers that might interfere with reaching his/her career goals.	○	○	○	○	○
24. Use current research findings to intervene effectively with a career client.	○	○	○	○	○
25. Be empathetic toward a career client when the client refuses to accept responsibility for making decisions about his/her career decision.	○	○	○	○	○

APPENDIX F

MULTCULTURAL COMPETENCE IVENTORY

The following statements cover counseling practices in multicultural counseling. Indicate how accurately each statement describes you as a counselor, psychologist, or student in a mental health training program when working in a multicultural counseling situation. Give ratings that you actually believe to be true rather than those that you wish were true.

Currently, when working with minority clients,

	Very Inaccurate	Somewhat Inaccurate	Somewhat Accurate	Very Accurate
1. I perceive that my race causes clients to mistrust me.	○	○	○	○
2. I have feelings of overcompensation, over-solicitation, and guilt that I do not have when working with majority clients.	○	○	○	○
3. I am confident that my conceptualization of client problems does not consist of stereotypes and value-oriented biases.	○	○	○	○
4. I find that differences between my worldviews and those of the clients impede the counseling process.	○	○	○	○
5. I have difficulties communicating with clients who use a perceptual, reasoning, or decision-making style that is different from mine.	○	○	○	○
6. I include the facts of age, gender roles, and socioeconomic status in my understanding of different minority cultures.	○	○	○	○
7. I use innovative concepts and treatment methods.	○	○	○	○
8. I manifest an outlook on life that is best described as "world-minded" or pluralistic.	○	○	○	○
9. I examine my cultural biases.	○	○	○	○
10. I tend to compare client behaviors with those of the majority group.	○	○	○	○

	Very Inaccurate	Somewhat Inaccurate	Somewhat Accurate	Very Accurate
11. I keep in mind research findings about minority clients' preferences in counseling.	○	○	○	○
12. I know what the changing practices, views, and interests of people are at the present time.	○	○	○	○
13. I consider the range of behaviors, values, and individual differences within a minority group	○	○	○	○
14. I make referrals or seek consultations based on the clients minority identity development.	○	○	○	○
15. I feel my confidence is shaken by the self-examination of my personal limitations.	○	○	○	○
16. I monitor and correct my defensiveness (e.g., anxiety, denial, anger, fear, minimizing, overconfidence).	○	○	○	○
17. I apply the sociopolitical history of the clients' respective minority groups to understand them better.	○	○	○	○
18. I am successful at seeing 50% of the clients more than once, not including intake.	○	○	○	○
19. I experience discomfort because of the clients' different physical appearance, color, dress, or socioeconomic status.	○	○	○	○
20. I am able to quickly recognize and recover from cultural mistakes or misunderstandings.	○	○	○	○

	Very Inaccurate	Somewhat Inaccurate	Somewhat Accurate	Very Accurate
21. I use several methods of assessment (including free response questions, observations, and varied sources of information and excluding standardized tests).	○	○	○	○
22. I have experience at solving problems in unfamiliar settings.	○	○	○	○
23. I learn about clients' different ways of acculturation to the dominant society to understand the clients better.	○	○	○	○
24. I understand my own philosophical preferences.	○	○	○	○
25. I have a working understanding of certain cultures (including African American, Native American, Hispanic, Asian American, new immigrants from developing countries, and international students).	○	○	○	○
26. I am able to distinguish between those who need brief, problem-solving, structured therapy and those who need long-term, process-oriented, unstructured therapy.	○	○	○	○
27. When working with international students or immigrants, I understand the importance of legalities of visa, passport, green card, and naturalization.	○	○	○	○
28. My professional or collegial interactions with minority individuals are extensive.	○	○	○	○
29. In the past year, I have had a 50% increase in my multicultural case load.	○	○	○	○
30. I enjoy multicultural interactions as much as interactions with people of my own culture.	○	○	○	○

