Student Programming in Social Justice: Evaluation through the Counselor's Lens

Roy H. Joy
Southern Illinois University Carbondale

Nicole L. Cundiff
University of Alaska Fairbanks

A social justice leadership program targeted at undergraduate and graduate students was evaluated through a university-based counselor's lens. Differences between social justice program participants and a comparison group of nonparticipating students were examined pre-and post-program intervention on measures of Ethnocultural Empathy, Agency, Understanding and Knowledge of social justice issues, and Personal and Professional Beliefs about diversity. No significant differences on any measures were found between the two groups at Time 1 assessment. Significant positive change was found on all measures for the social justice participant group at Time 2. Significant differences between the two groups at Time 2 were found on measures of Ethnocultural Empathy, Agency, Personal Beliefs, and Understanding and Knowledge. This type of "in-house" evaluation is demonstrated to show the application of viable consultation resources located within counseling centers in the academic setting, which could assist in the development and effectiveness of student programs. Providing such consultation services can help foster collaboration among professionals and units within the university and facilitate assessment and accountability for continued program development and administrative support.

University based counseling psychologists, in addition to providing mental health treatment services for psychological problems, can function as organizational consultants to the campus community (Cooper, 2003). Beyond offering more traditional forms of mental health consultation services, there is a growing interest in the role counseling centers can play in providing a broader variety of organizational consultation services to their community (Archer & Cooper, 1998; Cooper, 2003; Pace, Stamler & Yarris, 1996; Westbrook, Kandell, Kirkland, Phillips, Regan, Medvene, & Oslin, 1993). Cooper (2003) proposed a model that counseling center psychologists could serve as internal organizational consultants, through the following typology: education/training, program, doctor-patient, and process (see also Dougherty, 2000). Out of these four approaches, Cooper (2003) describes

program consultation as when "the consultant assists the organization with a program, particularly through helping them to develop evaluation methods" (p. 233). This component aligns the internal organizational consultant's role with that of a program evaluator.

In this article, we first describe the knowledge and skills of the typical university-based psychologist that relates to organizational consulting. Counselors with these skills can often provide program evaluation services. Then, we will discuss specific activities that organizational consultants participate in when serving as program evaluators. Finally, the process and results of a program evaluation will be reported, describing the development of a Social Justice Leadership Institute (SJLI) at a major Midwestern university. The findings from this evaluation can be used as a resource for counselors interested in organizational consulting.

Internal Consultation

Although our knowledge and training as psychologists often make us well-suited to function as program evaluators (Hadley & Mitchell, 1995), it is uncommon for university counseling center psychologists who provide consultation services to function as evaluators of programs outside of their own agency. However, when functioning as an organizational consultant within the university community, the ability to provide program evaluation services can be a valuable tool in the consultant's tool kit. Through the provision of program consultation services, a university-based psychologist can utilize skills in organizational consulting and evaluation research methodologies to assess and provide feedback for enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of university-based programs.

Counseling psychologists trained in providing organizational consultation services have the process skills needed to help people communicate their aims and goals for their program, discuss their feelings and fears about its evaluation, and engage in the kind of collaborative relationship that is beneficial to the consulting process. Furthermore, having knowledge in the use of scientific methodology and research design, instrument development and measurement, data analysis, and data interpretation skills gives the consultant the technical foundation necessary for conducting program evaluations.

There are important skills needed by the consultant to be effective in carrying out program evaluation activities. First, the consultant must understand the purpose of the evaluation and be knowledgeable of the sequencing of activities involved in conducting a program evaluation. Second, strong evaluation design and data analysis skills—knowing how to identify and evaluate assessment instruments that are relevant to the evaluation, the ability to develop new measures that are both reliable and valid, and being able to recognize and minimize various sources of invalidity—are necessary skills for providing dependable information about a program and its effects. Third, the consultant needs to have good listening, communication, and interpersonal skills, strong writing and presentation skills, and the ability to work effectively with both individuals and small groups. This means that the consultant serving as a program evaluator must, at times, be task oriented—designing evaluation procedures, finding and/or designing instruments, identifying adequate controls, planning statistical analyses, as well as being people oriented—listening to and communicating with staff, facilitating discussion about the focus, aims, and goals of the program, and identifying resources and other information needed to carry

out the evaluation. Finally, the consultant needs to become familiar with the workings of the program being evaluated (Matuzsek, 1981).

Program evaluation is usually undertaken to determine the impact of a program in order to provide information for improving decision making about the program's development, to enhance the effectiveness and impact of the program, and to document accountability for administrative support (Matuszek, 1981; Schuh & Upcraft, 2000; Shadish, Cook, & Leviton, 1991). The methodology used in evaluation, with emphasis on sound research design and evaluation techniques, allows a consultant to provide feedback about a program that is needed for making such important decisions.

