The Effect of Student Race and Class Intersections on the Assignment of School-Based Resources

Randolph Michael Scott-McLaughlin II

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
under the Executive Committee
of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

2022

Abstract

The Effect of Student Race and Class Intersections on the Assignment of School-Based Resources

Randolph Scott-McLaughlin II

Professional decision-making concerning the nature and quantity of schoolchildren's educational, counseling, and remedial experiences is critical to children's success. How are aspects of students' race and socioeconomic status associated with teachers' and counselors' recommendations regarding the supportive and remedial services provided to them? This study examined how racial/ethnic identity and social class may influence the early treatment decisions that teachers and counselors make about programs and services that could benefit their students. The study analyzed archival data collected from teachers and counselors via a classroom vignette study in which participants suggested appropriate programming and services for a hypothetical child. The scenario and the presenting issues were the same across all vignettes, while the hypothetical child's race/ethnicity and socioeconomic background varied. Overall, the results suggested that many teachers and counselors can make unbiased decisions about service recommendations for students. However, responses to the Asian American vignette frequently seemed to be affected by the model minority stereotype; in addition, trends that suggested biased views towards Latinx and low SES students were found, along with the possible existence of a positive feedback bias toward Black students. Suggested future research directions included the creation of a scale for the measurement of attitudinal dispositional ratings with an extension to clinical settings.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

STUDENT RACE AND CLASS INTERSECTION

Introduction

> Segregation of white and Negro children in the public schools of a State solely on the basis of race, pursuant to state laws permitting or requiring such segregation, denies to Negro children the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. . . (*Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954)

It has been 34 years since the landmark Brown v. Board of Education case resulted in the integration of the U.S. national school system (*Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954). A separate but equal doctrine (*Plessy v. Ferguson*, 1895) was in effect from the time that Black people were first allowed to pursue education after the abolishment of slavery up until 1954 when the policy was deemed unconstitutional. During this time, outright hatred of Black people and general discrimination toward people of color existed throughout the country (Clayton, 1996; Lofton & Davis, 2015). There was such a strong backlash to school integration that the U.S. National Guard and the U.S. Army were required to escort the first group of Black students (called the Little Rock Nine) to class out of concern for the students' safety (Clayton, 1996). Decades later, there is still reason to believe that full educational equity has not yet been achieved for Black students (Rothstein, 2015).

School-Based Professionals and Identity-Related Bias

Professional decision-making concerning the nature and quality of schoolchildren's educational, counseling, and remedial experiences is critical to children's success. Students from diverse identity groups can tell that they are being treated differently from an early age (Bigler & Wright, 2014; Brown et al., 2011; McKown & Strambler, 2009). This differential treatment

subtly conveys negative messages to children that can disrupt the development of a positive self-identity and maintain motivation in school (Bohrnstedt et al., 2015; Haynes et al., 1989; Pigott & Cowen, 2000). When assumptions are present in the minds of counselors and educators about their students, these beliefs not only undermine the development of a solid counseling alliance (L. Pérez-Gualdrón et al., 2016) but can also interfere with students' scholastic achievement (Foxx et al., 2020). Moreover, the biased diagnostic impressions that may result from counselors' preconceptions can dramatically impact subsequent referrals and service delivery (Minton, 2016).

The Study

The study aimed to contribute to the literature by examining the extent to which racial/ethnic identity and social class may influence the early treatment decisions that teachers and counselors make about programs and services that could benefit their students. The results suggested that overall many teachers and counselors are able to make unbiased decisions about service recommendations for students. However, students of color, specifically Asian Americans, were consistently affected by the model minority stereotype, which also impacted the behavioral attributional ratings of these students.

The study and its findings represent new information for school-based professionals in that previous studies have not examined the interaction between race/ethnic identity and social class (Foxx et al., 2020; Shell, 2020). Additionally, the analysis served to produce directions for future research, including the suggested development and refinement of a scale to measure perceived student dispositions and the expansion of attitudinal dispositional ratings specifically toward clinical settings. Furthermore, future research should continue to investigate the

attributional biases that seem to exist towards Asian American, Latinx, and low SES students, as well as the possible existence of a positive feedback bias for Black students.

Chapter I – Review of the Literature

As a discipline, counseling psychology focuses on psychological practice in the context of social justice issues related to race, social class, gender, sexuality, and ethnicity (Sue, 2010; Sue et al., 1992; Sue & Sue, 2015)**.** In their work within school settings, school counselors and counseling psychologists provide counseling services as they work closely with teachers to evaluate students who need additional support. The literature in counseling psychology has focused on the ways that biases such as racism (Sue et al., 2007; Sue & Sue, 2015) and classism (Lott, 2002; Smith et al., 2008) may influence clinical decisions in a therapeutic context, but has less often attended to the ways that these biases impact other settings. On the other hand, educators have a long history of noting the different ways that students of color and poor students are labeled as gifted, or conversely, as being in need of special services (Ahram et al., 2011; Peterson, 2015). Despite the role that counselors can play in serving and making referrals for students, they have yet to adequately explore the impact of race and social class in school-based referrals and services (Foxx et al., 2020; Shure et al., 2020).

This chapter will begin by outlining how counselors and educators have approached bias related to cultural identity. Next, the relative lack of research on teacher and counselor bias towards students regarding the race and class intersection with regard to counseling practice will be highlighted. This discussion will be followed by an overview of the resources allocated to and recommended for students based on their race and social class location. Next, research on how educational resources' availability impacts students over the long term will be discussed. Finally, the current study will be presented.

1.1 Identity-Related Bias in Counseling Psychology

The population in the United States continues to become more diverse at every level of education (Humes et al., 2011; McFarland et al., 2019). Students of color across all racial demographics are becoming a larger population of the student body, as is reflected in the annual congressional report on trends in education (McFarland et al., 2019). These changing demographics require a greater emphasis on better understanding and managing multicultural competencies for counselors and teachers. The American Psychological Association (APA) noted the increased importance of understanding and regulating its members' professional behavior in these areas by issuing guidelines for multicultural competencies (American Psychological Association, 2003).

APA's multicultural practice guidelines were recently updated (American Psychological Association, 2017) for the 21st century to build upon the previously published set from 2002 (American Psychological Association, 2003). Current multicultural guidelines emphasize the importance of identity and intersectional components of multiple identities, thus creating a more comprehensive understanding of the individual. The guidelines charge psychologists to disrupt oppressive practices and inequity across a myriad of social systems, one of which is the educational system. In particular, Guideline 5 emphasizes that psychologists have an obligation to provide equal access to quality behavioral health resources.

Similarly, the guidelines of the American Counseling Association (ACA) have been updated from 1992's Multicultural Counseling Competencies (MCC), resulting in the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (Ratts & Greenleaf, 2017). These guidelines also emphasize intersectionality. The ACA guidelines emphasize the counselor-client

dyad and their intersecting identities as they relate to privilege and marginalization. The focus is on relationships between the client and counselor, and particular attention is paid to how respective positions of privilege or marginalization impact the relationship. In a complementary fashion, the ACA also created advocacy competencies (American Counseling Association, 2018). This advocacy framework is also relevant to the school setting because it is an organization with policies and procedures that impact the student. Counselors can find themselves in a position to advocate for students (whether as individuals or groups) with regard to their well-being within that organization.

1.2 Multicultural Competence, Counseling, and Diagnosis

How do issues of multicultural competence play out in counselors' decision-making on their clients' behalf? Two aspects of identity with respect to such decision-making will be profiled below: race and social class.

1.2.1 Race

Longstanding findings suggest the influence of race in the clinical and diagnostic decisions made by therapists and healthcare professionals. Alegria, Vallas, and Pumariega (2010) presented a review of racial disparities in children's mental health that indicated clinicians might be asking children of color diagnostic questions in a way that had a different impact than on White children. In particular, when Black children are asked similar questions on a standardized screening questionnaire, Black children were more likely to under-endorse specific items despite the child having similar overall clinical severity levels on the measure (Wu et al., 2009). The bias that Alegria et al. noted, therefore, seems to be a failure to identify cases that would benefit from therapeutic intervention because Black and White children responded differently to the same

types of questions. Consequently, the line of questioning seemed to bias the clinicians toward underdiagnosing children of color, denying them access to treatment that could be beneficial.