	Very Inaccurate	Somewhat Inaccurate	Somewhat Accurate	Very Accurate
31. I am involved in advocacy efforts against institutional barriers in mental health services for minority clients (e.g., lack of bilingual staff, multiculturally skilled counselors, racial and ethnic minority counselors, minority professional leadership, and outpatient counseling facilities).	○	○	○	○
32. I am familiar with nonstandard English.	○	○	○	○
33. My life experiences with minority individuals are extensive (e.g., via ethnically integrated neighborhoods, marriage, and friendship).	○	○	○	○
34. In order to be able to work with minority clients, I frequently seek consultation with multicultural experts and attend multicultural workshops or training sessions.	○	○	○	○
35. I am effective at crisis interventions (e.g., suicide attempt, tragedy, broken relationship).	○	○	○	○
36. I use varied counseling techniques and skills.	○	○	○	○
37. I am able to be concise and to the point when reflecting, clarifying, and probing.	○	○	○	○
38. I am comfortable with exploring sexual issues.	○	○	○	○
39. I am skilled at getting a client to be specific in defining and clarifying problems.	○	○	○	○
40. I make my nonverbal and verbal responses congruent.	○	○	○	○

REFERENCES

Abreu, J. M., & Atkinson, D. R. (2000). Multicultural counseling training: Past, present, and future directions. *Counseling Psychologist, 28*, 641-656.

Adams, B. A. (2013). *Self-efficacy in mental health workers: The mediating effects of experience and education.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3691464).

Altbach, P., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. (2009). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution.* Paris, France: United Nations of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Press.

Altmaier, E. M. (2003). Multicultural competence and accreditation in professional psychology. In D. B. Pope-Davis, H. L. Coleman, W. M. Liu, & R. L. Toporek (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural competence in counseling and psychology* (pp. 304-313). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Alvarez, A. (1995). Perceptions of fraudulence, counseling self-efficacy, and satisfaction with work. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 56*, 2851.

American Counseling Association. (2014). *ACA Code of Ethics*. Retrieved from http://www.counseling.org/docs/ethics/2014-aca-code-of-ethics.pdf?sfvrsn=4

American Psychological Association (APA). (1997). *Guidelines and principles for accreditation of programs in professional psychology*. Washington, DC: Author.

American Psychological Association (APA). (2003). Guidelines on multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists. *American Psychologist, 58,* 377–402

Arredondo, P. (2003). Evolution of the multicultural counseling competencies: Background and context. In G. Roysircar, P. Arredondo, J. N. Fuertes, J.G. Ponterotto, & R. L. Toporek (Eds.), *Multicultural counseling competencies 2003: Association for multicultural counseling and development* (pp. 1-16). Alexandria, VA: ACA Press.

Arthur, N., & Popadiuk, N. (2010). A cultural formulation approach to career counseling

with international students. *Journal of Career Development, 37*, 423-440.

Bandura, A. (1962). Social learning through imitation. In M. R. Jones (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium of motivation* (pp. 211-269). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*, 191-215. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanisms and human agency. *American Psychologist, 37,* 122-147.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1989). Regulation of cognitive processes through perceived self-efficacy. *Developmental Psychology, 25,* 729-735.

Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in changing societies.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

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

Barbee, P. W., Scherer, D., & Combs, D. C. (2003). Prepracticum service learning: Examining the relationship with counselor self-efficacy and anxiety. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 43,* 108-119.

Bartram, B. (2008). Supporting international students in higher education: Constructions, cultures and clashes. *Teaching in Higher Education, 13*, 657-668.

Beck, S. C. (2001). Multicultural counseling competence as a function of multicultural counseling training in doctoral counseling psychology programs. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3061750).

Betz, N. E., & Hackett, G. (1981). The relationship of career-related self-efficacy expectations to perceived career options in college women and men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28*, 399-410. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.28.5.399

Beverage, P. L. (1991, March). The relationship of evaluation in counseling supervision and counselor self-efficacy. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 51*, 2982.

Bhandari, R., & Chow, P. (2007). *Open Doors 2007: Report on International Educational Exchange.* New York: Institute of International Education.