Program Evaluation

The basic purpose of consulting in program evaluation is to provide information that helps improve the performance and functioning of the service program being evaluated (Hadley & Mitchell, 1995; Matuszek, 1981). When counseling center psychologists serve as evaluators of programs within the larger university community, they are considered internal organizational consultants (Cooper, 2003). When serving in the role of internal consultant, one must be sensitive to how involvement within the larger university organization and with members of the program may affect the consulting process. Although being a member of the organization need not limit the consultant's effectiveness in carrying out the consultation process, Dougherty (2000) warns that internal consultants should not let their roles and involvement within the organization limit objectivity when assessing a program's need for change.

A university's use of internal consultants to provide program evaluation services can have several advantages (Matuszek, 1981). For one, given the internal consultant's knowledge of the larger organization in which the program exists, there is increased likelihood that the recommendations that follow from the evaluation process may be a good fit with and actually benefit the program. Another advantage is that important decisions about changes to new or pre-existing programs can be guided by results from ongoing program evaluation inputs which typically would not be the case if an outside source were utilized. Furthermore, program evaluation results can provide a good starting point from which to discuss larger issues that program staff and/or university administrators need to address. By having evaluation data from which to provide input on decision making for improving program functioning, the internal consultant can be a strong advocate for positive changes within a program.

The steps that generally comprise a program evaluation sequence include making initial contact, designing a project plan, implementing the plan, analyzing data, interpreting the findings, and disseminating the results (Hadley & Mitchell, 1995; Matuszek, 1981). These activities typically take place within a larger program evaluation model. A simple yet useful model provided by Oetting (1977) is particularly appropriate for the consultant when program development is in its initial stages. Within this model, initial needs assessment leads into evaluation during the process of program development planning. The program evaluation plan is then carried out at the same time that the program is being implemented. The program evaluation results provide the feedback necessary to inform the needs assessment, changes in development and modification of the program, and improvements in plans for further evaluation.

Social Justice Leadership Institute

Several models for conceptualizing the development of social justice allies using a developmental focus have been proposed (Bishop, 2002; Hardiman & Jackson, 1992, 1997; Broido, 2000; Broido & Reason, 2005). Broido (2000) studied the development of social justice attitudes and actions among college students. Her findings suggested that self-understanding, acquiring information and knowledge about social justice issues, actively engaging and making meaning of this information, developing confidence in one's views and base of knowledge, learning skills necessary for working as allies, and having opportunities to engage in social justice ally roles were all necessary preconditions to social justice ally behavior. In discussing how college experiences influence the development of social justice attitudes, Broido and Reason (2005) point out that formal and informal interaction with diverse peers, courses and workshops that impart knowledge and allow for healthy dialogue and discussion, and strong, visible institutional support of diversity were all necessary precursors to developing social justice allies within academic settings.

Drawing from Broido's work (2000; Broido & Reason, 2005; Reason & Broido, 2005), the Social Justice Leadership Institute (SJLI) conceptualized the process of developing social justice allies to include fostering self-understanding to promote confidence and an ally identity, opportunities for interactions among a diverse group of peers, participating in educational and experiential learning workshops, and offering opportunities for involvement in social justice related activities. Additionally, the program drew from the intersectionality (Bowleg, 2008; Settles, 2006; Warner, 2008) and social privilege literatures (Black, Stone, Hutchinson, & Suarez, 2007; McIntosh, 2012; Wise, 2008), which are also considered to be important components for developing social justice allies.

SJLI Program Evaluation

The program evaluation model discussed above provided the framework used by a team of university-based, counseling center psychologists and interns to provide program evaluation services to the newly developing SJLI program run through the university's Office of Student Development. The SJLI program was a four-month, multifaceted experience that served to heighten participants' awareness, knowledge, and experiential understanding of how social institutions and systems that perpetuate power, privilege, and oppression create and maintain the various forms of social injustice. Prior to the consultants beginning to work with the SJLI program, staff from that office performed their own needs assessment in determining the absence of and need for training students to become informed advocates for social justice issues.

During initial contact, the consultants helped the program planning committee describe the questions to be addressed by the evaluation, define the information that was desired, and identify what information would be relevant to stakeholders of the program. The goal at initial contact was to help the committee identify the type of program evaluation desired, its focus, and for whom the results would be needed. As work among planning committee members progressed and more in-depth meetings were held, the goals and aims of the program became clearer and the general approach of the evaluation began to take shape. At this stage, the consultants were free to offer input, make suggestions and share ideas about the evaluation. However, the consultants did not take part in planning and designing the content of the program. Instead, the consultants'

goals were to help the committee take responsibility for formulating the program and give input into the evaluation.

During review meetings, the consultants also discussed how the data gathered from instruments and other forms of assessment could be used to answer questions about the program that were of interest to the planning committee and other stakeholders. Given that committee members came from different disciplines across campus with varying degrees of familiarity and experience with evaluation research, these discussions were essential to providing committee members with the information needed to be informed users of the evaluation's results.

Methods

Description of the Program

The SJLI co-curricular pilot program ran for nearly four months, from January through April 2010, covering an entire semester. To solicit student participation, the program was advertised two months prior to its start. Participants were students nominated by faculty, staff, or through self-nomination. After completing an application, a brief interview process was used to determine students' ability to participate in such an intensive co-curricular program. The goal was to select students that would stay highly involved, as attendance and commitment to each session was perceived as important to the program's success. A committee selected participants based on expressed commitment to the program, GPA, and past experiences engaging in leadership positions. A description of the program to applicants can be found in Appendix A.

