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Abstract

Although a commitment to social justice is central to the identity of counseling psychologists, little is known about how faculty contribute to a culture of social justice. The current study aims to explore engagement in social justice by answering six questions: 1) how do faculty define social justice, 2) how do they engage in social justice with students, 3) what barriers exist in relation to their engagement, 4) how often do faculty engage in social justice with students, 5) how supported do faculty feel in relation to their social justice efforts, and 6) what impact does training have on social justice self-efficacy and subsequent engagement? To examine these questions, a nationwide sample of 72 faculty from APA-accredited counseling psychology programs completed an online survey. Findings from thematic analysis revealed several themes across faculty definitions of, and engagement in, social justice, despite a number of barriers they also identified. Results from quantitative analyses suggested that most faculty engage in social justice. However, many are operating with little support. Several barriers to engagement exist, but graduate school training in social justice may help to eradicate those barriers. Faculty members who received training in social justice as students reported significantly more social justice self-efficacy now. Additionally, faculty with more social justice self-efficacy reported greater engagement in social justice in their professional and personal lives. Implications for promoting social justice among faculty are discussed, including practical suggestions for fostering self-efficacy, building a strong community, promoting adequate training, accessing role models, and engaging in self-care.
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Social justice has a short history but a long past in the fields of counseling and psychology (see Baranowski et al., 2016; Bemak et al., 2011; Brady-Amoon et al., 2012; Sanabria & DeLorenzi, 2019). Its past is marked by both enduring definitions that include equity, fairness, and distributive justice (Barrett & Olle, 2016; Miller, 1979; Prilleltensky, 2012) and updated descriptions that include action, advocacy, and moral responsibility (Brinkman & Hirsch, 2019; Goodman et al., 2004; Green et al., 2008; Hof et al., 2009; Sanabria & DeLorenzi, 2019).

Perhaps one of the earliest influencers of the field was Frank Parsons, a prominent leader and founder of vocational psychology who committed to social justice by advocating for equitable distribution of resources and rights for all people (Jones, 1994). As an extension of his social justice-oriented values, Parsons also integrated advocacy into the vocational literature and methods he proposed, which heavily influenced the foundational webbings of the counseling field (Davis, 1969; Hartung & Blustein, 2002; Jones, 1994).

Several decades later, the field experienced a sudden growth in the area of social justice, with an expansion of the literature around psychological practice, education, and training, particularly around the concept of multiculturalism and multicultural competence (MCC). Vera and Speight (2003) highlighted the integrated relationship between multiculturalism and social justice, commenting that a person cannot be committed to one without also being committed to the other. The multicultural movement continued to blossom, and in 1992, the emergence of MCC elucidated guidelines for working with culturally diverse clientele. MCC suggests that, through a process of reflexivity and refinement, therapists strive to achieve a level of proficiency in three main areas: cultural awareness and beliefs, cultural knowledge, and cultural skills (Sue et al., 1992). In essence, engaging in reflexive practices (cultural awareness), building culturally relevant knowledge to the client's worldview (cultural knowledge), and providing interventions congruent to a client's cultural values (cultural skills) all encompass the culturally competent therapist. Other influencers included Martin-Baró (1994), who expanded our lens to incorporate the macro-level influences on an individual's psychological well-being, while lifting the blinders to understand how context may influence mental health. This level of visibility, Martin-Baró explained, requires an expansion of consciousness and supersedes the confinements of social norms, socialization, and other social limitations in order to liberate people from an oppressive society (liberation psychology; Goodman et al., 2004). Similarly, Prilletensky (2014) proposed a concept of distributive justice that emphasizes contextual and sociohistorical influences on a person's well-being (Goodman et al., 2004).

The translation of social justice into counseling psychology was particularly apparent during the early 2000's, when a joint Task Force of the American Psychological Association's (APA) Society of Counseling Psychology and the Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues published a set of guidelines on how to promote multiculturalism and diversity within psychological education, training, and practice (APA, 2003). These guidelines were later updated to reflect the expanding literature on multiculturalism, complexity of identity, and influence of contextual factors on a person's way of being (APA, 2017a).

Indeed, APA acknowledges areas such as contextual influences on a person's experience; and diversity, social justice, and advocacy as components of counseling psychology's “Specialty Knowledge” (APA, 2019). Similar themes have been echoed by experts in the field. A recent study of counseling psychology training directors revealed that both multiculturalism and social justice/advocacy represent vital components of the field's future (Taylor et al., 2019).

Thus, incorporation of values that center on diversity and social justice advocacy are essential in counseling training programs (Scheel et al., 2018). Scheel and colleagues (2018) propose the Counseling Psychology Model Training Program (MTP), an ideal that conforms to APA and the Society for Counseling Psychology's (SCP) guidelines. The MTP proposes a set of four core values (i.e., growth toward full potential; holistic and contextual; diversity and social justice; and communitarian perspective), and twenty principles organized into six clusters (i.e., counseling psychology identity; multiculturalism, diversity, and social justice;
health service psychology; developmental, prevention, and strengths orientation; science–practice integration; and relationships within and between professional communities). The concurrent interplay of MTP principles suggest that one principle may not work effectively without the other; to adequately integrate science and practice, one must also engage in social justice. Moreover, researchers suggest that embodiment of said values may support a counseling psychologist’s ability to incorporate social justice and advocacy into work with clients (Scheel et al., 2018).

Although the field of counseling psychology aspires to engage in social justice, few professionals actually know how to put it into practice (Ali et al., 2008). Goodman et al. (2004) highlighted the challenge of moving from theory to action, suggesting that therapeutic intervention has primarily focused on the individual rather than oppressive systems and structures that incubate many of the mental health difficulties experienced by clientele. It is the lack of skills and practical suggestions, researchers suggest, that inhibits one’s self-efficacy and ability to put social justice into action (Ali et al., 2008; Goodman et al., 2004).

Indeed, research shows that although graduate level trainees desire training in social justice, they may not obtain the amount or quality of training that they hope for (Beer et al., 2012). In their mixed-methods study, Beer et al. (2012) sought to examine counseling psychology trainees’ commitment to social justice. In addition to a desire for more social justice training, findings revealed that perceptions of training environment significantly predicted level of commitment to social justice. Thus, it is imperative to consider strategies that promote a growth-fostering environment conducive to learning social justice-related objectives among graduate trainees.