Even when clinicians are given diagnostic presentations that are similar, Black clients are given more severe diagnoses at significantly higher rates than White clients (Delphin-Rittmon et al., 2015). For instance, Delphin-Rittmon et al. conducted a study utilizing a random sample of 1,484 patients admitted to a northeastern hospital and found that when controlling for age, sex, and insurance status, Black patients were more likely to be diagnosed with psychotic disorders like schizophrenia and less likely to be given mood disorder than White patients at the time of discharge from the hospital. In another analysis of why Black clients were more likely to receive a diagnosis of schizophrenia than White clients, Eack et al. (2012) analyzed archival data obtained from the 1995 multisite MacArthur Violence Risk Assessment Study. In that study, the researchers had clinicians interview hospital inpatients using a structured interview to obtain a diagnosis, thoroughly reviewed patient charts for the most recent chart diagnosis, and had the patient and clinician complete a perceived honesty questionnaire. In Eack et al.'s analysis of this data, they found that clinicians perceived Black clients as less honest when interviewed. Statistical analysis indicated that the perceived honesty of the interviewee mediated the relationship between race and client diagnosis, such that Black clients were more likely to be diagnosed with schizophrenia than were White clients. Results like these suggest that the biased views clinicians may hold towards diverse populations, specifically racially marginalized identities, can have deleterious effects on the quality of the clients' care.

1.2.2 Social class

With regard to social class, the psychological literature suggests that when psychologists think of people in poverty, it is from a deficit-based model (Cozzarelli et al., 2001; Lott, 2012).

Furthermore, psychology generally consists of people who identify as middle class, which influences the way they see and understand poverty and social class (Lott & Bullock, 2001). Along these lines, White Americans tend to engage in psychological and physical distancing from the poor (Kunstman et al., 2016). For reasons like these, poor clients may experience barriers to entering psychotherapeutic relationships within the current framework of therapy (Smith, 2005).

Minimal results exist concerning the impact of clients' social class on diagnostic impressions. However, they point to a similar effect as was discussed with race: when clients were described as having lower socioeconomic statuses, they were more likely to be seen as mentally ill or dysfunctional (Lee & Temerlin, 1970; Pietrantoni & Glance, 2019; Smith et al., 2011; Stein et al., 1972) and less appealing to work with (Lavell, 2018; Smith & Mao, 2012). Nevertheless, a small body of literature focuses on therapeutic interventions that target low SES and clients in poverty (Kim & Cardemil, 2012; Payne et al., 2015; Toth et al., 2013; Wadsworth.

1.3 Identity-Related Bias in School Counseling

As stated in the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) ethical standards for school counselors, school counselors are charged with providing programming for students that promotes achievement for all students and supports their parents and communities (American School Counselor Association, 2016). In order to achieve these goals, school counselors address the ways that biased attitudes and beliefs may impact their ability to work with a diverse population of students (Dameron et al., 2019; Foxx et al., 2020; Grey, 2019; L. Pérez-Gualdrón et al., 2016; Pietrantoni & Glance, 2019; Ratts et al., 2016; Shell, 2020). Some of the particular areas that have received research attention include the opportunity gap (Grey, 2019), differential disciplinary practices (Shure et al., 2020), and alternative education program placement (Betters-

Bubon et al., 2016; Goodman-Scott et al., 2019; Shell, 2020) among White students and students of color (Grey, 2019).

Educational psychologists and other social scientists have also attempted to explain some of the aforementioned disparate treatment between White students and students of color by using socioeconomic status (SES) as an explanatory variable (Ganao et al., 2013). Bryant and Wilson's (2020) study reviewed archival data on disciplinary practices employed at a high school, and they found through logistic regression a statistically significant difference in the suspension rates and discipline referrals between high and low socioeconomic status students; specifically, low SES students were found to be 2.84 times more likely to be suspended than their high SES counterparts. Nevertheless, even with SES taken into account in both discipline referrals and school suspensions, Black students were also significantly more likely to receive these punishments than their White peers.

The differences in academic achievement between Black and White students have also been investigated from the context of socioeconomic status. The findings were similar to those mentioned above; Bohrnstedt et al. (2015) found that, after controlling for SES, differences between White and Black students on academic achievement metrics were still present. In other words, this literature suggests that, while socioeconomic status may be a factor, it is not the primary force in explaining the differences found between White students and students of color.

1.4 The Importance of Intersectionality

The fields of counseling and counseling psychology have overarching aims to develop critical consciousness in emerging professionals, who can then continue to advocate for change after their schooling is completed (L. M. Pérez-Gualdrón & Yeh, 2014). The current zeitgeist within this work emphasizes moving beyond consideration of individual identities in favor of

intersectional approaches; current contributors to the literature are encouraged to expand upon this focus (Shin et al., 2017). As Shin et al. noted, most intersectional work in counseling psychology research focuses on two or more identities and how they influence the individual. However, the authors argue that a more robust approach is to consider the individual experience of intersecting identities and the intersections of the systems of oppression that operate within these intersecting identities and advocate for disrupting those systems. Research that comprises variables corresponding to more than one identity-related form of systemic oppression could aid in this regard.

1.5 Counselor-Client Identity Interactions

Multicultural research has made it clear that counselors and psychologists are not immune to the impact of societal biases within their work (Sue, 2011; Sue & Sue, 2015). To this end, the multicultural literature emphasizes the need for counselors to attend to the potential for harm to their clients from marginalized groups via a lack of professional multicultural competence. For example, concerning research on more commonly-studied aspects of identity, researchers have shed light on the potential for attitudes related to clients' race (Cerezo et al., 2020; R. Johnson et al., 2018), gender (Platt, 2020; Szymanski, 2020), and sexual orientation (Abreu et al., 2020) to distort the therapeutic alliance along with therapists' early diagnostic impressions (R. L. Owens et al., 2015). Early diagnostic impressions are of central importance in that a therapist initially assesses a client and can determine the adequacy and appropriateness of any services offered subsequently.

With regard to race, discrimination generally negatively affects health and can also negatively impact the mental health of targets of discrimination (Carter et al., 2017). Microaggressions are one vehicle by which targets of discrimination experience the negative

daily encounters that encompass slights, behaviors, beliefs, and comments (Sue, 2010). Therapists themselves can communicate microaggressions within the counselor-client dyad, both through verbal statements and nonverbal communications (R. Johnson et al., 2018). Given the unconscious nature of these communications, microaggressions can occur when counselors are unaware of their biases and the damage that they can cause as they undermine the therapeutic encounter's effectiveness.

1.6 Identity-Related Bias in Education

Applying these considerations to the field of education, the analysis of bias and discrimination within American educational institutions has a decades-long history and continues to be examined today. One area where policy-related progress has been made relates to school desegregation according to race. In Kenneth Clark's (1979) review of the impact of social sciences on policy in the 25 years after Brown v Board, he noted that while Brown v. Board resulted in desegregation and the removal of many racialized segregation laws like interracial marriage through the Loving case, there was great difficulty in applying the spirit of the Brown v. Board decision in northern urban centers. Clark argued that the segregation in urban centers did not violate the technical laws written regarding desegregation; however, the effect of city zoning and anti-busing legislation led to segregated schools that were the same as the just previously legally segregated schools in the Southern States.

More currently, not only is racial segregation in schools increasing (Coughlan, 2018), but socioeconomic status segregation (Orfield et al., 2016) within the school system is also increasing. As Owens (2020) argued, school districts and neighborhoods have become more diverse; however, the student population within these schools does not reflect the school district's diversity. So while the Brown v. Board decision has legally desegregated schools, it is

increasingly becoming apparent that schools are reverting to the age of segregation through alternative policymaking practices (Coughlan, 2018; Orfield et al., 2016; A. Owens, 2020), which Kenneth Clark (1979) warned was happening over 30 years ago.