Program Content

Through a series of interactive, educational workshops participants were challenged to examine how their personal experiences and social identities have been influenced by systems of oppression and privilege. The program was developed using theoretical background from the intersectionality (Bowleg, 2008; Settles, 2006; Warner, 2008), Broido's work (2000; Broido & Reason, 2005; Reason & Broido, 2005) on development of social justice attitudes, and social privilege literature (Black, et al., 2007; McIntosh, 2012; Wise, 2008). All workshops were developed and conducted by faculty recruited from the university because of their knowledge or expertise in these respective areas. The committee reviewed the workshops developed, and changes were made to ensure the content aligned with the goals of the program. A listing of the program components in consecutive order can be found in Appendix B. All program sessions took place on the campus in order to ensure easy access for the students.

Participant and Procedures

From the 85 students who applied, 50 were selected to participate in the program based on the previously mentioned qualifications. Program participants came from numerous academic majors and disciplines. They were divided into two cohort groups of 25 each, and each cohort was taken through the same series of sessions held on different days to accommodate schedules as attendance was strongly recommended.

An online survey was constructed in order to collect the evaluation data. The survey consisted of several pre-established scales and measures, as well as measures that were developed specifically

for this study. All elements of the study were submitted and approved by an IRB to ensure protections for human subjects. The measures included demographics, program expectations held by SJLI participants, knowledge and understanding of social justice related issues and concepts, perceived agency in matters of social justice, attitudes and beliefs about social justice and diversity issues, ethnocultural empathy, and social desirability.

For purposes of comparison, student-life resident advisors (SRAs) were emailed an invitation to participate in a research study to assess the attitudes non-participating students had towards various social groups. This group was selected as the comparison group due to similarity of attributes with the SJLI cohort. For instance, SRAs are leaders on campus (a requirement of the SJLI participants), as they are hired to supervise students on residence floors. Additionally, the SRAs participated in mandatory diversity training at this institution prior to the study, which aligned with most of the SJLI participants' experiences, as many have had direct diversity awareness training to some capacity. Having these experiences was necessary, as understanding and knowledge of diversity issues was an area of interest.

Thirty SRAs participated in the study by completing the online survey used for data collection. Demographics for each group can be found in Table 1. The two groups were highly similar in GPA, age, gender, non-traditional student status, and region in which they grew up. Both groups consisted of students from a variety of majors with no major concentration in any particular major. Out of both groups, the highest rated religion was Christianity (SJLI 58.1%; Comparison 68.6%) followed by not religious (SJLI 20.9%; Comparison 11.4%), and the majority of participants were heterosexual (SJLI 97.5%; Comparison 88.6%) and European American (SJLI 79.1%; Comparison 76.5%) followed by African American (SJLI 9.3%; Comparison 14.7%); the remaining percentage is categorized as other (SJLI 11.6%; Comparison 8.8%). As can be found in Table 1, there were only slight differences between the groups in ability, socio-economic status, academic level, and first-generation student status. In sum, the groups were similar and seemed to have had comparable experiences, allowing for additional investigation between the groups.

Table 1

Demographics of SJLI and Comparison Groups

Variable	SJLI	Comparison
N		
Pre	47	30
Post	40	23
Disability		
Yes	4.7%	16.6%
No	95.3%	83.3%
Academic		
Freshman	20.5%	0.0%
Sophomore	20.5%	28.6%
Junior	29.5%	40.0%
Senior	18.2%	31.4%
Graduate	11.4%	0.0%
First-generation		
Yes	62.8%	80.6%

Variable	SJLI	Comparison
No	37.2%	19.4%
Non-traditional Student		
Yes	11.9%	11.1%
No	88.1%	88.9%
GPA	3.5 (0.5)	3.4 (0.7)
Region		
Small town (<10,000)	37.2%	33.3%
Large town (>10,000)	62.8%	66.7%
SES		
Lower class	25.6%	17.1%
Middle class	34.9%	62.9%
Upper class	39.5%	20.0%
Average age	21.3 (3.7)	21.0 (2.0)
Variable	**SJLI**	**Comparison**
Gender		
Female	64.1%	42.9%
Male	35.9%	57.1%

All participants first read over the parameters of the study and gave consent to participate. The participants in the SJLI program were asked to complete the online survey before orientation to the program with 47 completing the survey. The SRA comparison group were emailed a request for voluntary participation and given a two-week window for completion of the survey during the same time frame as the SJLI participants. Thirty SRAs participated in the pre-test with 23 completing the post-test, giving a 76.7% retention rate for this group. The survey took about 30 minutes for each group to complete and post-test data were obtained through re-administration of the survey at the end of the semester. This process allowed for the examination of differences between the groups over time (from pre-program to post-program) with the program itself serving as the intervention. At the end of the program, 40 SJLI participants completed the exit online survey giving a retention rate of 85.1%.