The current literature offers case examples of strategies that could be implemented to promote social justice in the classroom (Baranowski et al., 2016; Brinkman & Hirsch, 2019; Edwards et al., 2017; Goodman et al., 2018; Green et al., 2008; Motulsky et al., 2014; Murray et al., 2010). Clark-Taylor (2017), for example, enhanced social justice self-efficacy by introducing students to a feminist approach to community engagement. Toporek and Worthington (2014) provided a model that combines community service learning and “difficult dialogues,” or conversations that challenge inherent biases and assumptions of marginalized people. When applying this model in their own classroom, they found that having difficult dialogues interwoven into applied service learning helped create more meaning for students. Motulsky and colleagues (2014) provided other strategies used in their department, such as regular meetings with faculty around diversity-related programming, reflective-based experiential activities, and the inclusion of social justice-oriented studies into their quantitative and qualitative courses. In addition, other researchers have highlighted the value of providing students with opportunities for service learning, social justice-oriented practicum experiences, exposure to readings on social justice, reflection activities, and opportunities to apply course material and act as an advocate for those in need (Ali et al., 2008, 2014; Green et al., 2008; Sanabria & DeLorenzi, 2019).

Aside from case examples, many articles on social justice oriented training have provided theoretical approaches to engaging in social justice with students. However, empirical studies that explore the potential impact of social justice training and possible predictors of social justice and advocacy engagement are lacking. The current study seeks to answer this call by exploring six primary questions: 1) how do counseling psychologists define social justice, 2) how do they engage in social justice efforts, 3) what barriers do they perceive in relation to engagement in social justice, 4) how often do they engage and train students in social justice, 5) how supported do they feel in relation to their social justice efforts, and 6) what impact does social justice training have on their social justice self-efficacy and subsequent engagement?
Methods

Participants and Procedure

Faculty members at all 69 APA-accredited counseling psychology doctoral programs were invited to participate in this study which occurred in November 2019. Participants were recruited through APA’s Division 17 (Counseling Psychology) discussion listerv and through individual emails sent to faculty whose contact information was displayed on their university websites. The invitations contained a link to a secured website (Qualtrics XM) where participants could consent to participate in the study and complete the survey. All participants were informed of their rights, potential risks and benefits, and provided consent prior to participation.

In total, 72 counseling psychology faculty members participated in this study. Approximately half (51.6%) identified as women, 39.1% identified as men, 3.1% as gender non-binary, 3.1% as genderqueer, and 3.1% as agender. The majority of participants (65.2%) reported their race/ethnicity as White; while 10.6% identified as Black/African American, 6.1% as Multiracial, 7.6% as Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin, 6.1% as Asian, 3.0% did not identify, and 1.5% identified as another race/ethnicity not listed. The current study represented psychologists who were slightly more diverse than those in the broader academic psychology workforce, where 53% identify as women and 78% identify as White, 10% as Asian, 5% as Black/African American, 5% as Hispanic, and 2% as Other (APA, 2020).

Of the three career stages listed, 48.5% reported they were early career psychologists, 30.3% were mid-career psychologists, and 21.5% were late-career psychologists. The mean age of respondents was 44.57 years old (SD = 11.28), which closely approximates the average age of psychology research doctorates in faculty positions across the U.S. (M = 50.5; APA, 2020). On average, participants had been teaching for 16.12 years (SD = 11.76), and most (87.9%) were tenure-track, but not yet tenured.

Measures

Each participant completed a self-administered questionnaire that consisted of mostly quantitative measures, complemented by qualitative items aimed to further explicate participants’ perceptions and experiences (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

Open-ended questions invited participants to briefly share: 1) how they define social justice, 2) how they enact social justice with their students, and 3) what barriers exist for faculty in relation to engaging in social justice efforts. Although collecting qualitative data through the survey method may not be a traditional qualitative method of choice (e.g., Flick, 2002), several studies have utilized this method to better understand differing phenomena (e.g., Terry et al., 2017). Moreover, administration of open-ended response items provides an array of benefits that were deemed appropriate given the aims of our study (see Toerien & Wilkinson, 2004). Particularly, open-ended questions provide an opportunity for participants to share more information than quantitative items alone and, as in the case of the present study, leads to a richer understanding of how faculty define social justice, methods they use to enact social justice, as well as barriers they encounter in their work. Additionally, providing a self-administered questionnaire allows for standardization of procedures in survey administration, an area that is difficult to do in other qualitative methods (e.g., semi-structured interviews; Robson, 1993).

Quantitative items included two subscales embedded in the Social Issues Questionnaire (Miller et al., 2009): the Social Justice Self-Efficacy (SJSE) subscale (20 items) and Supports and Barriers Related to Social Justice Engagement (SBSJSE) subscale (nine items; five support-related items and four barrier-related items).

The SJSE subscale was designed to measure a person’s confidence in their ability to carry out social justice advocacy efforts within a range of contexts, including interpersonal, intrapersonal, community, and institutional/political settings. One sample item from this scale was, “How much confidence do you have in
your ability to encourage and convince others to participate in community-specific social issues?” Items were rated on a likert scale, from 0 (no confidence at all) to 9 (complete confidence). Higher scores indicated greater social justice self-efficacy. In the present study, the Cronbach's alpha for the SJSE subscale was .92 (similar findings are also reported in (Miller et al., 2009, 2011), suggesting excellent internal consistency. Miller et al. (2009) reported criterion-related validity for the SJSE subscale through its correlation with an individual's outcome expectations surrounding social justice ($r = .56, p < .01$), commitment to social justice ($r = .68, p < .01$), and interest in social justice ($r = .63, p < .01$).

The SBSJE measures both supports and barriers individuals perceive they would encounter when pursuing various social justice advocacy efforts. One sample item from this subscale was “If you were to engage in social justice activities, how likely would you be to worry that getting involved would require too much time or energy?”. Items were rated on a likert scale from 0 (not at all likely) to 9 (extremely likely). Within this measure, the Supports for Social Justice Engagement subscale (5 items) had a Cronbach's alpha of .90 and the Barriers for Social Justice Engagement subscale (4 items) had a Cronbach's alpha of .69. Similar reliability statistics were reported in Miller et al. (2009). Some evidence of criterion validity is provided through the relationship between SBSJE and commitment to social justice ($r = .40, p < .01$) (Miller et al., 2009).

Lastly, the survey included demographic items in an effort to describe the participants and explore the relationship between demographic items (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, career stage, graduate school training in social justice) with potential dependent variables (e.g., social justice self-efficacy, perceived supports and barriers related to engaging in social justice).

**Data Analysis**

Qualitative data from the three open-ended social justice-related questions were each thematically analyzed by the first and second authors to capture underlying themes across participants for each question (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Due to the nature of qualitative research, particularly Thematic Analysis (TA), results are organized into qualitatively meaningful themes that are not quantified, as frequency does not determine value (Pyett, 2003). Thus, qualitative research relies on trust of the researcher(s) and the scientific rigor found in the procedures involved in the study. These are described as follows. First, TA posits that the researcher cannot be separated from the interpretation of data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thus, positionality of the authors was regularly reflected on and discussed during the consultative process of data interpretation and analyses. The authors describe their positionality as follows. The first author is a faculty member who identifies as a White, Christian, middle socioeconomic status (SES), cis, woman from the Midwest. The second author is a doctoral student who identifies as a multiracial second generation American, invisibly disabled, spiritual, cis, woman of color from a low socioeconomic status (SES) upbringing. Given the inherent power difference between the faculty member (first author) and graduate student (second author), authors were aware that the second author may feel pressured to shift her responses to match the first author. Thus, special consideration was made by the first author to empower the second author to feel a sense of belonging to the research and data through regular check-ins and mentoring around the research process. Further care was taken to fully discuss agreements and disagreements from both authors to ensure that resultative themes were indicative of what both authors were interpreting from the data.