The legal framework of critical race theory (CRT) connected the work of the lawyers and social scientists (Clark et al., 2004; Clark, 1979) that helped achieve the desegregation of schools. This theory attempts to address societal injustices from the assumptive position that racism constitutes an integrated framework deeply embedded within American society's cultural bedrock (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). CRT has influenced many other disciplines beyond the legal realm, such as public health, education, and psychology (Volpe, 2019). Not only has CRT influenced other disciplines, but scholars also maintain that there is a need for increased collaboration among scholars and policymakers so that scientific data can be used to inform changes in education and public health (Carbado & Roithmayr, 2014). Derrick Bell (1980) specifically helped pave the way for applying CRT to education with regard to pedagogical practices. Educators like Gloria Gladson-Billings (1995; 2006, 2009) have since intertwined critical race theory with educational theory in such a way that multicultural pedagogy is understood to be the proper default mode of practice. The impact of CRT has been so significant that disciplines that are adjacent to education, such as school counseling, have also adopted this framework and are currently working to encourage its acceptance across their field (Borrero & Yeh, 2013; Goodman-Scott et al., 2019; Minton, 2016; L. Pérez-Gualdrón et al., 2016; Shell, 2020). This study assumes CRT to be a basic conceptual building block in that racial identity is assumed to be embedded within the way that individuals experience and view the world. However, the study itself will build upon this idea to analyze other contextual factors such as

social class. This study, therefore, is informed by CRT and builds upon it but will not be strictly analyzing a CRT model of the data.

1.7 Bias and Classroom Settings

The educational literature suggests that identity-related bias affects classroom operations in the same way that it can impact therapists' impressions. Pigott and Cowen (2000) found that both African American and White teachers judged African American children to have more severe school adjustment problems and fewer competencies than White children. Furthermore, teacher bias is further complicated when viewed from beyond the Black-White binary, and more racial-ethnic identities are included in the analysis. For example, Hughes, Gleason, and Zang (2005) found that teachers were most biased in their academic perception of Black students than for either White or Latino students. These expectations of their students are relevant because a teacher's expectations of academic ability influence a child's performance on educational tasks (Beady & Hansell, 1981).

Teacher ratings typically ascribe more behavioral problems and more unsatisfactory academic performance to African American children than to their White peers (Dauber et al., 1993; DeMeis & Turner, 1977; Horwitz et al., 1998; Lindholm et al., 1978; Pigott & Cowen, 2000; Skiba et al., 2014). Entwisle and Alexander (1988) demonstrated that first-grade teachers responded differently to African American and White children who were displaying the very same behavior, indicating different ways of interpreting child behavior based on child ethnicity. A consequence of these differing interpretations of behavior based on race is that students of color have more drastic disciplinary action taken against them by their educators (Skiba et al., 1997, 2011). Not only is race critical in understanding how students' behavior is interpreted, but social class can also negatively impact teacher evaluations of their students (Skiba et al., 2011).

Byrant and Wilson (2020) noted that differential disciplinary actions taken against students of color could be explained by social class; however, few studies have adequate data on socioeconomic status to provide information on this hypothesis (Anyon et al., 2016; Bradshaw et al., 2010). Relatedly, a well-established body of research has suggested that teacher perceptions and expectations are associated with student achievement outcomes (Beady & Hansell, 1981; J. E. Brophy & Good, 1970; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968).

1.8 Cultural Identity and School-Based Referrals for Service Provision

Relative to their presence in the population**, a** disproportionate amount of Black students are in special education (Foxx et al., 2020; Ganao et al., 2013; Proctor et al., 2012; Shell, 2020). Although counselors have acknowledged the disproportionate number of Black students in special education classrooms, the role educators' and school counselors' biases may play in this trend has not been widely investigated (Shell, 2020). Unfortunately, such biases can result in inappropriate referrals and the resulting placement of students in more restrictive classroom settings than their ability level requires (Sullivan & Proctor, 2016).

One of the longstanding impacts of the identity-related interactions described above is how educational resources are deployed and made available to students. A popular form of deploying educational resources to students is called the Response to Intervention (RTI) model (Johnson et al., 2006). In the manual on RTI implementation, Johnson et al. described that this approach allows educators to identify and provide supportive services to academically struggling students who may be at risk of failing their coursework. Students receive the minimally effective amount of support needed to rectify their academic difficulties. Johnson et al. described that the RTI model is commonly multi-tiered: Tier 1 provides generalized research-based interventions for students at risk for having a learning disability; Tier 2 focuses on domain-specific student

difficulties; Tier 3 is highly individualized interventions that rely on psychological assessment tools to diagnose a specific learning disability.

A notable aspect of the response to the intervention model is that students receive services without academic failure being a prerequisite to qualify for formal psychological assessments (White et al., 2012). Proctor, Graves, and Esch (2012) argued that gatekeeping academic supportive services behind standardizing psychological testing could be expensive, time-consuming, and unnecessary for students who only require Tier 1 services. An additional downside to gatekeeping educational, supportive services behind psychological testing is that students of color, specifically Black students, are inconsistently identified by consolers and educators as needing testing (Sullivan & Proctor, 2016).

While RTI is an improvement to the previously used waiting to fail model, Proctor, Graves, and Esch (2012) cautioned that it should be used as one option among many for addressing the overrepresentation that students of color have in special education classrooms. However, these authors also noted the lack of research studies specifically targeting how RTI impacted Black students and highlighted that this issue is critical because Black students are overrepresented in special education classrooms. Additionally, Proctor et al. found that students of color benefited from alternative avenues to a multi-tiered needs-based approach for educational support because the student was given supportive educational services more appropriate to the student's needs. While there is benefit from additional educational resources being available, Sullivan and Proctor (2016) argued that school-based counselors and psychologists are currently inconsistent in the ways that they identify and deploy enhanced learning techniques for struggling students.

Relatedly, as previously mentioned, students of color are disproportionally suspended and disciplined for the same behaviors when compared to their White peers (Horwitz et al., 1998; Losen & Gillespie, 2012). Losen and Gillespie (2012) produced a report as part of The Civil Rights Project to bring attention to the disparate impact of school suspensions with attention to race on Latino, Native American, Black, and White students. Furthermore, Black students were more often rated as requiring special educational programming. This issue is complicated by the reality that there are students who do require those types of services; however, the report suggested that the current services provided frequently have poor outcomes for students that are in them (Ford, 2012). Finally, the report also noted that the teacher's race is critically important when viewing the rates of office disciplinary referrals (ODRs) made. Specifically, Black teachers were more likely to make an ODR for a student regardless of the student's race or ethnicity. Therefore, the teacher's race is also relevant for enhancing the understanding of how racial differences influence decisions made about students' needs.

In addition to the influence of race on decisions made about students, there is evidence that social class may play a similar role in the classroom (Foxx et al., 2020; Shell, 2020; Skiba et al., 1997; Sullivan & Proctor, 2016). For instance, Skiba, Peterson, and Williams (1997) reviewed how teachers made disciplinary office referrals and student suspensions in middle schools. They found that students of color and students from low socioeconomic status were disproportionately impacted by both office disciplinary reports and out-of-school suspensions. Even more troubling is that minor daily behavioral issues like non-compliance were the main precipitators of disciplinary actions. While this finding is decades old, it appears to be robust and has been replicated in contemporary studies (Foxx et al., 2020; Shell, 2020). The apparent failure

to sustain progress on these issues highlights the continuing disparity in the treatment of students based on their race and social class membership.

1.8 The Study

The fact that biased attitudes may influence teachers' and counselors' perspectives is made more tragic by the fact that children of color and poor children experience the lowest amounts of educational opportunity. Current guidance by the American School Counselors Association and their related materials provide information for counselors that help address the lower educational outcomes attained among poor and racially diverse students (Minton, 2016). However, counselors currently struggle to provide enough access to adequate resources for students from diverse backgrounds (Foxx et al., 2020; Shell, 2020).