Measures

Social Desirability

The Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Short Scale (Reynolds, 1982; Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972) was used to measure if respondents to a study are influenced by social desirability. The short scale consists of two 10-item, true-false subscales that have been equated by the number of positive and negative socially desirable instances. Only one 10-item subscale was used in this study to reduce the total number of items in the study. This process was feasible as both subscales assess similar aspects of social desirability, are essentially identical, and tend to present similar results (for more information, see Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972). The measure is scored additively with the highest possible score of 10, indicating a greater likelihood of social desirability influencing survey responses ($\alpha = .80$; test-retest $r = .47, p = .01$).

Knowledge

The Knowledge Measure (D'Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991) assessed the degree to which respondents agreed or disagreed with statements describing various forms of social (in)justice. The measure included 14 items that were rated on a 5-point Likert scale with higher scores

reflecting greater knowledge of social justice issues (α = .75; test-retest r = .76, p < .01). Example items included, "One out of every six people in the U.S. lives in poverty"; and "a group can be oppressed only if another group exists with the power to oppress them."

Understanding

The Understanding Measure (D'Andrea et al., 1991) assessed the degree to which respondents self-identified as understanding social justice related terms and concepts. The measure included 21 items that were rated on a 4-point scale with higher scores reflecting greater understanding (α = .91; test-retest r = .78, p < .01). Understanding scores were calculated by taking the sum of the individual items. Example items included: privilege, oppression, social justice, pluralism, multiculturalism.

Agency

The Agency Measure was created by the authors to assess the extent participants believed they would be able to recognize and address acts of oppression or social injustice in their environment. The measure included 4 items that used a 5-point Likert scale with higher scores reflecting a greater sense of awareness and personal agency (α = .73; test-retest r = .20, p = .28). Example items included, "I can *identify* acts of oppression when they occur in my environment"; and "I can *respond* to acts of oppression when they occur in my environment."

Personal and Professional Beliefs about Diversity

The Personal Beliefs about Diversity and Professional Beliefs about Diversity measures (Pohan & Aguilar, 2001) assess one's beliefs about diversity with respect to (a) race/ethnicity, (b) gender, (c) social class, (d) sexual orientation, (e) disabilities, (f) language, and (g) immigration (in Personal Beliefs about Diversity measure only), with questions posed within the context of one's personal worldview (i.e. about relationships, raising children, treatment of others, living conditions, and stereotypes) and within the professional, educational context (e.g., instruction, staffing, segregation/integration, curriculum materials, and multicultural versus monocultural education). The Personal Beliefs about Diversity measure consists of 15 items (α = .86; test-retest r = .77, p < .01) and the Professional Beliefs about Diversity measure consists of 25 items (α = .89; test-retest r = .83, p < .01). Both use a 5-point Likert scale with higher scores reflecting greater openness or acceptance of diversity issues in general. Subscales could be broken down for each of these measures to look at openness towards specific areas of diversity, however this study only examined the overall effects of the program to diversity acceptance in general. Example items from the Personal Beliefs measure include, "Making public facilities accessible to the disabled is simply too costly"; and "There is nothing wrong with people from different racial backgrounds having/raising children." Example items from the Professional Beliefs measure include, "People of color are adequately represented in most textbooks"; and "All students should be encouraged to become fluent in a second language."

Ethnocultural Empathy

The Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (SEE; Wang, Davidson, Yakushko, Savoy, Tan, & Bleier, 2003) assesses empathic feelings toward different racial and ethnic groups. The SEE is made up of 31 items that use a 6-point scale with higher scores reflecting more empathy for other

ethnicities and cultures ($\alpha = .94$; test-retest $r = .65$, $p < .01$). The scale can be broken down into four subscales (empathic feeling and expression, empathic perspective taking, acceptance of cultural differences, and empathic awareness). Example items include, "I feel annoyed when people do not speak Standard English"; and "I am touched by movies or books about discrimination issues faced by racial or ethnic groups other than my own." This study only examined the impact of the SJLI program on overall ethnocultural empathy and did not break down the analysis into more detail on this measure; more information about sub-scale information and outcomes can be found by contacting the authors.

Expectations

Program Expectations (SJLI participants only) were also assessed to determine participants' expectations about what affect the SJLI program would have on their experience as a student. This measure consisted of 5 items created by the authors and used a 5-point Likert scale with higher scores reflecting greater agreement between expectations and program goals ($\alpha = .82$; test-retest $r = .87$, $p < .01$). Example items included, "Having such a program as SJLI will be significant to my experience at [institution]"; and "Having such a program as SJLI will be valuable in helping create the experience I desire at [institution]."

Results

Social Desirability

Overall correlations for the measures used in this study (i.e., across time and groups) can be found in Table 2; a more specific breakdown on the correlations across measures for each group can be requested from the authors. The Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Reynolds, 1982; Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972) was not significantly related to any of the other measures in the study. Additionally, the SJLI group had a mean score of 4.10 ($SD = 2.00$) while the comparison group scored similarly with a mean score of 4.60 ($SD = 2.50$). Again, the range of scores for this measure is from 1-10, 10 indicating social desirability in reporting. Therefore, responses to other measures in this study are not influenced greatly by social desirability.