Both explicit content (semantic) and underlying concepts of data (latent) were thematically analyzed using an approach informed by a constructivist-interpretive lens (Ponterotto, 2005). The constructivist-interpretive paradigm asserts that each individual constructs their own reality (Hansen, 2004), and that each reality is valid and can be understood (Schwandt, 1994). In the case of research, the researcher and participant co-create a reality through interactions and interpretations of participants’ responses (Ponterotto, 2005). However, given the survey nature of the current qualitative method, co-creation was seen primarily between
each coder and the data, as well as between the two coders as they moved through the iterative process of analysis, as detailed below.

Scientific rigor was demonstrated through the procedural steps taken by both authors during analysis of qualitative content. Analysis was employed in an iterative fashion, as steps taken were sequential, recursive, and repetitive until agreement was made among coders (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Furthermore, an inductive approach was taken in that the development of codes and themes were unearthed from the data collected. The order of which analyses were conducted are as follows. First, each coder started with one question and familiarized themselves with all the responses provided for that one question through reading and re-reading. Each coder then created an initial set of codes that were continuously reviewed and revised on an individual basis. Authors then met to discuss findings, highlight any inconsistencies, address any disagreements, revise, and compile codes into a code book. Authors then individually recoded responses with the latest iteration of the code book. Themes were also constructed in an iterative and consultative fashion as both authors identified potential themes individually and together, until codes were further clustered into themes that both authors agreed best captured the data. This process was repeated for each question until agreement was met for all three open-ended questions. Moreover, documentation for each stage of analysis was maintained by both coders to ensure an audit trail for data. While all disagreements were resolved by the first and second author, a third-party masters-level student was identified as an arbitrator prior to start of coding process in the event a disagreement was unable to be resolved. In order to familiarize the arbitrator to the data in the event a disagreement occurred, the arbitrator also reviewed responses to the open-ended questions.

Quantitative data from this survey was analyzed through SPSS 26. Inferential statistics were used to examine counseling psychology faculty engagement in social justice efforts and the degree to which they feel supported in those efforts. MANOVAs and follow-up ANOVAs were used to explore relationships between demographic variables (e.g., whether or not a faculty member was trained in social justice efforts in their graduate program) and the participant’s level of social justice self-efficacy and their level of social supports and barriers to social justice engagement. Bivariate correlations were also used to explore relationships among variables (e.g., social justice self-efficacy and social justice engagement).

Results

In the following section, results are presented according to the six research questions posed: 1) how do counseling psychologists define social justice, 2) how do they engage in social justice efforts, 3) what barriers do they perceive in relation to engagement in social justice, 4) how often do they engage and train students in social justice, 5) how supported do they feel in relation to their social justice efforts, and 6) what impact does social justice training have on their social justice self-efficacy and subsequent engagement? Qualitative findings are presented first, followed by quantitative findings.

Question 1: How do Counseling Psychologists Define Social Justice?

Of the 72 faculty members who participated in the study, 55 provided their definitions of social justice. Our analysis revealed five key themes across definitions of social justice: 1) equity, 2) systemic change, 3) equality, 4) advocacy, and 5) personal commitment and responsibility. Descriptions of each theme, along with examples, are provided below.

Equity

Appearing in approximately a third of the responses, faculty included equity in their understanding of social justice. These responses tended to emphasize the provision of resources to all based on level of need, as well as promotion of fairness, justness, and access. Most of the responses explicitly used the term equity or a variation of the term, such as the responses below:
It is used in different ways. Although it is intended to mean affirmation of equity across aspects of humanity historically associated with oppression, it has been watered-down to be a buzz word to show other intellectuals that you are savvy. A more compelling concept would be “mutual edification” which has a positive direction going beyond tolerance of other groups.

challenging systemic oppression from white supremacy, racism, heterosexism, ableism etc. to make all resources and opportunities inclusive of historically stigmatized and/or marginalized populations--seeking equity and inclusivity

A smaller number of participants did not use the term equity explicitly, but rather included the definition of equity in their definition of social justice:

Ensuring that those who need care [receive] it, regardless of their circumstances or intersecting [identities].

Justice and care for all especially groups who have experienced some type of injustice or systemic or structural inequity manner.

**Systemic Change**

An emphasis on systemic change was also found in approximately a third of participants’ definitions of social justice. Responses captured under this theme were mostly focused on systemic oppression and historical injustice. Another notable feature of this theme was the action-oriented nature of responses, further highlighting that social justice may not just be a concept, but rather a form of action.

eliminating disparities that exist because of longstanding systems of oppression in all domains of life, public and private

Working toward systems-level change as a form of prevention, working to ameliorate and prevent harms done to marginalized individuals and groups.

Centering the voices and experiences of underrepresented and marginalized groups; advocating for and supporting marginalized folx, using my privilege to work for a more equitable society

challenging, disrupting and replacing attitudes, behaviors, systems, and policies that are oppressive and that restrict peoples safety and well-being

As demonstrated above, participants emphasize the action of social justice, whether that is through providing space for others with marginalized identities, challenging systemic inequities, or using embodied privilege to leverage the voices of those who are marginalized.

**Equality**

In addition to equity and systemic change, approximately a quarter of responses discussed equality in their definitions of social justice. Whereas equity focused more on the distribution of resources based on need, this theme focused more on allocating the same amount of resources among people, as well as equal access and rights for all.

Advocating for equality amongst all social groups.

basic rights and freedoms for all individuals regardless of class, location, gender, ethnicity, religion, age, sexual orientation, and ability
All people are treated fairly and have equal access to resources.

Responses captured under the theme of equality also often captured other themes of advocacy and commitment, as described below.

**Advocacy**

A smaller number of faculty defined social justice as including advocacy. While a few responses highlight the personal act of standing up for oppressed individuals, and empowering others in their personal and professional lives, the majority of responses referred to advocacy in a broader sense.

- advocating for and supporting marginalized folx
- Advocating to reduce structural barriers that result in inequities
- advocacy for underserved including discussing biased attitudes of others
- advocating for or helping advance the status of underprivileged groups.

**Personal Commitment & Responsibility**

A small number of faculty also described social justice as a personal commitment that was taken on themselves. This theme was different from others in that it added a personal sense of responsibility to engage with social justice. Some participants explicitly named social justice as a commitment:

- a commitment to promoting equal opportunities, resources, and treatment of all individuals
- A commitment to equity (broadly defined)
- Committed to creating an environment where all people are treated with respect, dignity, and fairness.