How are aspects of students' race and socioeconomic status associated with teachers' and counselors' recommendations regarding the supportive and remedial services provided to them? Previous studies have most often examined differences in the number and nature of accommodations given to Black, White, and poor students but did not explore other racial identities nor differential social class statuses or how they might interact in school-based decision-making. This study was designed to analyze archival data collected from teachers and counselors via a classroom vignette study in which participants suggested appropriate programming and services for a hypothetical child in the vignette (Appendix A). The scenario and the presenting issues were the same across all vignettes, while the race/ethnicity and the socioeconomic background of the hypothetical child varied. In this way, the study aimed to study the differential impact of student demographics (if any) upon decisions about tracking and services and do so in an intersectional fashion that exceeds the White/African American comparisons that characterize past research.

Based on what has already been stated above, the potential for both race and socioeconomic status to influence decisions made by individuals about others merits investigation. These potential biases are especially important when considering the identities of the decision-maker and the identities of the person whom the decision is being made. Furthermore, this study assumed CRT as an underlying framework for the study but built on the idea of race being of central importance by also addressing factors in addition to race that intersects with racial identity.

1.9 Aims and Hypotheses

The overarching aim of the study was to investigate the correlates of behavioral ratings and programmatic recommendations that teachers and counselors make for students based on students' racial-ethnic backgrounds and social class. The specific aims of the study were:

1.9.1 Aim 1

To analyze the behavioral ratings and service/programmatic intervention recommendations of the teachers and counselors for the student vignettes. Exploratory factor analysis was used to determine thematic relationships.

1.9.2 Aim 2

To identify correlates of behavioral ratings and service recommendations with individual participant characteristics such as social class, race, and current type of school involvement.

1.9.3 Aim 3

To explore the relationships between participants' behavioral ratings and recommended student interventions with vignette characteristics such as student race and social class.

1.9.4 Aim 4

To generate hypotheses for future studies based on directions found in the current proposal.

Chapter II -Method

The current study analyzed data collected from a sample of professionals and trainees in the school-based fields of teaching and school counseling. The data had not previously been examined or analyzed in any way. The findings are intended to serve as a means for hypothesis generation and directions of future research on related issues. This chapter will describe the participants, procedures, and the data analysis strategy.

2.1 Participants

All 203 survey respondents were either 1) working members of or 2) graduate students with current practica in the school-based fields of education, school counseling, school social work, or school psychology. Participants may have been practicing in public, private, or charter schools at the elementary, middle, or high school level. Individuals resided and worked within the United States. Table 1 displays the demographic characteristics of the participants.

Table 1

Participant Demographics

Gender	N
Male	20
Female	114
	2missing

Participant Age	
Mean	Median
31.23	28

Years with professional certificate/license	
Mean	Median
9.87	7

Type of School	N
Public	100
Charter	10
Private/Independent	17
9 missing	
School Level	N
High school	71
Middle school/junior high	25
Elementary	34
Majority SES of School	N
Low-income/poverty	44
Working-class	27
Lower-middle class	14
Middle-class	24
Upper-middle-class	10
Upper-class/wealthy	11
6 missing	
Majority Race/Ethnicity of School	N
African American/Black	21
Native American or Pacific Islander	1
Latino/a	26
Asian/Asian American	5
White	71
12 not identified	
School Involvement of Participant	N
I am a teacher	58
I am a school counselor	28
I am a graduate student in a teacher education program and/or a student teacher	20
I am a graduate student in a psychology or counseling program and/or a counseling trainee	30

2.2 Procedures

The measures used in the study were distributed through an online questionnaire available to participants through Qualtrics. The survey link was shared widely via in-person groups, online group forums, and schools and other organizations in which teachers and counselors worked together (e.g., after-school programs). Groups that specifically worked with K-12 students were the target of recruitment. Then snowball recruitment was utilized starting in 2013 until 2015, when a sample of 203 was achieved. The collection team for this data included the present author.

Participants completed online surveys requiring approximately 20 minutes. The online survey was accessed by a computer in locations of the participants' choosing. The survey was completed online, and no personally identifying information was requested. The online survey tool used secure encrypted data collection procedures, and no IP addresses were ever collected as part of this process. Each page had an "exit" button so that participants could leave the study at any time.

The online survey collected demographic information and participants' recommendations as to interventions appropriate for a hypothetical student based upon their reading of one of eight case vignettes. The cases were identical, except for variation in the social class (low income/high income) and the race/ethnicity (White/Black/Asian American/Latino) of the student.

2.3 Measures

2.3.1 Demographic items

A short demographic questionnaire was presented to the participants at the beginning of the online survey. Participants were asked to identify their gender, age, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic group membership, US state of residence, type of professional license they work under, and their current school involvement. The survey also asked for information to contextualize the type of schooling environment they work within, such as school type, student age group they work with, the majority socioeconomic group at the school, and the majority racial/ethnic group. Only 5 percent of participants did not indicate where they were located. The locations of the remaining participants were New York (68.4%), New Jersey (8.8%), Virginia (2.9%), Arizona (2.9%), California (1.5%), Georgia (1.5%), Maryland (1.5%), North Carolina (1.4%), Connecticut (0.7%), Illinois (0.7%), Massachusetts (0.7%), Michigan (0.7%), New Mexico (0.7%), and Washington, D.C. (0.7%).

2.3.2 Participant race-ethnicity

The race/ethnicity question was constructed according to US census categorizations, which conflate race and ethnicity; for example, Black and African American was one option for participants to select (Black is the race while African American is the ethnicity). The survey also permitted participants to select multiple categories; ultimately, this option was only utilized by participants who were checking off the Latinx ethnic group. However, nine participants selected only the Latinx ethnic group and did not select a racial category. In order to more clearly reflect participant race, the current study proposes creating a new variable to extract the racial groups reflected in the sample. These categories would be Black, Native American, Asian, and White.

2.3.3 Participant self-reported social class

Each participant had the opportunity to identify their social class membership via a survey item with six options: low-income/poverty, working-class, lower-middle-class, middle class, upper-middle-class, and upper class/wealthy (see Table 2).

Table 2

Socioeconomic Status of Participants

SES	N
Low-income/poverty	4
Working-class	5
Lower-middle class	14
Middle class	71
Upper-middle-class	36
Upper class/wealthy	4

This study further reduced these variables into four categories: poverty, working-class, middle class, and upper class. This change addresses the low number of participants that self-identified as upper class/wealthy, low-income/poverty, and working-class. The study proposes a new middle-class category that would contain the previously labeled lower-middle-class and middle-class categories. The study also proposes that a new upper-class category would contain the previously labeled upper-middle class and upper class/wealthy categories.

2.3.4 Participant school level

The survey collected the data regarding participants' work with high school, middle school, or elementary school students. These were reflected in the dataset as individual dummy codes in three separate variables. This study further reduced these three school-age ranges to be collapsed into one variable with three levels: 1 = elementary school, 2 = middle school, 3 = high

school. Two participants reported that they work with pre-school-aged children and will not be included in the analysis as they work with students outside the age range for the study.

2.4 Procedures

2.4.1 Stimulus

Participants received a case vignette (Appendix A) that corresponded to their professional identification in the field of education or counseling and then were shown a randomly selected vignette with regard to the hypothetical student's characteristics. Eight vignettes could be presented, and these differed along two dimensions: race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status.

The vignette placed the participant in charge of a third-grade nine-year-old student that resides in a large US city. The participant was then informed that this student was newly added to their roster and explicitly told the student's race and ethnicity. The student's socioeconomic status is not explicitly stated and was communicated through details about the student's home life, housing situation, and mother's occupation. All other aspects of the vignette remain the same across all eight possible identity configurations.