Table 2

Interclass Correlations of Measures

Scale	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. Social Desirability	–							
2. Effectiveness	-.08	–						
3. Personal Beliefs	-.06	.85**	–					
4. Professional Beliefs	-.44	.84**	.91**	–				
5. SEE	-.01	.68**	.79**	.60*	–			
6. Agency	.12	.56*	.47*	.57*	.65**	–		
7. Program	.01	.82**	.72**	.62*	.68**	.45	–	
8. Knowledge	-.16	.87**	.89**	.88**	.88**	.41	.90**	–

Note: *$p < .05$, **$p < .001$

Individual Comparisons

T-tests were used to examine the differences between the SJLI and comparison groups for all measures before and after intervention, as well as examining change over time. Program expectations were only assessed for the experimental group. The t-test, looking at the differences in program expectations by the SJLI group from Time 1 (M = 4.17; SD = .73) to Time 2 (M = 4.11; SD = .91), was not significant; t (17) = 0.60, p = .56. From beginning to end, participants expected that the program would positively impact their student experience.

Quick examination of Table 3 shows that there were no significant differences (i.e., $p < .05$) between the two groups at Time 1. Agency was "near" significance with a p = .06. The SJLI group (M = 3.64; SD = .60) rated lower than the comparison group (M = 3.90; SD = .61) on this measure.

Table 3

Program Differences on Ethnocultural Empathy, Agency, Personal and Professional Beliefs, Knowledge, and Understanding of Social Justice Issues

Measure	Pretest			Posttest			Δ	
	M(SD)	t	p	*M(SD)*	T	p	t	p
SEE								
SJLI	4.41(.64)	1.40	.17	4.66(.52)	2.50	.02**	2.15	.05**
COMP	4.37(.43)	-	-	4.19(.57)	-	-	-2.03	.07*
Agency								
SJLI	3.64(.60)	1.88	.06*	4.17(.44)	2.76	.01**	4.36	.00**
COMP	3.90(.61)	-	-	3.80(.50)	-	-	-1.11	.22
Personal Beliefs								
SJLI	2.69(.32)	-1.44	.15	4.32(.59)	2.62	.01**	9.08	.00**
COMP	2.79(.34)	-	-	3.90(.56)	-	-	7.71	.00**
Professional Beliefs								
SJLI	3.73(.48)	1.79	.08*	4.02(.59)	1.04	.31	2.60	.02**
COMP	3.62(.53)	-	-	3.81(.61)	-	-	4.20	.00**
Knowledge								
SJLI	3.56 (.43)	0.77	.45	3.84 (.56)	1.14	.26	2.89	.02**
COMP	3.57 (.33)	-	-	3.56 (.31)	-	-	-0.13	.91
Understanding								
SJLI	70 (10)	0.34	.74	76 (7)	2.51	.02**	4.81	.00**
COMP	69 (15)	-	-	67 (12)	-	-	-1.32	.24

Note: *$p < .10$, **$p < .05$

Statistically significant differences between the groups at Time 2 were found on several variables. Ethnocultural Empathy (t (15) = 2.50, p = .02), Agency (t (21) = 2.76, p = .01), Personal Beliefs (t (25) = 2.62, p = .01), and Understanding (t (15) = 2.51, p = .02) were rated higher for the SJLI group than the comparison group. Positive statistically significant change ($p < .05$) from Time 1 to Time 2 was demonstrated on all measures for the SJLI group, while change was only evident on Professional and Personal Beliefs for the comparison group; see Table 2 for more information.

MANOVA

A restricted model, MANOVA, was investigated in order to control for *familywise* error (i.e. alpha inflation due to multiple comparisons examined using one dataset), while examining the differences between the experimental (SJLI) and the comparison (SRA) groups across Time 1 and Time 2 on Ethnocultural Empathy, Agency, Personal and Professional Beliefs, and Knowledge. Understanding was not entered into this analysis due to the vast differences in measurement types (i.e. averages versus additive measures) this scale used compared to all other scales.

A 2 (condition) X 2 (time) mixed model factorial MANOVA, using Type III Sums of Squares, was performed in order to examine the effects of the program. Box's *M* was found to be statistically significant ($M = 84.23$, $F (30, 5215) = 2.44$, $p < .001$) for this analysis, which is likely due to differences in number of participants (*N*) per condition. Therefore, Pillai's Trace is reported in the remaining analyses based on Tabachnick and Fidell's (2001) recommendations. Omnibus *F* tests for main effects of time ($F (5, 67) = 25.86$, $p < .001$; $\eta^2 = .66$) and condition ($F (5, 67) = 3.41$, $p = .008$; $\eta^2 = .20$) were found to be statistically significant as well as the interaction between the two variables ($F (5, 67) = 4.29$, $p = .002$; $\eta^2 = .24$). Due to significant interactions found, the remaining analysis will focus on interactions for the univariate tests.