While others described how they perceive social justice to be a personal action and responsibility:

- Using the power and privilege that I have to ensure that those who have less power than me are included in power structures equitably.
- working myself personally and professionally and to empower others to advocate for and change systems for healthy living, voices, for all locally, regionally, in the US and [internationally]
- Approaching every endeavor with the goal of attending to the non-dominant aspects of our culture and attenuating them toward egalitarian ends.

**Question 2: How do Counseling Psychologists Engage in Social Justice Efforts?**

We received 66 responses regarding how faculty engage in social justice efforts. Our analysis revealed six key themes: 1) working within the classroom, 2) from the classroom to students’ lives and profession, 3) from the classroom to the community, 4) advising/mentoring, 5) individual efforts, and 6) acknowledged limitations to social justice efforts. Descriptions of each theme, along with examples, are provided below.

**Working within the Classroom**

Approximately half of faculty who responded highlighted several ways in which they engaged in social justice efforts within the confines of the classroom. In addition to fostering discussions around power, privilege, oppression, and liberation, approximately half of the participants noted that they incorporate social justice assignments in their course materials. Some respondents noted that they encourage their students to
consider the power and privilege they hold and identify specific ways they can advocate for communities or people who are marginalized or oppressed. Activities ranged from classroom discussions about oppression and positionality, to required readings and assignments that allowed students to dive into the literature to explore barriers that marginalized groups face.

I engage in open and inclusive conversation about social justice issues. I ask them to use their power and privilege when they can to include others who have less power and privilege than them.

Through discussions, through personal stories, readings

In some of my classes, a project will include a social justice component. Or, at a minimum, we’ll have readings on social justice

Written assignments: Critical developmental history papers—exploration of how critical, multicultural and traditional theories impact our clients and ourselves as psychologists; Use of videos that highlight connections to real-world issues (e.g., racism and poverty)

I incorporate social justice aspects in my course materials. For example, in my abnormal psych class, while covering substance use disorders, we talked about poverty, unemployment, systemic racism, and capitalism, how they interact to create an environment for substance use issues (specifically we discussed the Pine Ridge Reservation and White Clay NE) and also harm reduction techniques. In my practicum course, I have my students writing reflections about their reactions to their clients, where those biases may come from, and how to work through those.

From the Classroom to Students’ Lives and Profession

Approximately half of responses from faculty also highlighted how they help students connect what they are learning in their coursework about social justice to their personal and professional lives as future psychologists. An emphasis was made on supporting students in building a critical consciousness and application to their research and clinical work.

Teaching them to translate their research, to honor their embodied knowledge, to mentor/create spaces for others based on their positionalities

I have students critique theoretical and conceptual frames associated with research, the construction of knowledge and clinical practice

I teach them how to critically consume psychotherapy science, to whom our knowledge base is limited; how systems of oppression and privilege operate and how that creates the context in which we are doing clinical work; to integrate a conceptualization of these realities and their impact into psychological assessment, treatment planning, conceptualization; to prioritize systems-level or system-focused interventions alongside intra or interpersonal interventions

When I am teaching I constantly challenge students to think about class, race, sex, ability, gender identity, LBGTQ and so on.

Attempt to create awareness of the institutional inequities that exist, and identifying institutional boundaries that limit opportunity
To understand how their position as MH providers affords them some privileges to speak out about inequities, and offer their expertise to those in need

I have taught them about prejudice and privilege. I have also then used exercises to apply what they learned to their own lives.

**From the Classroom to the Community**

Approximately half of responses from faculty also indicated a translation of course material to the community. An emphasis was made on experiential learning, such as community engagement, to help students further understand and embody social justice knowledge.

We provide free trainings, we engage in volunteer opportunities, we conduct research focused on social justice, we discuss social justice in every lab meeting

Our students work in the their first year with our university services in food insecurity and housing access; they take two [courses on] social justice (local and global) and participate in projects in both of these experiences. we send out information about actions happening in communities

We have used class time to volunteer at a local agency that serves victims and perpetrators of IPV, students have written letters to advocate for gender-equality (i.e., wrote a letter to the president of our university to advocate for more gender-neutral bathrooms on campus), graduate students facilitated group discussions with undergraduate students after seeing the film Fattitude, we have held an open-mic event for the #metoo movement, we advocated for free menstrual supplies in campus restrooms

We talk about what social justice means and the many different ways it looks. It doesn't always mean making a large gesture that'll affect hundreds. It could mean advocating for a single person. We can all engage in social justice on a daily basis. In one of my classes we volunteer at a woman's shelter in other classes we discuss how they can practice social justice with their clients.

In addition to finding opportunities to teach social justice theory, I provide my students political advocacy training and seek to arrange opportunities for them to meet with our federal lawmakers

**Advising/Mentoring**

Few faculty members highlighted the advisory or mentorship roles they also serve for students as conduits for teaching social justice concepts. Responses under this theme spoke to mentorship, advising, and encouragement.

Inspire, teach, guide mentor.

mentor their academic activities,

Encouraging participation in liberation-based social media movements, community psychology

**Individual Efforts**

Even fewer faculty discussed methods they specifically used in their own work to promote social justice. Responses under this theme emphasized how the faculty member engages in social justice efforts, rather than how they engage their students.
Recruiting Diverse Students,

Nominating diverse students for GA positions and awards.

Engagement in professional organizations that promote social justice related activities.

Acknowledged Limitations to Social Justice Efforts

Although most participants identified at least one way in which they engage in social justice with their students, one participant noted that they do not implement social justice activities into the classroom, due to concerns that additional activities would extend the length of time students are enrolled in their doctoral programs.

Very limited opportunities. Our doctoral program is long and adding anything else to it would an extra year.)

Other participants also shared barriers to applying social justice in their classrooms, as detailed in the following section.

Question 3: What Barriers do Counseling Psychology Faculty Perceive in Relation to Social Justice Engagement, if Any?

Of the 67 responses, the greatest reported barrier to engaging in social justice was identified as lack of time, followed by positionality and fear of consequences, institutional barriers, lack of colleague support, students who were not ready, emotional exhaustion, and lack of training. A small number of participants reported no barriers to engagement.

Time

The most common theme across faculty responses was the barrier of time. Most responses captured by this theme simply stated time as a barrier, without context. Other responses highlighted that their time is mostly allocated to the multitude of responsibilities their roles as faculty require of them.

A lack of time and energy. Being a professor at the doctoral level is very demanding.

Like many, not having enough time to do everything.

Being so busy and bogged down with everything else that I need to do on a day-to-day basis.

Positionality and Fear of Consequences

Approximately a third of participants identified the fear of potential reactions from others, based on their own positionality, as a barrier to engaging in social justice related activities. Many participants noted painful experiences of being silenced by others and fears of facing potential consequences that outweigh the benefits. Several participants disclosed their own identities, both privileged and marginalized, when discussing fear of consequences that engaging in social justice related topics would bring.