Teachers and counselors were given different vignettes based on their answers to the previous question regarding their status at the school they work at and will be reflected in the dataset by two different variables: (a) Teacher Vignette and (b) Counselor Vignette. The two variables mentioned above each have a 2x4 matrix with two SES conditions and four racial-ethnic categories, which amount to eight variable conditions across the two vignette variables (Teacher Vignette and Counselor Vignette). Preliminary analysis of both the Teacher Vignette and Counselor Vignette variables suggests that there may be insufficient power to find significant trends across the eight respective vignettes (Appendix A) according to hypothetical student demographics. The current study proposes that Teacher Vignette and Counselor Vignette

be combined into one variable called vignette. This new variable will combine Teachers and Counselor Vignette conditions with the same racial and SES combination condition. For example, a Counselor Vignette and Teacher vignette that received an African American High SES vignette will be recorded in the new Vignette variable as both receiving the same condition, High SES. This study also proposes that a separate variable be created to denote teacher or counselor participant conditions. This modification is intended to provide sufficient power to the analysis to allow for trends to be found in the data as it relates to the student vignette's race and social class.

After participants read the vignette, they were asked to rate the hypothetical student with regard to several behavioral characteristics (Appendix B) on a Likert scale ranging from 1-Disagree strongly to 4-Agree strongly. Finally, participants were asked to choose supports, programs, and services (Appendix C) for the hypothetical student that fell within the following broad categories: special education services, psychological counseling support, gifted student programming, additional teaching resources, family intervention, or extracurricular activities. Participants were first asked to choose all options they thought would be useful for the student and then narrow these options down to the one they thought was most important to implement.

2.5 Data Analysis

2.5.1 Study Aim 1

To analyze the behavioral ratings and service/programmatic intervention recommendations of the teachers and counselors for the student vignettes. Exploratory factor analysis is to determine thematic relationships.

2.5.2 Study Aim 2

To identify correlates of behavioral ratings and service recommendations with individual teacher and counselor characteristics such as social class, race, and current type of school involvement. The factor-analyzed subcategories are for use in multiple regression analyses that model participant and student racial and social class interactions.

2.5.3 Study Aim 3

To explore the relationships between teachers and counselor behavioral rating and recommended student interventions with vignette characteristics such as student race and social class.

2.5.4 Study Aim 4

To generate hypotheses for future studies based on directions found in the current proposal.

Chapter III - Results

In the following section, the preliminary analysis and results of the study are presented. First, the preliminary analysis will be presented, followed by the corrections and changes to the data that were required for the subsequent data analysis. Then the previously-noted hypothesis and corresponding results from the data analyses will be presented in their respective order.

3.1 Sample Characteristics and Considerations

The data was collected until N = 203 was established. After data collection was completed, the data were reviewed for completeness and missing data. Of the 203 participants who began the survey, 136 participants were retained for the study, as participants were deleted who did not respond to all items related to the study vignette.

3.2 Preliminary Analysis and Corrections

The preliminary analysis required that several variables be recoded, collapsed into new variables, or altered for the subsequent analysis. The following are the steps that were taken to adjust the data set.

3.2.1 Participant Race-Ethnicity

The race/ethnicity question was originally constructed according to US census categorizations, which conflate race and ethnicity; for example, Black and African American was one option for participants to select (Black is the race while African American is the ethnicity). The survey also permitted participants to select multiple categories; ultimately, this option was only utilized by participants checking off the Latinx ethnic group.

In order to more clearly reflect participant race, the current study created a new variable to extract the racial groups reflected in the sample. These categories were Black, Asian, White,

as well as those participants who did not provide their racial group, hereafter referred to as Not Identified.

Table 3
Participant Race Condensed

Race	*n*	%
Black	14	10.3
Asian	8	5.9
White	101	74.3
Not Identified	13	9.6
Total	136	100

3.2.2 Participant Self-Reported Social Class

Each participant had the opportunity to identify their social class membership via a survey item with six options: low-income/poverty, working-class, lower-middle-class, middle class, upper-middle-class, and upper class/wealthy (see Table 2 in the previous chapter). As noted in Table 4, the participants were recoded into three categories: *low*, *middle*, and *upper SES* groups. The lowest SES grouping, therefore, now contains the former categories of low-income/poverty, working-class, and lower middle class; the next group contains those identifying as middle-class; the third contains upper-middle class and upper class/wealthy. The result of this recording is fewer, more balanced categories for the SES variable.

Table 4

Socioeconomic Status of Participants Reduced

SES	*n*
Low	23
Middle	71
Upper	40
Not Reported	2
Total	136

3.2.3 Participant School Level Recoding

The survey collected the data regarding participants' work with students at different K-12 educational levels, including high school (n = 71), middle school (n = 26), elementary school (n = 34), and kindergarten (n = 2) students. Five participants did not indicate their grade level.

3.2.4 Stimulus

To allow for broader comparisons of experimental conditions, vignette variables were combined across professional groups into one variable called vignette. For example, a Counselor Vignette and Teacher vignette that received an African American High SES vignette was recorded in the new Vignette variable as within the same condition, African American High SES (See Appendix Table 6).

3.3 Study Questions

The following section will review the research questions that guided the data analysis along with the associated statistical results.

3.3.1 Aim 1

The first aim was to analyze the behavioral ratings and service/programmatic intervention recommendations of the participants for the student vignettes. To assess the structural components of the 25 behavioral ratings (see Appendix B for the complete list) contained within the student vignette, a weighted least squares factor analysis with oblique varimax rotation was used. Schreiber's (2021) overview of recommendations regarding exploratory factor analysis recommends that, for Likert scales, the most appropriate modern approach to utilize is weighted least squares factor analysis. What makes this approach unique among other forms of factor analysis is that the EFA does not place restrictions or preconceptions about how the scale items are supposed to cluster together but instead allows them to cluster to best fit the data based on the observable information. The next step after forming a structure is to rotate the loadings to aid in the interpretation of the factor structure, and this can be done according to one of two assumptions: either that the emergent factors are independent of one another or are not. As Schreiber stated in his review of the previous literature on factor analysis, typically, varimax is recommended, which assumes that factors are not completely independent from each other, and varimax was used for the present factor analysis.

The goal of the factor analysis was to determine which among the 25 behavioral items shared a common factor that could be seen as a latent variable underlying them all (Schreiber, 2021). A general rule of thumb for such analyses is that each factor should have at least three survey items for it to be considered a factor (Maccallum et al., 1999). Maccallum et al. went on to state that for smaller sample sizes such as in the current study, so long as there are three or more items on a factor with a loading of .6 or above, there is sufficient reason to consider the factor stable. The term *stable factor* indicated that it is a factor that warrants analysis and

interpretation; Winter et al. (2009) also contended that sample sizes smaller than 50 (as is the case in the present analysis) could be used in EFA when researchers take into account the size of individual loadings, the number of total factors, and the number of items used in the analysis in this way. Schreiber (2021) argued that there is not a mathematical rationale for choosing .6 or, for example, .3 as the benchmark for the factor loading for an item and that these acceptable loadings may change based on the field of study. In other words, there are no exact rules as to what these numbers must be; rather, there are general guidelines as discussed.

Table 7

Attitudes Factors Eigenvalues

Factors	Eigenvalue	Proportion of Variance Explained
1	4.744	18.977
2	2.545	10.179
3	2.065	8.260
4	1.711	6.843
5	1.512	6.049
6	1.357	5.426
7	1.193	4.772
8	1.063	4.253
9	.999	3.995

The results of the EFA are displayed as Eigenvalues in Table 7. Eigenvalues are vectors that provide guidance as to how many factors to extract from an EFA. As previously stated, there are no exact numerical rules regarding how to decide the number of factors to extract generally; however, eigenvalues greater than 1 are typically considered to be the minimum. The higher the value, the more support for the extraction of the factors. In conjunction with the eigenvalue number, the proportion of the variance explained by adding the additional factor is also important to take into account. The rule of thumb is to not include more factors if the proportion of the variance explained by adding it is small, the eigenvalue is low, and the items within the factor are not loading strongly.

In this case, the size of the eigenvalue tells us that mathematically up to eight factors could be extracted because their eigenvalue is greater than 1 (See Table 7). However, looking at Table 7's column proportion of the variance explained, the first factor is strongly indicated with 19%, then the second drops to 10%, and the third at 8.2%. The fourth and fifth factors would explain roughly the same amount of variance, and their eigenvalues are both less than 2. None of these values alone point to any specific factor structure, but given the sample size and the number of items in the questionnaire proportionally to the number of factors extracted, more than three factors would likely not be an ideal factor solution. Also, given the eigenvalue of at least two and only a moderate increase in the proportion of variables explained by adding more factors, it appears that a three-factor solution is most supported.