Interactions

The interaction for condition X time was found to be insignificant for ethnocultural empathy ($F (1, 75) = 0.09$, $p = .770$; $\eta^2p = .001$). The SJLI group, however, had higher ratings of ethnocultural empathy at Time 2 ($M = 4.66$, $SD = .52$) than at Time 1 ($M = 4.41$, $SD = 0.64$), whereas the comparison group's scores on the SEE decreased from Time 1 ($M = 4.37$, $SD = 0.43$) of the study to Time 2 ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 0.57$).

The interaction for condition X time was found to be statistically significant on Agency ($F (1, 75) = 6.59$, $p = .012$; $\eta^2p = .085$). The experimental group had higher ratings of Agency at Time 2 ($M = 4.17$, $SD = .44$) than at Time 1 ($M = 3.64$, $SD = 0.60$). The comparison group's scores on Agency slightly decreased from Time 1 ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 0.61$) of the study to Time 2 ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 0.50$).

The interaction for condition X time was significant on Personal Beliefs ($F (1, 75) = 13.11$, $p = .001$; $\eta^2p = .156$). Both the experimental group and the comparison group had an increase in ratings of Personal Beliefs from Time 1 ($M = 2.69$, $SD = .32$; $M = 2.79$, $SD = .34$) to Time 2 ($M = 4.32$, $SD = 0.59$; $M = 3.90$, $SD = .56$). The SJLI group, however, demonstrated greater change over time on Personal Beliefs.

The interaction for condition X time was found insignificant on Professional Beliefs ($F (1, 75) = 2.77$, $p = .100$; $\eta^2p = .038$). Both the experimental group and the comparison group had an increase in ratings of Professional Beliefs from Time 1 ($M = 3.73$, $SD = .48$; $M = 3.62$, $SD = .53$) to Time 2 ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 0.59$; $M = 3.81$, $SD = .61$).

The interaction for condition X time was also insignificant on Knowledge of social justice questions ($F (1, 75) = 0.02$, $p = .903$; $\eta^2p = .000$). The SJLI group had an insignificant increase in

ratings of Knowledge from Time 1 ($M = 3.56$, $SD = .43$) to Time 2 ($M = 3.84$, $SD = 0.56$). The comparison scores on Knowledge showed no change from Time 1 ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 0.33$) to Time 2 ($M = 3.56$, $SD = 0.31$).

Results from the individual comparisons and the more restricted model come to similar conclusions that the Social Justice Leadership Institute had a positive effect on the experimental group on most of the measures as the main effects across group and time were significant and large. Additionally, there were significant interactions found with regards to Agency and Personal Beliefs, and these effects support the positive impact of the SJLI program as well.

Discussion

The purpose of this paper is to detail how counseling psychologists can utilize their training to assist programs with assessment and evaluation. In this section, we detail the overall evaluation results from the Social Justice Leadership Institute (SJLI) and how counselors can enhance the reach and impact of their own careers through evaluation and consulting.

Evaluation

The purpose of the SJLI was to develop multicultural competence in college students that would address social justice issues based on enhancement of self-awareness, knowledge, and skills. A measure of social desirability was included in the study in order to assess whether social desirability had an impact on the validity of participants' responses. Social desirability was not found to have a relationship with any of the measures used in this evaluation, indicating that it was not likely to impact responses from the groups assessed.

In order to determine the effects of the SJLI program, differences between the SJLI group and a comparison group were examined on ethnocultural empathy, agency, understanding and knowledge of social justice issues, and professional and personal beliefs about diversity before the intervention, after the intervention, and looking at change over time for each group. There were no large differences found between the SJLI and comparison groups on all areas assessed before the intervention. Differences, however, were found between the groups after the intervention on ethnocultural empathy, agency, personal beliefs, and understanding. The SJLI group displayed more of these qualities than the comparison group. No differences were found between the two groups on knowledge and professional beliefs after the program intervention.

Change, from pre-intervention to post-intervention, was also assessed for both groups. The SJLI group demonstrated positive change on all areas assessed, whereas change was only evident on professional and personal beliefs for the comparison group. These findings indicate the effectiveness of the SJLI program on participants' ethnocultural empathy, agency, and knowledge and understanding of social justice issues. Based on these findings, the evaluation team considered the initial implementation of the program to be successful.

Internal Consultation

This study demonstrates the importance in the role counseling center psychologists can play as internal organizational consultants. Counseling center psychologists can provide effective and inexpensive program assessment and evaluation services to other units within their university.

Increasingly in higher education, administrators, governing boards, accrediting bodies, as well as state and federal governments are demanding data that demonstrate program effectiveness. Additionally, with scarce resources becoming a reality, there is a growing need to work collaboratively in documenting outcomes, demonstrating accountability, and assessing changes in students' attitudes and behavior due to program interventions. What we have tried to show here is the importance of incorporating evaluation planning into the beginning stages of program development, using internal consultants that have the background and training to facilitate such a process.

Getting support for establishing a new program requires that the program be conceptually grounded and its effectiveness in producing change demonstrated. By incorporating into a systematic program the important elements for developing social justice allies and evaluating the program's effects on students' knowledge, attitudes, feelings and perceived agency, we have been able to provide input on this program's ability to develop social justice allies among college students.