Bikos, L., & Furry, T. (1999). The job search club for international students: An evaluation. *The Career Development Quarterly, 48*, 31-44.

Blustein, D. (2001). Extending the reach of vocational psychology: Toward an inclusive and integrative psychology of working. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59*, 171-182.

Byars-Winston, A. M., & Fouad, N. A. (2006). Metacognition and multicultural competence: Expanding the culturally appropriate career counseling model. *The Career Development Quarterly, 54*, 187-201.

Castillo, L. G., Brossart, D. F., Reyes, C. J., Conoley, C. W., & Phoummarath, M. J. (2007). The influence of multicultural training on perceived multicultural counseling competencies and implicit racial prejudice. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 35,* 243-254.

Cates, J. T. (2006). *The effects of infusing multicultural training into counseling practicum on trainees' self-perceived multicultural counseling competence*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3210947).

Chao, R. C. (2012). Racial/ethnic identity, gender-role attitudes, and multicultural counseling competence: The role of multicultural counseling training. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 90,* 35-44.

Coleman, H. L. K., & Hau, J. M. (2003). Multicultural counseling competency and portfolios. In D. B. Pope-Davis, H. L. Coleman, W. M. Liu, & R. L. Toporek (Eds.). *Handbook of Multicultural Competence in Counseling and Psychology.* (pp. 304-313). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*, 155-159.

Constantine, M. G. (2002). Predictors of satisfaction with counseling: Racial and ethnic minority clients' attitudes toward counseling and ratings of their counselors' general and multicultural counseling competence. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 49*, 255-26.

Constantine, M. G., & Ladany, N. (2000). Self-report multicultural counseling competence scales: Their relations to social desirability attitudes and multicultural case conceptualization ability. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47,* 155–164. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.47.2.155

Constantine, M. G., Okazaki, S., & Utsey, S. O. (2004). Self-concealment, social self-efficacy, acculturative stress, and depression in African, Asian, and Latino international college students. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 74*, 230-241.

Constantine, M. G., Anderson, G. M., Berkel, L. A., Caldwell, L. D., & Utsey, S. O. (2005). Examining the cultural adjustment experiences of African international college students: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*,

57-66.

Council of Graduate Schools. (2014). *Findings from the 2014 CGS international graduate admissions survey.* Washington, DC: Author.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2017). *Accredited Career Programs*. Retrieved from Http://www.cacrep.org/directory/?state=&dl%5B%5D=M&pt_id=19&pc_logic=any&accr_status%5B%5D=A&accr_status%5B%5D=PA&accr_status%5B%5D=IP&keywords=&submitthis=

Crockett, S. A., & Hays, D. G. (2011). Understanding and responding to the career counseling needs of international college students on U.S. campuses. *Journal of College Counseling, 14*, 65-79. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1882.2011.tb00064.x

Cumming-McCann, A. A. (1999). *Multicultural counseling competencies and racial identity development of practicing vocational rehabilitation counselors.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from the ProQuest Thesis and Dissertation Database. (UMI No. AAT 9939757).

Daniels, J. (1997). The influence of performance feedback and causal attributions upon ratings of counseling self-efficacy. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A,* 2068.

D'Andrea, M., Daniels, J., & Heck, R. (1991). Evaluating the impact of multicultural counseling training. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70,* 143-150.

De Graaf, R. V. (1996). Counselor self-efficacy development: An examination over time of the influence of trainee exposure to clients, negative affectivity and the supervisory alliance. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 57,* 2147.

Efstation, J. F., Patton, M. J., & Kardash, C. M. (1990). Measuring the working alliance in counselor supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37*, 322-329. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.37.3.322

Evans, K. M., & Larrabee, M. J. (2002). Teaching the multicultural counseling competencies and revised career counseling competencies simultaneously. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 30,* 21-33.

Flores, L. Y., & Heppner, M. J. (2002). Multicultural career counseling: Ten essentials for training. *Journal of Career Development, 28*, 181- 202.