The factors that were extracted were named The Problem Child, The Prodigy, and The *Sensitive Child*. These factors can be interpreted as follows. The Problem Child is viewed as a student who has poor self-regulation abilities, is dangerous to other children physically, is argumentative with the teacher, and is viewed as having underlying mental health difficulties. The second factor has been named The Prodigy. This child is viewed as being intellectually gifted and bored due to a lack of academic challenge. This child is essentially seen as too intelligent for the coursework and is underperforming due to boredom. The third factor is The Sensitive Child. This student is viewed as coming from a household that lacks parental structure and is stressful for the student in some way. This child is seen as internalizing their distress which manifests as shyness, withdrawal, and general passivity. These three factors were turned into subscales where each Likert ranking for items that are mostly loaded on that subscale was added up. Therefore, the more strongly a participant rated their attitude toward the student on the

Likert scale, the more points were added to this newly created variable. Henceforth these three factors will be referred to as subscales of *the disposition profile*.

Table 8

Disposition Profile Factor Structure

	Factor		
Attitude	The Problem Child	The Prodigy	The Sensitive Child
Poor self-control	0.754*	0.016	0.091
Physically aggressive	0.707*	-0.24	0.14
Poor impulse control	0.682*	0.088	0.077
Acts out physically	0.613*	-0.298	0.064
Possible attention deficit disorder	0.544*	-0.045	-0.039
Defiant	0.54*	0.022	0.03
Antisocial	0.426*	-0.057	0.313*
Argumentative	0.416*	-0.043	-0.206
Possible mental health diagnosis	0.412*	0.033	0.128
Possible psychological issues/problems	0.342*	-0.083	0.193
Compliant	-0.24	-0.215	-0.181
Easily influenced	0.207	0.077	0.062
Intelligent	-0.258	0.665*	0.023
Gifted	-0.008	0.642*	-0.09
Needs more academic challenge	0.009	0.57*	-0.023
Bored	0.215	0.564*	-0.093
Creative	-0.369	0.492*	-0.017
Ingenious	-0.061	0.333*	-0.018
Performing below grade level	0.039	-0.24	-0.141
Withdrawn	0.081	0.064	0.74*
Stressful home environment	0.079	-0.261	0.605*
Passive	0.271	-0.028	0.525*
Lacks parental involvement	0.356*	-0.282	0.481*
Shy	-0.107	0.214	0.433*
Emotionally distressed	-0.019	-0.252	0.36*

Note. * are significant $p > .05$

3.3.2 Aim 2

The second aim was to explore correlates of the service recommendations with individual participant characteristics such as social class, race, and professional field in the context of

vignette conditions. For these analyses, the races of the participant were condensed into two participant categories corresponding to a) persons of color, b) White participants, and c) those who did not identify with (or volunteer) any racial category to help account for the preponderance of White participants as compared to the other racial categories.

Choose-all recommendations. Service recommendations were provided by participants in two stages. First, participants were asked to choose all the recommendations that they thought might be appropriate for Michael; next, they were asked to choose the one that they believed was the most suitable. Results of these two stages will be presented separately, beginning with the choose-all item. For this item, an exploration was conducted of the relationship between the student vignette characteristics, specifically Michael's racial group or SES level, and service recommendations when participants were invited to choose all that was appropriate.

The first step in this analysis was to review the service recommendations participants made across all vignette conditions when they were given a choice to choose all service recommendations that seemed appropriate and might benefit the student (see Table 9). As the table indicates, the top 5 choose-all categories across all vignette conditions were supportive school counseling, school counselor consultation with family, after-school art program, strategic behavior plan, and family meeting on student performance.

Table 9

Service Recommendation (Check all that apply) Frequencies

Service Recommendation	*n*	Percent
Supportive school counseling guidance	118	9.7%
School counselor consultation family	111	9.1%
After school art program	91	7.5%
Strategic behavior plan	85	7.0%
Family meeting on student performance	85	7.0%
General Education	71	5.8%
School social worker support	70	5.7%
Community organizations services	66	5.4%
School-based mental health treatment counseling	61	5.0%
Assessment possible learning disability	61	5.0%
After school program for at-risk students	49	4.0%
After school sports participation	47	3.9%
Parenting skills workshop	44	3.6%
After school academic remediation	37	3.0%
Special Education Cooperative Team Teaching	32	2.6%
Special Education Teacher Support Services	25	2.1%
Mental health clinic referral	22	1.8%
Unstructured Montessori style classroom	21	1.7%
Private tutor	21	1.7%
Gifted Class	20	1.6%
Placement with special ed teacher paraprofessional	19	1.6%
School chess team	19	1.6%
Accelerated advanced academic placement	17	1.4%
Science club	16	1.3%
Medical assessment	11	0.9%

Choose-all services and vignette race. Next, service recommendations were examined according to different vignette race conditions, collapsing across vignette SES. The service recommendations were ranked as displayed in Table 10, which displays the top five; the remaining items can be seen listed in Appendix E. All conditions had strategic behavior plans

and family meetings on student performance in the top five recommendations except for the Latinx Vignette condition. Additionally, the Latinx Vignette condition was the only one where either school social worker support or general education was within the top 5 recommendations.

To examine differences in service recommendation frequencies across participants between the four experimental conditions representing vignette race, the chi-square was used to compare ranked frequencies of each service recommendation. Two service recommendations were found to differ significantly according to vignette race and are described below. The details of the insignificant results for all other service recommendations can be found in Appendix F.

Table 10

Rankings of Choose-All Service Recommendations by Vignette Type

Rank	African American	Asian	Latinx	White	Low SES	High SES
1	School counselor consultation family (9.60%)	Supportive school counseling guidance (9.90%)	Supportive school counseling guidance (9.20%)	Supportive school counseling guidance (10.20%)	School counselor consultation family (10.41%)	Supportive school counseling guidance (9.20%)
2	Supportive school counseling guidance (9.20%)	School counselor consultation family (8.10%)	School counselor consultation family (8.50%)	School counselor consultation family (10.20%)	Supportive school counseling guidance (10.10%)	School counselor consultation family (7.80%)
3	After school art program (7.90%)	Family meeting on student performance (7.50%)	School social worker support (7.60)	After school art program (7.40%)	Family meeting on student performance (7.40%)	After school art program (7.80%)
4	Strategic behavior plan (7.60%)	After school art program (7.10%)	After school art program (7.30%)	Family meeting on student performance (6.70%)	After school art program (7.00%)	Strategic behavior plan (7.20%)
5	Family meeting on student performance (6.90%)	Strategic behavior plan (6.80%)	General Education (7.00%)	Strategic behavior plan (6.40%)	Strategic behavior plan (6.70%)	Family meeting on student performance (6.60%)

School social worker support. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of school social worker support. The relationship between these variables was significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = 8.22, p = .042). Post-hoc residual analysis indicated that there was a significant difference in the decision on this item between Latinx and White vignettes. The direction of this difference suggests that

when Michael was Latinx, participants were more likely to recommend a visit to the social worker than when he was White.

Table 11

School social worker support

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
School social worker support	No	16	20	10	20	66
	Yes	18	16	24	12	70
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Accelerated advanced academic placement. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of accelerated advanced academic placement. The relationship between these variables was significant (X2 [3, N = 136) = 11.23, p = .011). Post-hoc residual analysis indicated that there was a significant difference in the decision on this item between Asian American and Latinx vignettes. The direction of this difference suggests that when Michael was Asian, participants were more likely to recommend accelerated advanced placement for him than when he was Latinx.