When evaluation is included as part of the planning process, it informs program development and serves as a component in the iterative process of program implementation, change, and refinement. Assessment and evaluation are becoming indispensable tools for justifying and improving our programs, informing policy and practice decisions, and advocating for program survival (Schuh & Upcraft, 1998, 2000). Counseling psychologists can use their background in measurement, experimental and quasi-experimental design, and analysis to assist programs throughout their university campuses, while at the same time enhancing their own experiences and demonstrating their value as consultants who work collaboratively to assist other professionals and units across campus. Giving back to the community by serving in this vein can be beneficial to everyone involved.

Future Research

Test-retest reliability examines correlations across groups and the lack of correspondence for the comparison group and agency could have weakened the observed relationship. The agency measure could have been confusing for all subjects, except for the SJLI group post intervention. The advanced and specific nature of the measure looking at oppression could have been interpreted differently by novice subjects and responded to with more nuanced points of view by the experimental group after being immersed in the subject area during the institute. Additional, research is needed to understand this complex interaction of agency and to determine what personality characteristics and academic content enhance versus hinder identification with agency. Further exploration is also needed in the development of the measure to ensure that we were not sampling from two different constructs. There could be a difference between identification of oppression and the act of responding to oppression for instance, which would be better assessed by examining the measure with a factor analysis. This could not be done in the present study, as a larger sample size is needed to run this type of analysis.

Limitations

Threats to validity are always potential limitations to any study. The particular threats of concern in this study are due to design (e.g. the potential for history to impact the groups being

examined), content (e.g. social desirability on such a politically sensitive topic), and bias from internal evaluations. History is addressed using a highly similar comparison group concurrently as the program group. This does not rule out the potential effects that history can have for both groups, but does help to demonstrate the effects of the program. Next, measuring for social desirability allowed us to assess this threat statistically, and there were no relationships found between social desirability responding and any of the other measures used in this study.

Finally, potential issues tend to arise while using internal evaluators on program assessment. To prevent allegiance bias or bias toward finding positive outcomes in evaluation, the evaluators in this study did not help develop the program. The evaluation did serve to later inform the committee on improvements to the program, but the initial program was not related to the evaluators in any way. Finding more systematic ways to assess such limitations in future evaluations of the program would increase the generalizability of the findings and further demonstrate the program's impact on behavior that is intended to address social justice issues.

Conclusion

Program evaluations should always be conducted with important decision makers and other significant stakeholders in mind; such local assessments occur within the political climate of the institution (Schuh & Upcraft, 2000). Carrying out plans for evaluating new or existing programs and disseminating results of their impact on important student outcomes among different shareholders enables us to play a significant role in these political realities. It allows us to be recognized as having valuable input to offer in the decision-making process about programs and resources and helps us to build networks of trust and goodwill as our abilities and contributions are recognized. Furthermore, program assessment and evaluation can aid in future program planning by suggesting modifications to enhance program effectiveness and identifying conceptually and empirically significant components that are needed to sustain program fidelity over time.

Counseling center psychologists should consider becoming involved in program assessment and evaluation efforts on their campuses to assist in making available the kinds of information needed to help evaluate local program interventions on student development and aid in decision-making about programming and the use of limited resources. By conducting local assessments and evaluations, counseling center psychologists have an opportunity to impact programs that affect students at their institutions. In the current evaluation, we were interested in examining how participation in a newly developed social justice leadership program would influence college students' beliefs and feelings about social justice issues. Severing as internal consultants offering program evaluation services was an essential part of the SJLI program development. We were able to provide input about the program's influence on student outcomes and aid its administrators in making informed choices about its content, the resources being committed toward its implementation, and important components to be maintained within the program. The benefits to counseling center psychologists who act as program consultants are that it helps to expand the reach of their evaluation services beyond their own agency and allows for collaboration with other professionals to benefit the students we all seek to serve.

About the Authors

Roy H. Joy, Ph.D. is a retired senior staff psychologist from the Counseling Center at Southern Illinois University Carbondale. He is founder of Psychological Associates, a private clinical and consulting practice located in Carbondale, IL. His email address is rhjoy@siu.edu and website is www.psycholgicalassociatesil.com.

Nicole L. Cundiff, Ph.D. is director of the Northern Leadership Center (NLC) and assistant professor of business administration in the School of Management at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. More information about the NLC can be found at www.uafleadership.com. Inquiries regarding this article may be directed to Nicole Cundiff at nlcundiff2@alaska.edu.

References

Archer, J. A., Jr., & Cooper, S. E. (1998). *Counseling and mental health services on campus: A handbook on contemporary practices and challenges*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bishop, A. (2002). Becoming an Ally: Breaking the cycle of oppression in people (2nd ed.). Halifax, Nova Scotia: Fernwood.

Black, L. L., Stone, D. A., Hutchinson, S. R., & Suarez, E. C. (2007). The development and validation of the social privilege measure. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling Development, 40,* 16-32.