I have found that when I lean into social justice issues, particularly in the current sociopolitical climate, there is a large contingency of psychology doctoral students who become dissatisfied with the particular approaches I use. I am either too militant, not militant enough, silencing of dialogues, encouraging of dissension and conflict within a cohort of students, etc. It is exhausting for an instructor to infuse social justice into a course curriculum in the current climate, because a lot of the students’ emotional reactions to current events channel directly into you as an instructor.
Sometimes I feel too tired, because I have marginalized identities that require my own personal resistance.

PC culture - both students and I are at times afraid to say the “wrong” thing

I often feel as if I get punished by others with power and privilege for engaging in social justice

My own white, male, cis, het, SES privilege, mainly.

The fear of personal safety. I am Taiwanese and would like to advocate for the human rights issues that are occurring in Hong Kong, Xinjiang, and Tibet, however, being a foreigner in this country makes me worried about my physical safety and documentation status.

Speaking up can be a form of social justice and [unfortunately] there have been times when my voice has been silenced or I feel that the consequences for speaking up would outweigh the benefits (e.g., my voice would not be heard and others might be hurt as a result). Ultimately, however, I feel that because social justice can take so many forms, most times there are few barriers to advocating for others in some way.

**Institutional Barriers**

Several faculty members reported there to be a lack of institutional support for engaging in social justice efforts. How this looked varied: several participants noted that social justice engagement was not a requirement at a systemic level (e.g., tenure, APA accreditation), while others noted that there are simply not enough resources to support social justice initiatives.

Promotion and tenure guidelines were not built to support social justice activities

Just accreditation requirements for covering material that may not include social [justice] topics

There are not systematic requirement for a social justice focus in our work - e.g. APA accreditation

lack of funding to provide support such that I do all of my own administrative work, as well as all of the support work for my class preps (psychometrics, tests & measures, psychological assessment, and average 1.5 new course preps per semester (while other faculty have been teaching the same four courses for their entire career at the institution

**Lack of Colleague Support**

In addition to lack of support from the institution, several faculty members noted a lack of support from their colleagues. Responses captured under this theme mostly highlighted resistance, discomfort, and hesitation demonstrated by colleagues in regard to social justice topics. The lack of support thus translated into a barrier for social justice engagement.

lack of complete commitment and engagement by colleagues

Hesitation of colleagues

Other faculty biases.
department requirements; resistance from [other] faculty members who have more seniority; time (I wish the day had [more] than 24 hours!)

**Students Just Aren't Ready**

Several responses also highlighted the developmental stage of their students as a way to gauge whether or not to engage in social justice activities. Faculty members mostly focused on their perceived notion of the students’ development and comfort with social justice related activities and discussions.

developmental stage of students cultural identity

Sometimes my students aren’t ready to hear this.

Some of the challenge is students developmental level - so they aren’t all ready to move to action if they haven’t had a knowledge foundation. Personally, I try to balance myself so not to burnout or fatigue. So I stay informed and try to use public advocacy when I don’t engage in demonstrations as much.

We still have incorporated discussions of diversity and inclusivity in several places in the course, but not every day. The barrier would be not wanting to alienate students who are not fully committed to that perspective.

In an undergraduate course I teach, students are less “bought in” to the social justice mission of counseling psychology. In that context, I am less insistent that social justice topics come up every class.

**Burnout and Emotional Exhaustion**

Relatedly, some of the faculty spoke to feeling burned out and emotionally exhausted by the cost of engaging in social justice. Most responses captured under this theme spoke to either the potential exhaustion, or the experience of being exhausted after engaging in social justice related activities.

Systemic garbage, such as [retaliation and] exhaustion.

Isolation and burnout cause so few of us are actively working toward it, emotional exhaustion from the pain of the work

Emotional costs of doing work actively

One faculty member highlighted the exhaustion that comes from holding their students' emotional reactions to social justice curriculum:

It is exhausting for an instructor to infuse social justice into a course curriculum in the current climate, because a lot of the students’ emotional reactions to current events channel directly into you as an instructor.

**Lack of Training**

Additionally, a handful of participants reported lack of training as a primary obstacle to social justice engagement. Some noted fears surrounding not knowing enough about a topic, not possessing the skills to navigate difficult discussions, and wondering when it is appropriate to engage in social justice efforts.

My own lack of knowledge/inability to be “up” on all pertinent topics
fear of not knowing enough about a topic, fear of navigating tough discussions, wondering if it is the right place, having enough time to complete a discussion

my own newness to the specifics of counseling psych social justice

there might be times when it feels difficult to relate it to the topic of a course (e.g., statistical methods course)

None

Even fewer participants stated that no barriers exist in relation to their social justice involvement, but one included a caveat related to tenure demands: “I’m now a full professor, so none.”

In my academic job and practice, not much

None

I cannot think of barriers. My University’s culture revolves around human diversity

Question 4: How Often Do Faculty Engage with Students in Social Justice?

In addition to the qualitative questions posed in this study, quantitative findings suggest that despite the barriers counseling psychology faculty face, they are quite engaged in social justice efforts, both in their professional and personal lives. A large proportion (81.4%) of counseling psychology faculty reported that they engage in social justice in at least half of their classes, and nearly two-thirds reported that they do so in 70-100% of their classes. Similarly, 85.4% stated that they engage in social justice efforts in their personal lives in at least half of the opportunities they have to do so, and half stated that they do so even more often (70-100% of the time).

Question 5: How Supported Do Faculty Feel in Relation to their Social Justice Efforts?

Although most faculty reported engaging in social justice on a regular basis, many reported doing so with little to no support. The majority (55.7%) of the participants stated that they never received any training from their graduate program on social justice. Further, over 20% of respondents reported that they have received very little or little support from their current workplace to engage in social justice efforts. The large majority (89.5%) of respondents noted that their institutions do not include social justice as an expectation for tenure, but most (57.8%) believed that social justice engagement should be included as a tenure criterion.

Question 6: What Impact Does Training Have on Social Justice Self-Efficacy and Subsequent Engagement?

Results from a MANOVA indicate that small, but significant, differences exist between faculty members who received training in social justice while they were in graduate school and those who did not, with regard to both their current social justice self-efficacy and the support they feel while engaging in social justice now, $F(3, 59) = 3.05, p < .05$; Pillai’s Trace = .13; partial $\eta^2 = .13$.

Findings from follow-up ANOVAs suggest that faculty members who received training in social justice while they were graduate students were significantly more likely to experience higher social justice self-efficacy as a faculty member now, $F(1, 61) = 4.24, p < .05$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.07$ ($M_1 = 149.66, SD_1 = 21.45; M_2 = 137.24, SD_2 = 25.73$). Additionally, faculty who received training in social justice while in graduate school reported experiencing more support when engaging in social justice now, $F(1, 61) = 7.86, p < .01$, partial $\eta^2 = .11$ ($M_1 = 40.55, SD_1 = 6.83; M_2 = 34.18, SD_2 = 10.49$).