Table 12

Accelerated advanced academic placement

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Accelerated advanced academic placement	No	31	26	33	29	119
	Yes	3	10	1	3	17
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Choose-all services and vignette SES. To examine service recommendation frequencies across all participants between the two experimental conditions representing vignette SES by collapsing across vignette race, the chi-square test was used to compare categorical frequencies of each service recommendation. Across all SES conditions, the top two ranked choices were either school counselor consultation with the family or supportive school counseling guidance, except for the High SES condition where after-school art program was tied with school counselor consultation with the family (see table 10). Three service recommendations were found to differ significantly according to vignette SES and are described below. The details of the insignificant results for all other service recommendations can be found in Appendix F.

School counselor consultation with family. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of school counselor consultation with family. The relationship between these variables was significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = 12.4, p = .0001). Post-hoc residual analysis indicated that there was a significant difference in the decision on this item between Low SES and High SES vignettes. The direction of this difference suggests that when Michael was Low SES, he was significantly more likely to have been recommended school counselor consultation with family than if he was High SES.

Table 13

School counselor consultation family

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
School counselor consultation family	Yes	61	50	111
	No	4	21	25
Total		65	71	136

Special education teacher support services. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of special

education teacher support services. The relationship between these variables was significant (X2 [1, N = 136) = 6.95, p = .008). Post-hoc residual analysis indicated that there was a significant difference in the decision on this item between Low SES and High SES vignettes. The direction of this difference suggests that when Michael was Low SES, he was significantly less likely to have been recommended special education teacher support services than if he was High SES.

Table 14

Special Education Teacher Support Services

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
Special Education Teacher Support Services	Yes	6	19	25
	No	59	52	111
Total		65	71	136

Accelerated advanced academic placement. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of accelerated advanced academic placement. The relationship between these variables was significant (X2 [1, N = 136) = 4.59, p = .032). Post-hoc residual analysis indicated that there was a significant difference in the decision on this item between Low SES and High SES vignettes. The direction of this difference suggests that when Michael was High SES, he was significantly less likely to have been recommended accelerated advanced academic placement than if he was Low SES.

Table 15

Accelerated advanced academic placement

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
Accelerated advanced academic placement	Yes	4	13	17
	No	61	58	119
Total		65	71	136

Final choice recommendations. As mentioned, the choose-all item was followed by an item that asked participants to choose one final, most highly-prioritized service recommendation for Michael. As Table 11 indicates, the top five final-choice categories across all vignette conditions were supportive school counseling and/or guidance, school counselor's consultation with family, family meeting for support of classroom performance, after-school art program, and school social worker support.

Table 16

Service Recommendation (choose one) Frequencies

	n	Percent
Supportive school counseling and/or guidance	31	22.8
School counselor's consultation with family	17	12.5
Family meeting(s) for support of classroom performance	14	10.3
After-school art program	9	6.6
School social worker support	9	6.6
After-school program for at-risk students	8	5.9
School-based mental health treatment or counseling	7	5.1
Assessment for possible learning disability	6	4.4
Gifted classroom	4	2.9
Placement in an inclusive classroom setting (i.e., Special Education Cooperative Team Teaching)	4	2.9
Strategic behavior plan	4	2.9
Parenting skills workshop for family members	4	2.9
General education	3	2.2
Placement in resource setting (i.e., Special Education Teacher Support Services)	3	2.2
Placement in resource setting that provides a special education teacher and a paraprofessional	2	1.5
Off-site mental health clinic referral	2	1.5
Medical assessment	2	1.5
After-school academic remediation	2	1.5
Community organizations/services (Boys/Girls Club, etc.)	2	1.5
Unstructured or Montessori-style classroom	1	.7
Private tutor	1	.7
Accelerated/advanced academic placement	1	.7
Total	136	100.0

Looking within categories of vignette conditions, the top five service recommendations were ranked as displayed in Table 12. The top choice across all conditions was supportive school counseling, and the second choice was school counselor's consultation with family for all except

the African American and Asian American Vignette conditions. With the exclusion of the Latinx Vignette condition, family meeting for support of classroom performance was within the top 5 service recommendations. The only two vignette conditions to receive an after-school art program as a top 5 choices were the Asian American and High SES vignette conditions. Also, only the African American and Latinx Vignettes received the after-school program for at-risk student recommendation in the top 5 choices. The Low SES and African American Vignette conditions were also the only two to have school-based mental health treatment or counseling recommended in the top 5 choices. Finally, the only condition that received the recommendation of a gifted classroom or placement in an inclusive classroom setting within their top 5 choices was the Asian American Vignette condition.

Table 17

Rankings of Final Service Recommendations by Vignette Type

Rank	African American	Asian American	Latinx	White	Low SES	High SES
1	Supportive School Counseling (20.6%)	Supportive School Counseling (23.1%)	Supportive School Counseling (20.6%)	Supportive School Counseling (28.1%)	Supportive School Counseling (23.1%)	Supportive School Counseling (22.5%)
2	Family meeting(s) for support of classroom performance (14.7%)	After-school art program (11.1%)	School counselor's consultation with family (20.6%)	School counselor's consultation with family (12.5%)	School counselor's consultation with family (15.4%)	School counselor's consultation with family (9.9%)
3	School-based mental health treatment or counseling (11.8%)	Family meeting(s) for support of classroom performance (11.1%)	School social worker support (11.8%)	Family meeting(s) for support of classroom performance (9.4%)	Family meeting(s) for support of classroom performance (13.8%)	After-school art program (7%)
4	School counselor's consultation with family (11.8%)	Gifted classroom (8.3%)	After-school art program (8.8%)	School-based mental health treatment or counseling (6.3%)	School-based mental health treatment or counseling (9.2%)	After-school program for at-risk students (7%)
5	After-school program for at-risk students (8.8%)	Placement in an inclusive classroom setting (i.e., Special Education Cooperative Team Teaching) (8.3%)	After-school program for at-risk students (8.8%)	Assessment for possible learning disability (6.3%)	School social worker support (7.7%)	Family meeting for support of classroom performance (7%)

Final choice services and vignette race. To examine differences in service recommendation, chi-square tests were used to examine categorical frequencies across all participants between the four experimental conditions representing vignette race. The relationship between these variables was not significant ($X2$ [63, $N = 136$) = 58.5, $p = .636$).

Table 18

Rankings of Final Service Recommendations by Vignette Race

	Vignette Race				
	Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Supportive school counseling and/or guidance	7	8	7	9	31
School counselor's consultation with family	4	2	7	4	17
Family meeting(s) for support of classroom performance	5	4	2	3	14
School social worker support	0	3	4	2	9
After-school art program	1	4	3	1	9
After-school program for at-risk students	3	0	3	2	8
School-based mental health treatment or counseling	4	1	0	2	7
Assessment for possible learning disability	0	2	2	2	6
Parenting skills workshop for family members	1	1	1	1	4
Strategic behavior plan	2	1	0	1	4
Placement in an inclusive classroom setting (i.e., Special Education Cooperative Team Teaching)	0	3	1	0	4
Gifted classroom	0	3	0	1	4
Placement in resource setting (i.e., Special Education Teacher Support Services)	1	1	0	1	3
General education	2	0	1	0	3
Community organizations/services (Boys/Girls Club, etc.)	0	1	1	0	2
After-school academic remediation	0	1	1	0	2
Medical assessment	0	1	0	1	2
Off-site mental health clinic referral	1	0	0	1	2
Placement in resource setting that provides a special education teacher and a paraprofessional	1	0	0	1	2
Accelerated/advanced academic placement	1	0	0	0	1
Private tutor	1	0	0	0	1
Unstructured or Montessori-style classroom	0	0	1	0	1
Total	34	36	34	32	136

Final choice services and vignette SES. To examine differences in service recommendation frequencies across all participants between the two experimental conditions representing vignette SES, the chi-square test was used. The relationship between these variables was not significant ($X2$ [21, $N = 136$) = 22.8, $p = .356$).