Flores, L. Y., & Bike, D. H. (2014). Multicultural career counseling. In F.T.L. Leong (ed.), *APA handbook of multicultural psychology.* (Vol. 2, pp. 403-416).

Fouad, N. A., & Bingham, R. (1995). Career counseling with racial/ethnic minorities. In W. B. Walsh & S. H. Osipow (Eds.), *Handbook of vocational psychology* (pp. 331-366). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Fouad, N. A., & Byars-Winston, A. M. (2005). Cultural context of career choice: Meta-analysis of race/ethnicity differences. *The Career Development Quarterly, 53*, 223-233.

Gilliamm, K. A. (2012). *Effects of professional socialization factors on career counseling self-efficacy and interest* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Thesis database. (UMI No. 3554317).

Grimm, L. G., & Yarnold, P. R. (1995). *Reading and understanding multivariate statistics.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Gordillo, F. A. (2015). *The influence of counselor demographics, work experience, and training on counselor self-efficacy and multicultural counseling self-efficacy among urban school counselors.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Thesis database. (UMI No. 3681192).

Hanassab, S., & Tidwell, R. (2002). International students in higher education: Identification of needs and implications for policy and practice. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 6*, 305-322.

Havens, M. C. (2003). *Mental health counselor's self-efficacy and the relationship to multicultural counseling competency*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Thesis database. (UMI No. 3098427).

Heppner, M. J., & Heppner, J. J. (2003). Identifying process variables in career counseling: A research agenda. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 62,* 429-452.

Heppner, M. J., Multon, K. D., Gysbers, N. C., Ellis, C. A., & Zook, C. E. (1998). The relationship of trainee self-efficacy to the process and outcome of career counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45*, 393- 402.

Heppner, M. J., O'Brien, K. M., Hinkleman, J. M., & Flores, L. Y. (1996). Training counseling psychologists in career development: Are we our own worst enemies? *The Counseling Psychologist, 24,* 105-125.

HoIcomb-McCoy, C. C. (2000). Multicultural counseling competencies: An exploratory factor analysis. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 28*, 83-97.

Holcomb-McCoy, C., Harris, P., Hines, E. M., & Johnston, G. (2008). School counselors' multicultural self-efficacy: A preliminary investigation. *Professional School Counseling, 11*, 166-178. doi:10.5330/PSC.n.2010-11.166

Hunt, L. (2004). Using the Multicultural Counseling Inventory (MCI) to assess multicultural counseling competence: A review of the literature. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from the ProQuest Thesis and Dissertation Database. (UMI No. 3148985).

Huey, S. J., Tilley, J. L., Jones, E. O., & Smith, C. A. (2014). The contribution of cultural competence to evidence-based care for ethnically diverse populations. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 10,* 305-338.

Iannelli, R. J. (2000). *A structural equation modeling examination of the relationship between counseling self-efficacy, counseling outcome expectations, and counselor performance.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Thesis database. (UMI No. 9988728).

Institute of International Education. (2015). *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. Retrieved from http://www.iie.org/Research-and-Publications/Open-Doors

International Student Work Group (2014). *Resources for Partnering with International students.* Retrieved from http://ncda.org/aws/NCDA/asset_manager/get_file/64588/resources_for_partnering_with_international_students.pdf

Ishii, H., Olguin, D. L., & Keim, J. (2009). Career assessment with international students: International Student Card Sort (ISCS). In G. R. Walz, J. C. Bleuer, & R. K. Yep (Eds.), *Compelling counseling interventions: VISTAS 2009* (pp. 1-10). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Johnson, A., & Williams, D. J. (2015). White racial identity, color-blind racial attitudes, and multicultural counseling competence. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 21*, 440-449.

Johnson, E., & Seems, S. R. (1989, August). *Supervisory style and the development of self-efficacy in counseling training.* Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans.

Kirk, R. E. (2008). *Statistics: An introduction* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Kocarek, C. E. (2001). Understanding the relationships among counseling self-efficacy, anxiety, developmental level, coursework, experience, and counselor performance. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Thesis Database. (UMI No. 3020231).