Faculty who reported higher levels of social justice self-efficacy also reported significantly more engagement in social justice with their students ($r = .45, p < .001$) and in their personal lives ($r = .38, p < .01$).
Furthermore, faculty who perceived more support for their social justice efforts were significantly more likely to display higher levels of social justice self-efficacy ($r = .42, p = .001$). Lastly, faculty who engaged in more social justice with their students were also more likely to be older ($r = .31, p < .01$) but were no more likely to engage in social justice in their personal lives ($r = .09, p = .49$). No significant differences were found in relation to social justice self-efficacy, barriers, supports, or social justice engagement in professional or personal lives based on gender, race/ethnicity, career stage, or tenure status.

### Table 1. Correlations among Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SJ in Classes</th>
<th>SJ in Personal Life</th>
<th>Career Stage</th>
<th>SJ Self-Efficacy</th>
<th>SJ Support</th>
<th>SJ Barriers</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SJ in Classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ in Personal Life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.87*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ Self-Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJ Barriers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. SJ = “social justice”. * signifies $p < .01.$

### Discussion

Six research questions surrounding faculty knowledge of, attitudes towards, and experiences with social justice were posed in this study. Each finding is briefly summarized, unexpected and poignant findings are highlighted, and a series of reflection questions are offered to help the reader personalize the findings for their own practice.

The first question explored counseling psychology faculty members’ definitions of social justice. Participants highlighted five key themes in relation to their definition of social justice: 1) equity, 2) systemic change, 3) equality, 4) advocacy, and 5) a personal commitment. Of note, several participants commented that social justice involves a sustained commitment to equity, advocacy, and self-reflection, a comment echoed by other scholars in the field (see Baranowski et al., 2016; Brady-Amoon et al., 2012). Working toward systemic changes requires dedication and endurance; one cannot claim to be a social justice advocate and participate in it in an intermitted fashion; it is a value that must permeate a faculty member’s self-reflection, the lessons they teach, the readings they utilize in their classes, the assignments they provide, and the work they participate in within their communities. To personalize this study’s findings to one’s own life, an educator reading this article might ask themselves, “When was the last time I reviewed my readings in my syllabus for inclusivity and representation from a wide range of scholars?”, “How often do I reflect on my own assumptions, biases, and privileges?”, and “What does social justice mean to me? What does it look like?”
The second question in this study examined the ways in which faculty engage in social justice with their students. Results suggested many faculty take a “layered approach” to social justice work. Participants highlighted a number of ways in which they engage in social justice within themselves, their classes, their labs, their programs, their campuses, and more broadly, their communities. In fact, the very range of responses from faculty underscored the breadth by which social justice work is enacted: from prompting student reflection on implicit biases to discussions around the impact of systemic racism on mental health issues; from writing letters with students to those in positions of power on gender equality to providing trainings on political advocacy; and from arranging meetings with federal lawmakers to partnering with university services on food insecurity and housing access. Although many participants highlighted intensive, semester-long social justice initiatives, it should be noted that we can engage in social justice work every day; through the conversations we have, the readings we engage in, and the ways we incorporate social justice topics into our curriculum, clinical work, and research. As the reader considers how they might apply the results from this part of the study in their own lives, we invite them to reflect on the following questions: “How can I intentionally incorporate social justice related content into my curriculum?”, “How am I helping my students apply social justice content to their lives, understanding of their professional identity, and connection with the community?”, “How am I modeling social justice in my classroom and in my interactions with my students?”, “How can I use my talents, skills, and knowledge to advocate for a more equitable future?”, and “How can I harness the talent within my classes to support greater equity in our communities?”

The third question investigated barriers that discourage or prevent faculty from engaging in social justice. The top three themes were lack of time, positionality and fear of consequences, and institutional barriers. Other scholars also identified time as a significant challenge for individuals who aim to infuse social justice in research and advocacy endeavors (Baranowski et al., 2016). In addition, Baranowski and colleagues (2016) noted challenges reported by students in relation to financial constraints, limited training, and perceived program resistance to advocacy, closely mirroring the challenges faculty noted in this study as well. Our findings suggest that faculty may need extra support to engage in social justice efforts, such as those from their colleagues and the institution, as emotional exhaustion and tenure pressures were common barriers experienced. It is also important to note that marginalized faculty often experience added pressures, invisible labor, and added service roles than non-marginalized faculty (Huff, 2021), and racial battle fatigue and minority stress create additional stressors above and beyond what is traditionally understood as “burnout” (see Smith, 2004, 2008; Danquah et al., 2021). Findings from a recent narrative analysis suggest faculty experiencing racial battle fatigue may benefit by creating boundaries around those who are destructive, finding and nurturing community with professionals of shared identities, and engaging in self-care through physical activities and counseling (Quaye et al., 2019). Affecting systemic change on the larger level may be cumbersome for faculty members. Thus, engaging in reflective practices may be more tangible. Faculty might consider reflecting on the following questions: “What stands in the way of me engaging in more social justice work?”, “How does my positionality inform my level of (dis)comfort with social justice related content I teach?”, “How can I continue to create an inclusive environment for my students and facilitate courageous conversations, while also maintaining my own well-being?”, “Have I found a support network with others dedicated to social justice initiatives?”, “How do I feel about the amount of social justice initiatives I am currently engaged in?”, “How sustainable does the amount of social justice work I am engaged in currently feel for me?”, and “What are methods I can take to better sustain the amount of social justice work I want to engage in?”

The fourth question assessed how often faculty engage in social justice. A strong majority of faculty reported engaging in social justice efforts in both their personal and professional lives. Although social justice has been touted as a core component of the counseling and psychology fields (Brady-Amoon et al., 2012), research from this study provides credence for the notion that our fields do not just “talk the talk”, but also “walk
the walk.” Results from this study demonstrate that faculty have utilized many opportunities to partner for social justice. As the reader considers how this finding might connect with their own life, a point of reflection may be: “How often do I engage in social justice efforts with my students?”, “How often do I engage in it in my personal life?”, and “Given that the value of social justice is a core tenet of counseling and psychology, how can I engage in it more meaningfully?”

The fifth question surveyed how supported faculty feel in relation to their social justice efforts. Findings from this study suggest that support is lacking in some key respects. Nearly one in five respondents stated that they received very little to little support for their social justice efforts within their university. Further, a little over half of the respondents reported that they never received any training as a graduate student on ways to engage in social justice. Among those who did receive training in graduate school, it is unclear how much emphasis was placed on social justice efforts. For example, one single-hour seminar on the importance of social justice is likely to register a much smaller impact than more continuous training and modeling by faculty members and fellow students. A similar lack of training was reported in a study of 66 counseling psychology students. Singh et al. (2010) found that 85% reported that they had not received any coursework in social justice. Further, even when trainings occur, many faculty and students struggle to translate theoretical frameworks for social justice into practical action (Ali et al., 2008).