Bowleg, L. (2008). When black + lesbian + woman ≠ black lesbian woman: The methodological challenges of qualitative and quantitative intersectionality research. *Sex Roles, 59,* 312-325.

Broido, E. M. (2000). The development of social justice allies during college: A phenomenological investigation. *Journal of College Student Development*, *41*, 3-18.

Broido, E. M., & Reason, R. D. (2005). The development of social justice attitudes and actions: An overview of current understandings. In R. D. Reason, E. M. Broido, T. L. Davis, and N. J. Evans (eds.), *Developing Social Justice Allies*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cooper, S. (2003). College counseling centers as internal organizational consultants to universities. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *55*, 230-238.

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

Doughtery, A. M. (2000). *Psychological consultation and collaboration in school and community settings* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Hadley, R. G., & Mitchell, L. K. (1995). *Counseling research and program evaluation.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Hardiman, R., & Jackson, B. W. (1992). Racial identity development: Understanding racial dynamics in college classrooms and on campus. In M. Adams (ed.), *Promoting diversity in college classrooms: Innovative responses for the curriculum, faculty, and institution.* New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 52. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hardiman, R., & Jackson, B. W. (1997). Conceptual foundations for social justice courses. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, and P. Griffin (eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook.* New York: Routledge.

Matuszek, P. A. (1981). Program evaluation as consultation. In J. C. Conoley (Ed.), *Consultation in schools: Theory, research, procedures.* Boston, MA: Academic Press.

McIntosh, P. (2012). Reflections and future directions for privilege studies. *Journal of Social Issues, 68,* 194-206.

Oetting, E. R. (1977). The counseling psychologist as program evaluator. *The Counseling Psychologist, 7,* 89-91.

Pohan, C. A., & Aguilar, T. E. (2001). Measuring educators' beliefs about diversity in personal and professional contexts. *American Educational Research Journal, 38* (1), 159-182.

Reason, R. D., & Broido, E. M. (2005). Issues and strategies for social justice allies (and the student affairs professionals who hope to encourage them). In R. D. Reason, E. M. Broido, T. L. Davis, and N. J. Evans (eds.), *Developing Social Justice Allies.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 38,* 119-125.

Schuh, J. H., & Upcraft, M. L. (1998, November-December). Facts and myths about assessment in student affairs. *About Campus,* 2-8.

Schuh, J. H., & Upcraft, M. L. (2000, September-October). Assessment politics. *About Campus,* 14-21.

Settles, I. H. (2006). Use of an intersectional framework to understand black women's racial and gender identities. *Sex Roles, 54,* 589-601.

Shadish, W. R., Cook, T. D., & Leviton, L. C. (1991). *Foundations of program evaluation: theories of practice.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Strahan, R., & Gerbasi, K. (1972). Short, homogenous versions of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 28,* 191-193.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics,* 4th ed. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Wang, Y., Davidson, M. M., Yakushko, O. F., Savoy, H. B., Tan, J. A., & Bleier, J. K. (2003). The scale of ethnocultural empathy: Development, validation, and reliability. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *50*, 221-234.

Warner, L. R. (2008). A best practices guide to intersectional approaches in psychological research. *Sex Roles, 59,* 454-463.

Westbrook, F. D., Kandell, J. J., Kirkland, S. E., Phillips, P. E., Regan, A. M., Medvene, A., & Oslin, Y. D. (1993). University campus consultation: Opportunities and limitations. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *71*, 684-688.

Wise, T. (2008). *White like me: Reflections on race from a privileged son.* Soft Skull Press: Berkley, CA.

Appendix A

Program Description

The Social Justice Leadership Institute (SJLI) was designed to advance the development of ethical and moral student learners, leaders and citizen scholars. There is a recognized need to do more to prepare our students for life beyond college. To address this need, the Office of Student Development partnered with other departments and individuals from across campus to develop a program that would further enhance the educational experience and social consciousness of our students. By bringing together faculty and staff expertise, a cadre of committed students and a proven series of meaningful activities, a program has been designed to provide a transformational experience for that solidifies for participants a clear and practical understanding and application of Mahatma Gandhi's advice to individuals interested in changing the world: "Be the change that you want to see."

Through workshops, reflection, interactive exercises, small group dialogue and the development and expansion of critical thinking skills, participants will acquire the skills to relate to, communicate with, and understand individuals who are different from themselves. They will learn how to harness and direct their energies to bring about personal and societal insights and change. Participants will gain a clearer understanding of what it means to be more fully aware of the world and how it can be altered, improved, and made better. The SJLI offers an awakening of potential. Targeted students are those that tend to lead by action more than title or popularity. They are often incredibly passionate in their humanitarian beliefs and willing to speak out to address injustice. The opportunity is intense, requires commitment and will teach individuals how to be even better agents for change.

Appendix B

Program Components

- Orientation workshop
- Day-long interactive program on power, privilege, and oppression (P2O)
- Performance workshop called thinking and feeling diversity differently
- Workshop examining how institutions and systems serve to create and/or maintain social injustice
- Workshop on power, privilege, and ending gender violence
- Panel discussion on the different forms of social activism
- Campus-wide lecture by Tim Wise