Kogut, E. (2016). Adult attachment styles, self-efficacy, and causal attributional style for achievement-related failures. *Learning and Individual Differences, 50,* 64-72.

Kostareva, O. (2006). *U.S. American students' experience with and orientation toward international diversity in a Midwestern comprehensive university setting.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Thesis database. (UMI No.3244760).

Larson, L. M. (1998). The social cognitive model of counselor training. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26*, 219-273. doi:10.1177/0011000098262002

Larson, L. M., Cardwell, T. R., & Majors, M. S. (1996). Counselor burnout investigated in the context of social cognitive theory. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association National Convention, Toronto, Canada.

Larson, L. M., & Daniels, J. A. (1998). Review of the counseling self-efficacy literature. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26*, 179-218. doi:10.1177/0011000098262001

Larson, L. M., Suzuki, L. A., Gillespie, K. N., Potenza, M. T., Bechtel, M. A., & Toulouse, A. L. (1992). Development and validation of the Counseling Self-Estimate Inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 39*, 105-120. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.39.1.105

Leach, M. M., Stoltenberg, C. D., McNeill, B. W., & Eichenfield, G. A. (1997). Self-efficacy and counselor development: Testing the integrated developmental model. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 37*, 11-35.

Le, T., & Gardner, S. (2010). Understanding the doctoral experience of Asian international students in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields: An exploration of one institutional context. *Journal of College Student Development, 51*, 252-264.

Lee, M. E., Abd-Ella, M., & Burks, L. (1981). *Needs of foreign students from developing nations at U.S. colleges and universities.* Washington, DC: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D, & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a unifying social cognitive theory of career and academic interest, choice, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 45*, 79-122.

Lent, R. W., Cinamon, R. G., Bryan, N. E., Jezzi, M. M., Martin, H. M., & Lim, R. (2009). Perceived sources of change in trainees' self-efficacy beliefs. *Psychotherapy Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 46,* 317-327.

Lent, R. W., Hackett, G., & Brown. S. D. (1998). Extending social cognitive theory to counselor training: Problems and prospects. *The Counseling Psychologist, 26*, 295-306.

Lent, R. W., Hill, C. E., & Hoffman, M. A. (2003). Development and validation of the

counselor activity self-efficacy scales. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*, 97-108.

Lent, R. W., Hoffman, M. A., Hill, C. E., Treistman, D., Mount, M., & Singley, D. (2006). Client-specific counselor self-efficacy in novice counselors: Relation to perceptions of session quality. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*, 453-463.

Lent, R. W., & Maddux, J. E. (1997). Self-efficacy: Building a sociocognitive bridge between social and counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist. 25,* 240-255.

Lewin, T. (2012). Taking more seats on campus, foreigners also pay the freight. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/05/education/international-students-pay-top-dollar-at-us-colleges.html?pagewanted=all&_r=1

Li, G., Chen, W., & Duanmu, J. (2010). Determinants of international students' academic performance: A comparison between Chinese and other international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 14,* 389-405.

Logan, J. D. (2015). The relationship among counseling supervision satisfaction, counselor self-efficacy, working alliance and multicultural factors. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 76,* (2-A)(E).

Lopez, A. E. (2002). Factors influencing career decision-making and post-secondary career choices of a cohort group of female Cuban immigrants. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 62,* 4088.

Manese, J. E. (2001). The effect of training on multicultural counseling competencies: An exploratory study over a ten year period. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*, 31-41.

Martin, W. E., Easton, C., Wilson, S., Takemoto, M., & Sullivan, S. (2004). Salience of emotional intelligence as a core characteristic of being a counselor. *Counselor Education & Supervision. 44*, 17-30.

Melchert, T. P., Hays, V. L., Wiljanen, L. M., & Kolocek, A. K. (1996). Testing models of counselor development with a measure of counseling self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 74*, 640-644. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1996.tb02304.x

Menapace, B. R. (1998). *Correlates of effectiveness for White psychotherapists working with African-American clients: Multicultural competence, clinical experience, racial consciousness, multicultural training, and social experience. (*Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from the ProQuest Thesis and Dissertation Database. (UMI No. AAT 9807477).