If the field of counseling psychology wishes to embed social justice into its identity (Baluch et al., 2004; Fouad & Prince, 2011; Olle, 2018; Vera & Speight, 2003), we must create a consistent culture within our counseling psychology programs that centers on social justice initiatives, and we must be intentional about it. Social justice initiatives cannot be seen as an afterthought or add-on to a program, but instead as an integral, core component of our identity and actions, and this likely starts with the ways we train our students. A reader of this article might ask themselves, “How can I enhance my knowledge of social justice efforts? What continuing education training, books, or initiative do I have access to? Who can I ask for mentorship in this area?” and “How often do I train others (e.g., my coworkers, my students) in social justice? What holds me back from doing that more often?”

The last question in this study explored the potential impact of graduate school training on social justice self-efficacy later in life. Results indicated that faculty trained in social justice during their graduate studies reported greater social justice self-efficacy now. In addition, those who reported higher social justice self-efficacy also engaged in significantly more social justice efforts in their personal and professional lives. Results from this study of counseling psychology faculty provide mirror results from Beer and colleagues’ (2012) study of counseling psychology graduate students. The researchers found that students attributed coursework (training) focused on enhancing the learner’s understanding of social justice, supportive training contexts, and professional barriers as impacting their engagement in social justice initiatives.

These findings suggest that if we want to foster a culture of social justice, we need to empower counselors and psychologists with self-confidence in their social justice efforts. For this reason, we conclude this article with suggestions designed to increase our readers’ social justice self-efficacy. Our recommendations utilize Bandura’s (1977) model for self-efficacy development as a framework.

**Developing a Blueprint for Social Justice Engagement through Self-Efficacy**

According to Bandura (1977), self-efficacy develops through four sources: performance accomplishments, vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal. Building on Bandura’s theory, four recommendations to enhance social justice self-efficacy among counselors and psychologists are provided.
**Recommendation 1: Support Performance Accomplishments**

Challenging ourselves to try something new and, in the process, successfully performing those tasks enhances self-efficacy. Several of our respondents noted that their lack of training in social justice has been an impediment to their involvement in social justice efforts. If we want to encourage and support faculty engagement in social justice work, we need to enable them with the appropriate resources (e.g., training, institutional support/backing, emotional support for challenges related to social justice work). To increase self-confidence and competence for social justice work, a focus should be placed on enhancing social justice knowledge, awareness, and skills.

**Enhance Social Justice Knowledge.** A publicly available folder with a collection of social justice-oriented teaching resources and relevant articles could support the acquisition of new knowledge to enable psychologists to embed social justice more intentionally into their practice, teaching, advocacy, and science. Activities housed in this folder might include self-reflection exercises, journaling activities that invite students to reflect on issues of privilege and oppression, case studies, a critical examination at the cultural validity of research, discussions and opportunities to process reactions to discussions, anti-oppression advocacy, the use of media as a vehicle and a voice (e.g., writing to local newspapers), and experiential exercises (see also Burnes & Singh, 2010).

Several excellent resources exist, with ideas and strategies for enacting social justice in classes, research, and training programs (see Ali & Sichel, 2014; Burnes & Singh, 2010; Goodman et al., 2018; Heppner, 2017; Motluskay et al., 2014; Olle, 2018; Scheel et al., 2018; Singh et al., 2010; Toporek & Worthington, 2014; Vera & Speight, 2003; Winterowd et al., 2009). In addition to suggestions found in the articles cited above, the APA’s Division 17 (2017b) created a Social Justice syllabus, available on their website, which provides a number of suggestions for social justice oriented readings, assignments, activities, and syllabi.

Resource packets such as the one offered by Division 17 may provide a potential solution for the most common social justice engagement barrier: time. Providing counselors and psychologists with helpful resources can both spark their own creativity to apply social justice work in their classes, research, practice, and daily life, and it can also decrease the amount of time devoted to developing social justice-related activities.

**Support Social Justice Awareness.** In addition to resource packets, awareness could be enhanced through self-reflection activities. A counselor or psychologist might explore their own assumptions, biases, and privilege by using journal prompts such as: 1) How can I use my positionality to affect systemic change? What is one historical and one current example of which systemic oppression was addressed?, 2) When was a time that I wanted to engage in a difficult dialogue but felt too uncomfortable to do so? What held me back?, 3) When was a time that I felt safe to facilitate difficult dialogues within the classroom? What helped it feel safe?, and 4) When I think of diversity, what comes to mind? Are identities from across the spectrum of power (privileged, oppressed) included? What has informed my understanding of diverse backgrounds?

**Increase Social Justice Skills.** Lastly, skills could be developed through role models and social justice training videos, which are discussed in more detail in the next recommendation.

**Recommendation 2: Offer Vicarious Experiences**

Observing others who successfully accomplish a task can increase self-efficacy. Social justice self-efficacy could be enhanced by providing faculty with access to role models. Mentor matching, articles written by experts with practical recommendations for social justice engagement, video trainings, and courses could be used to provide opportunities for vicarious learning.

Given our finding that more than half of counseling psychology faculty reported no training on social justice, mentoring and other opportunities for training are imperative. Heppner (2017) notes that mentoring opportunities can provide pivotal support for social justice initiatives and outlines several strategies to promote cultural competence and social justice. Some recommendations include mentoring to enhance the creation of
culturally sensitive student services and encouraging mentees to consider how their research can be used as a tool for social change.

Mentoring might also take place within counseling and psychology programs, during faculty meetings, through multicultural/social justice town halls, or through informal interactions. As previously noted, Motluský et al. (2014) promoted the use of faculty meetings to build connection and support for their social justice engagement efforts. Their faculty engaged in ongoing discussions and reflective conversations that explore how they define social justice, diversity, and multiculturalism. The faculty shared their experiences with social justice engagement and carefully considered where they have experienced success and challenges related to their engagement. These meetings also offered opportunities for verbal and emotional support from others, which can be useful within the third avenue for self-efficacy: verbal persuasion.

**Recommendation 3: Provide Verbal Persuasion**

Receiving verbal encouragement from people who are important and influential in our lives can enable us to work through self-doubt and concentrate on the current task. Community support groups, mentoring experiences, social justice-oriented awards and recognition, and feedback from community members, students, and fellow social justice collaborators might all offer opportunities for counselors and psychologists to receive encouragement in their efforts.

In addition, faculty need to feel support for prioritizing social justice from colleagues, peers, and the profession, overall. As a field, we need to “put our money where our mouth is.” If we say social justice is important, we should acknowledge it in important benchmarks in a counselor’s or psychologist’s professional career (e.g., tenure).

Unfortunately, many institutions do not support faculty engagement in social justice work. Our study found that more than one in five counseling psychology faculty reported that they feel little to very little support from their workplaces for engaging in social justice efforts. This lack of support can lead faculty members to feel isolated, unappreciated, and burned out.