Meyer, R. L. (2012). *Predictors of counselor self-efficacy among Master's level counselor trainees: Impact of cohort versus non-cohort educational programs.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Thesis database. (UMI No. 3531646)

Mori, S. (2000). Addressing the mental health concerns of international students. *Journal of Counselig and Development, 78*, 137-144.

Munson, W. W., Stadulis, R. E., & Munson, D. G. (1986). Enhancing competence and self-efficacy of potential therapeutic recreators in decision making counseling. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal, 20*, 85-93

National Association of Colleges and Employers. (2011). *Job outlook 2012*. Bethlehem, PA: Author.

National Career Counseling Association. (2009). *Career Counseling Competencies.* Retrieved from http://www.ncda.org/aws/NCDA/pt/sd/news_article/37798/_self/layout_ccmsearch/true

National Career Development Association. (1985). Vocational and career counseling competencies. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 34*, 131-134

O'Brien, K. M., & Heppner, M. J. (1996). Applying social cognitive career theory to training career counselors. *Career Development Quarterly, 44*, 367-377.

O'Brien, K. M., Heppner, M. J., Flores, L. Y., & Bikos, L. H. (1997). The career counseling self-efficacy scale: Instrument development and training applications. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44,* 20-31. Doi:0022-0167/97

Obst, D., & Forster, J. (2007). *Perceptions of European higher education in third countries: Country report: USA.* New York, NY: Institute of International Education.

Olivas, M., & Li, C. (2006). Understanding stressors of international students in higher education: What college counselors and personnel need to know. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 33*, 217-222.

Orlinsky, D. E., Grawe, L., & Parks, B. K. (1994). Process and outcome in psychotherapy. In A. E. Bergin & S. L. Garfield (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change* (pp. 270-376). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Ottavi, T. M., Pope-Davis, D. B., & Dings, J. (1994). Relationship between White racial identity attitudes and self-reported multicultural counseling competencies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41,* 149–154. doi: 10.1037/0022-

0167.41.2.149

Parr, G., Bradley, L., & Bingi, R. (1992). Concerns and feelings of international students. *Journal of College Student Development, 33*, 20-25.

Pederson, P. B. (1991). Multiculturalism as a generic approach to counseling. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70*, 7-12.

Ponterroto, J. G., Rieger, B. T., Barrett, A., Harris, G., Sparks, R., Sanchez, C. M., & Magids, D. (1996). Development and initial validation of the multicultural counseling awareness scale. In G. R Sodowsky & J. C. Impara (Eds.), *Multicultural assessment in counseling and clinical psychology* (pp. 247-282). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurement.

Popadiuk, N., & Arthur, N. (2014). Key relationships for international student university-to-work transitions. *Journal of Career Development, 41*, 122-140.

Pope, M., Cheng, W. D., & Leong, F. T. L. (1998). The case of Chou: The inextricability of career to personal and social issues in a multicultural context. *Journal of Career Development, 25,* 53–64.

Pope-Davis, D. B. & Ottavi, T. M. (1994). Examining the association between self-reported multicultural counseling competencies and demographic and educational variables among counselors. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 72*, 651-654.

Pope-Davis, D. B., Reynolds, A. L., Dings, J. G. & Nielson, D. (1995). Examining multicultural counseling competencies of graduate students in psychology. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 26,* 322-329.

Potenza, M. T. (1990). *The impact of experience, supervision, and educational degree on counselor perceptions of self-efficacy.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska.

Rabaino, A. (2015). *Counseling expertise development and healthy personal development predictors of counseling self-efficacy among counselors-in-training*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Thesis database. (UMI No. 3722073).

Rawls, G. J. (2009). Research self-efficacy and research mentoring experiences as predictors of occupational commitment in counselor education doctoral students. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 69,* 4642.

Reynolds, A. L., & Constantine, M. G. (2007). Cultural adjustment difficulties and career development of international college students. *Journal of Career Assessment, 15*, 338-350. doi:10.1177/1069072707301218

Rienties, B., Beausaert, S., Grohnert, T., Niemantsverdriet, S. & Kommers, P. (2012). Understanding academic performance of international students: the role of ethnicity, academic and social integration. *Higher Education, 63*, 685-700.

Robinson, T. L., & Ginter, E. J. (Eds.). (1999). Racism: Healing its effects. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 77*, 1-111.

Rodrigues, C. A. (2005). Culture as a determinant of the importance level business students place on ten teaching/learning techniques – A survey of university students. *The Journal of Management Development, 24*, pp. 608- 621.

Ruiz, J. M., Gallardo, M. E., & Delgado-Romero, E. A. (2013). Latinas/os and immigration reform: A commentary to "Crossroads: The psychology of immigration in the new century" - The report of the APA Presidential Task Force on Immigration. *Journal of Latina/o Psychology, 1*, 149–154.

Rush, L. C. (2010). *The needed development of multicultural career counseling skills: If not now when? If not sure who?* Retrieved from http://www.counseling.org/docs/default-source/vistas/the-needed-development-of-multicultural-career-counseling-skills-if-not-now-when-if-not-us-who.pdf

Schaub, M. (2012). The profession of college career services delivery: What college counselors should know about career centers. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 26*, 201-215. doi:10.1080/87568225.2012.685854

Schwarz, G. L. (2016). *The relationship of supervision variables to counseling self-efficacy and outcome expectations among practicing psychologists.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation and Thesis database. (UMI No. 10162890).

Sesco, C. (2014). Torn in two: An examination of elementary school counselors' perceptions on self-efficacy. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 75*, (3-A)(E).

Shen, Y., & Herr, E. L. (2004). Career placement concerns of international graduate students: A qualitative study. *Journal of Career Development, 31*, 15-29.

Sherry, M., Thomas, P., & Chui, W. H. (2010). International students: A vulnerable student population. *Higher Education, 60*, 33-46.

Siaya, L., & Hayward, F. (2003). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses: Final report (2003).* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Singaravelu, H., White, L., & Bringaze, T. (2005). Factors influencing international students' career choice: A comparative study. *Journal of Career Development, 32*, 46-59.

Sipps, G. J., Sugden, G. J., & Faiver, C. M. (1988). Counselor training level and verbal response type: Their relationship to efficacy and outcome expectations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 35*, 397-401. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.35.4.397

Sodowsky. G. R. (1996). The Multicultural Counseling Inventory: Validity and applications in multicultural training. In G. R. Sodowsky & J. C. Impara, (Eds.), *Multicultural assessment in Counseling and Clinical Psychology* (pp. 283-324). Lincoln, NE: Buroso Institute of Mental Measurements.

Sodowsky, G. R., & Lai, E. M. W. (1997). Asian immigrant variables and structural models of crosscultural distress. In A. Booth, A. C. Crouter, & N. Landale (Eds.), *Immigration and the family: Research and policy on U.S. immigrants* (pp. 211–234). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sodowsky, G. R., Taffe, R. C., Gutkin, T., & Wise, S. L. (1994). Development of the Multicultural Counseling Inventory: A self-report measure of multicultural competencies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41,* 137-148.

Soresi, S., Nota, L., & Lent R. (2004). Relation of type and amount of training to career counseling self-efficacy in Italy. *The Career Development Quarterly, 52*, 194-201.

Spencer-Rodgers, J. (2001). Consensual and individual stereotypic beliefs about international students among American host nationals. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 25,* 639-657.

Spencer-Rodgers, J. (2000). The vocational situation and country of orientation of international students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling And Development, 28*, 32-49. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1912.2000.tb00226.x

Spencer-Rogers, J., & Cortijo, A. (1998). An assessment of the career development needs of international students. *Journal of College Student Development, 39,* 509-513.