Social justice efforts could be supported by institutions and organizations in many ways. First, 90% of the respondents stated that their programs do not currently include engagement in social justice efforts as a consideration for tenure. Most faculty in this study, however, expressed that social justice involvement should be counted towards tenure. If social justice is a key component of our counseling and psychology identities, it follows that it should be an important consideration for tenure as a professor. Second, tangible supports should be provided for social justice work. This might include course releases for social justice work, additional funding, and graduate assistantships to support social justice engagement at a programmatic level. Organizations including APA might encourage training programs to detail how they embody our identity as social justice change agents within future accreditation materials. On a systemic level, the APA Society of Counseling Psychology (SCP) has made strides in centering social justice in their work and offers resources faculty and administrators may find useful. The SCP has developed a [Social Justice Advocacy section of their website](#), which includes a historical timeline of social justice in counseling psychology, as well as sections on anti-racism and ways to address anti-black racism, social justice advocacy topics and issues, tools to engage in advocacy, immigration advocacy, issues for the advocate, advocacy training, and a social justice advocacy model. Tangible supports such as these may positively impact a counselor’s or psychologist’s felt sense of agency, appreciation, and emotional wellbeing.

**Recommendation 4: Attend to Emotional Arousal**

Our emotions, moods, reactions, and stress levels can influence how confident we feel in our own abilities (see also Goette et al., 2015), and results from this study suggest that many counseling psychologists are stressed, emotionally burned-out, and overwhelmed. In fact, many respondents identified emotional exhaustion
as a primary barrier to their engagement in social justice. Self-care can act as a critical shield against burnout and stress associated with social justice efforts. Self-care may be especially important for Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) educators, as the liberation of others may also be an act of liberation of self (Pitts, 2020). Social justice work is meaningful, necessary, and a core component of counseling psychology’s identity (Taylor et al., 2019), and social justice can also carry with it the tolls of a personal and emotionally demanding endeavor. Counselors and psychologists are encouraged to check in with themselves emotionally, to consider what forms of self-care work best for them, and to make a conscious plan to integrate self-care initiatives into their daily lives. In a field that is focused on serving others, it can be difficult for many counselors and psychologists to give themselves permission to engage in self-care, to recognize the difference between self-care and self-indulgence, to admit when they need to slow down, and to make self-care a consistent habit.

Additionally, self-care is not always singular; it does not necessarily mean journaling to oneself and taking solitary walks. Communal self-care can provide a helpful reminder that we are not alone in our work. This sense of community might be accomplished through membership in social justice-oriented social media groups, listservs, and locally organized social groups (e.g., Meetup). These experiences allow us to build a community; to feel that there are people “like us” engaged in the same efforts; and to connect with supportive circles.

Initiatives such as these address primary barriers counseling psychologists reported in this study: fear of consequences and lack of colleague support. Social justice-oriented counselors and psychologists may be met with resistance and discouragement from others who are not engaged in the same work. Resistance from others may even be more apparent for educators with intersecting marginalized identities (Pitts, 2020). For that reason, finding a sense of “community” and connection within this work is particularly vital.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

While discussing the implications of this study, the results must be understood within the context of its inherent limitations. Although the study’s sample represented greater diversity among participants than those of the broader APA faculty membership, the representation was weighted towards White participants (65% of respondents). Research suggests that Faculty of Color face additional strains in academia, from experiences of tokenization and microaggressions to increased service burdens and mentoring demands from students who may not find many other Faculty of Color for support (Constantine et al., 2008; Fouad & Carter, 1992; Griffin & Reddick, 2011; Louis et al., 2016). Although no differences in social justice self-efficacy, barriers, supports, or engagement were found between racial majority and minority participants, a broader, larger sample may reveal additional demands Faculty of Color experience in relation to their social justice engagement.

Relatedly, the sample was heavily weighted with tenure-track faculty. Findings from this study suggested that older faculty members were more engaged in social justice work with their students, and there was a trend toward greater engagement among those later in their career stages as well. It is possible that the demands of tenure limit an early career academic’s ability to engage in social justice efforts, whereas more senior faculty may not experience the same research pressures that may otherwise impede a faculty member’s engagement in community efforts and work related to privilege, oppression, and power.

Lastly, it is possible that both nonresponse bias and social desirability bias may have been present in this study. Although the survey invitation explicitly noted that academics who both were and were not engaged in social justice were invited to participate and faculty members at every APA-accredited counseling psychology institution were individually invited to participate, a select number of counseling psychologists participated. It is likely that those who are more invested in social justice were more likely to take the time to respond to this survey. Further, of those who chose to participate, social desirability bias may have impacted the way some participants responded. Social justice is a hot topic, and it is possible that participants may have attempted to present themselves in a socially desirable light. Given that most psychologists recognize social desirability
measures embedded in surveys, using a social desirability measure for these participants was determined to be of limited value. However, to minimize socially desirable responding, the survey was administered online, and data was collected in an anonymous fashion.

**Future Directions**

Future studies could build on the current study in several iterative ways. For example, two experimental design studies could be conducted to explore variables that impact counselors’ and psychologists’ social justice engagement. First, an experimental design study could target all four components of social justice self-efficacy outlined in the discussion section (training, mentoring, support and encouragement, and self-care) and could explore the impact of those interventions on the participant’s social justice self-efficacy and engagement. Second, an intervention study could explore strategies to prevent burnout associated with prolonged social justice work. Because one of the barriers related to engagement in social justice work was emotional exhaustion, an experimental study could be conducted to test the efficacy of a support group that meets once each week to provide space for counselors and psychologists to process their social justice experiences and to provide support and encouragement to each other.

**Implications and Concluding Remarks**

Social justice is an important component of counseling psychology’s identity (Vera & Speight, 2003) and, in addition to our field’s commitment to issues of diversity, a commitment to social justice and activism is projected to be a seminal part of the identity of counseling psychologists within the next decade (Taylor et al., 2019). Results from this study indicate that more training on social justice is needed, and training in social justice may positively impact a counseling psychologist’s confidence in their social justice efforts in the future. Those who displayed greater confidence in their social justice engagement also invested in significantly more social justice work with their students than did those with low social justice self-efficacy.

Counseling psychology faculty play a pivotal role in the future of our field; they train our students to become excellent clinicians, researchers, and future professors. They also provide students with the knowledge, attitudes, and skills to serve the broader world around us through the clients they touch with counseling, the voices they amplify with research, and the inspiration and knowledge they impart on future trainees. The training we provide our students sets an important tone for their confidence in their advocacy work later, and that confidence is an important potential precursor to the degree to which they actually engage in social justice in their personal and professional lives. If we want counselors and psychologists to step outside of the “Ivory Towers” and into the communities around them, we must be thoughtful about creating a new generation of social justice advocates, and confidence to advocate begins with adequate training, mentoring, support, and self-care.
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