Sue, D. W., Arredondo P., & McDavis, R. J. (1992). Multicultural competencies and standards: A call to the professional. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70,* 77-486.

Sue, D. W., Bernier, J. B., Durran, M., Feinberg, L., Pederson, P., & Vasquez-Nuttall, E. (1982). Position paper: Cross-cultural counseling competencies. *The Counseling Psychologist, 10*, 45–52.

Sue, D. W., Carter, R. T., Casas, J. M., Fouad, N. A., Ivey, A. E., Jensen, M., … Vasquez-Nuttall, E. (1998). *Multicultural counseling competencies: Individual and organizational development.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2008). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (5th

ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2013). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (6th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Sumer, S., Poyrazli, S., & Grahame, K. (2008). Predictors of depression and anxiety among international students. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 86,* 429-437.

Sutton, J. M., & Fall, M. (1995). The relationship of school climate factors to counselor self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 73*, 331-336. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1995.tb01759.x

Swanson, J. L. (1993). Integrating a multicultural perspective into training for career counseling: Programmatic and individual interventions. *The Career Development Quarterly, 42*, 41-49.

Tang, M., Addison, K. D., LaSure-Bryant, D., Norman. R., O'Connell, W., & Stewart-Sicking, J. A. (2004). Factors that influence self-efficacy of counseling students: An exploratory study. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 44*, 70- 80.

Tang, M., Fouad, N. A., & Smith, P. L. (1999). Asian Americans' career choices: A path model to examine factors influencing their career choices. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 54*, 142-157.

Tardar, S. (2005). Classroom participation by international students: The case of Turkish graduate students. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 9*, 337-355.

Tidwell, R., & Hanassab, S. (2007). New challenges for professional counselors: The higher education international student population. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly, 20*, 313-324.

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 Ethnic Minority Psychology, 11*, 259-271. doi:10.1037/1099-9809.11.3.259

Urban, E., & Orbe, M. P. (2007). "The syndrome of the boiled frog:" Exploring international students on U.S. campuses as co-cultural group members. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 36*, 117-138.

Urban, E. L. (2012). *Values of U.S. higher education for international students in the context of higher education internalization*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation Database. (UMI No. 3536231).

Vera, E. M., & Speight, S. L. (2003). Multicultural competence, social justice, and

ounseling psychology: Expanding our roles. *The Counseling Psychologist, 31*, 253-272.

Vespia, K. M., Fitzpatrick, M. E., Fouad, N. A., Kantamneni, N., & Chen Y. L. (2010). Multicultural career counseling: A national survey of competencies and practices. *The Career Development Quarterly, 59*, 54- 71.

Walters, K., & Wheeler, D. P. (2000). Assessment of multicultural competence scales for social work practitioners. *Practice and Research, 1,* 12-16.

Ward, C. (2001). *The impact of international students on domestic students and host institutions: A literature review.* Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University of Wellington.

Ward, C. M., & Bingham, R. P. (1993). Career assessment of ethnic minority women. *Journal of Career Assessment, 1,* 246-257

Watson, D. P. (1992). *Counseling self-efficacy and counseling competence: A comparative study of clergy and counselors in training*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertation Database. UMI No. 9314098

Wattles, J., & Kavilanz, P. (2017). *What Trump's recent H-1B move mean for workers and business.* Retrieved from http://money.cnn.com/2017/03/04/news/economy/h1b-visa-expedited-suspended-reaction

Yeh, J. C., & Inose, M. (2003). International students' reported English fluency, social support satisfaction, and social connectedness as predictors of acculturative stress. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly, 16*, 15-28.

Yoon, E., & Portman, T. (2004). Critical issues of literature on counseling international students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32*, 33-44.

Young, R. A., Marshall, S. K., & Valach, L. (2007) Making career theories more culturally sensitive. *The Career Development Quarterly, 56*, 4-18.

Zhao, Y., Jindal-Snape, D., Topping, K., & Todman, J. (2008). Theoretical models of culture shock and adaptation in international students in higher education. *Students in Higher Education, 33,* 63-75.