Table 19

Rankings of Final Service Recommendations by Vignette SES

	Vignette SES		
	Low SES	High SES	Total
Supportive school counseling and/or guidance	15	16	31
School counselor's consultation with family	10	7	17
Family meeting(s) for support of classroom performance	9	5	14
School social worker support	5	4	9
After-school art program	4	5	9
After-school program for at-risk students	3	5	8
School-based mental health treatment or counseling	6	1	7
Assessment for possible learning disability	3	3	6
Parenting skills workshop for family members	1	3	4
Strategic behavior plan	3	1	4
Placement in an inclusive classroom setting (i.e., Special Education Cooperative Team Teaching)	1	3	4
Gifted classroom	1	3	4
Placement in resource setting (i.e., Special Education Teacher Support Services)	0	3	3
General education	0	3	3
Community organizations/services (Boys/Girls Club, etc.)	1	1	2
After-school academic remediation	1	1	2
Medical assessment	1	1	2
Off-site mental health clinic referral	0	2	2
Placement in resource setting that provides a special education teacher and a paraprofessional	0	2	2
Accelerated/advanced academic placement	0	1	1
Private tutor	0	1	1
Unstructured or Montessori-style classroom	1	0	1
Total	65	71	136

3.3.3 Aim 3

This research question concerned the relationship between disposition profiles and participant SES, race, or current professional field within vignette conditions. ANOVAs were used to assess the association of two independent variables associated with the experimental conditions (vignette race, vignette SES) with the student disposition profile subscale scores (prodigy, problem child, and sensitive child) while accounting for the impact of participant SES, participant race, and participant professional field. Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity, and homoscedasticity.

First, for each subscale, ANOVAs were conducted to examine the impact of vignette SES and the four vignette race groups upon subscale scores across the entire dataset. Next, to further examine findings according to participant SES and race, ANOVAs were conducted using a split file technique, first with regard to participant SES (low, middle, and upper), on participant race (persons of color, White, and race not identified [RNI]), and on participant training level (trainee, professional), and occupation (teachers, school counselors).

The prodigy. A two-way between-subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of vignette SES and vignette race on the prodigy subscale. There were no significant main effects for vignette SES ($F [1, 128] = .145$, $p = .704$, $1-\beta = .067$) or vignette Race ($F [3, 128] = 1.50$, $p = .219$, $1-\beta = .388$). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the problem child subscale ratings ($F [3, 128] = 1.525$, $p = .211$, $1-\beta = .395$). However, although the omnibus tests found no significant effects, pairwise comparisons performed on a post hoc basis using the Bonferroni correction did produce significant results. A seemingly discrepant finding such as this can result from the difference in

power between the ANOVA test and the pairwise comparison: the null hypothesis for the ANOVA model is that all treatment groups have equal means, while the null hypothesis for the pairwise comparison is that the two specific groups have equal means. Post-hoc pairwise comparisons indicated that the mean rating for the Asian American vignette (Mean difference = 1.989, SE = 1.01, $p = .05$) was significantly higher than the Latinx vignette. Nevertheless, given the absence of significant omnibus findings, these post-hoc tests should only be interpreted at the level of trends. These trends suggest that participants were more likely to rate Michael higher on the prodigy subscale if Michael was Asian American than if he was Latinx.

Next, the data file was split according to the three levels of participant SES (low, middle, and upper), and then the same two-way between-subjects ANOVA was done with this split file.

For the low SES participant group, there were no significant main effects for vignette SES ($F [1, 16] = .113$, $p = .741$, $1-\beta = .062$) or vignette Race ($F [3, 16] = 1.59$, $p = .231$, $1-\beta = .338$). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the prodigy subscale ratings ($F [3, 16] = .086$, $p = .918$, $1-\beta = .061$).

For the middle SES participant group, there were no significant main effects for vignette SES ($F [1, 63] = .110$, $p = .110$, $1-\beta = .062$) or vignette race ($F [3, 63] = 1.70$, $p = 176$, $1-\beta = .424$) upon prodigy subscale ratings. There was, however, a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the prodigy subscale ratings, ($F [3, 63] = 3.36$, $p = .024$, $1-\beta = .735$). Post hoc comparisons using the Bonferroni correction indicated that the mean rating for the Black vignette (Mean difference = 2.79, SE = 1.27, $p = .032$) was significantly higher than the White vignette. This finding indicates that middle SES participants were more likely to rate Michael higher on the prodigy subscale if Michael was Black than if he was White.

For the upper SES participant group, there were no significant main effects for vignette SES, (F [1, 32] = .382, p = .541, 1-β = .092) or vignette Race, (F [3, 32] = 1.15, p = .346, 1-β = .279). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the prodigy subscale ratings, (F [3, 32] = 1.26, p = .306, 1-β = .303).

Next the data file was split according to the race of the participant using the three groups (see table 3): race not identified (RNI; (N= 13), Persons of Color (PoC; (N= 22), and White (N= 101). For the RNI participant group, there were no significant main effect for vignette race (F [1, 63] = 1.34, p = .322, 1-β = .203) or vignette SES (F [3, 63] = 3.17, p = .118, 1-β = .337). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the prodigy subscale ratings, (F [2, 7] = 1.56, p = .276, 1-β = .230).

For the White participant group there were no significant main effects for vignette SES (F [1, 93] = .001, p = .982, 1-β = .050) or vignette Race, (F [3, 63] = 994, p = .399, 1-β = .263). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette Race on the prodigy subscale ratings, (F [3, 93] = .864, p = .463, 1-β = .232).

For the PoC participant group there were no significant main effects for vignette SES (F [1, 14] = 1.78, p = .203, 1-β = .238) or vignette Race (F [3, 14] = 1.06, p = .399, 1-β = .227). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette Race on the prodigy subscale ratings, (F [3, 14] = .623, p = .612, 1-β = .148).

Next, the data file was split according to the training level of the participant using two groups: Professional (N = 86) and Trainee (N=50) and then the same two-way between-subjects ANOVA was done with this split file. For the Professional participant group, there were no significant main effect for vignette race (F [3, 78] = 1.79, p = .156, 1-β = .449) or vignette SES (F [2, 78] = .524, p = .471, 1-β = .110). There was also not a statistically significant interaction

between vignette SES and vignette race on the prodigy subscale ratings, (F [3, 78] = 2.43, p = .071, 1-β = .585).

For the Trainee participant group, there were no significant main effect for vignette race (F [3, 42] = 1.11, p = .358, 1-β = .277) or vignette SES (F [1, 42] = .497, p = .485, 1-β = .106). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the prodigy subscale ratings, (F [3, 42] = 1.36, p = .269, 1-β = .334).

Finally, the data file was split according to the occupation of the participant using two groups: Teacher (N = 78) and Counselor (N = 58) and then the same two-way between-subjects ANOVA was done with this split file. For the Teacher participant group, there were no significant main effect for vignette race (F [3, 70] = 2.10, p = .109, 1-β = .514) or vignette SES (F [1, 70] = .028, p = .868, 1-β = .053). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the prodigy subscale ratings, (F [3, 70] = 2.00, p = .122, 1-β = .493).

For the Counselor participant group, there were no significant main effect for vignette race (F [3, 50] = 1.30, p = .284, 1-β = .326) or vignette SES (F [1, 50] = 1.68, p = .201, 1-β = .246). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the prodigy subscale ratings, (F [3, 50] = 2.43, p = .076, 1-β = .573).

Problem child. A two-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of vignette SES and vignette race on the prodigy subscale. There were no significant main effects for vignette SES (F [1, 128] = .214, p = .644, 1-β = .075) or vignette Race (F [3, 128] = 1.65, p = .182, 1-β = .424). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the problem child subscale ratings, (F [3, 128] = 1.01, p = .387, 1-β = .271).

Next, the data file was split using the three levels of the participant SES (low, middle, and upper), and then the same two-way between-subjects ANOVA was done with this split file.

For the low SES participant group there were no significant main effects for vignette SES ($F [1, 16] = .061$, $p = .809$, $1-\beta = .056$) or vignette Race ($F [3, 16] = .439$, $p = .728$, $1-\beta = .119$). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the problem child subscale ratings, ($F [3, 16] = .249$, $p = .783$, $1-\beta = .083$).

For the middle SES participant group there were no significant main effects for vignette SES, ($F [1, 63] = .626$, $p = .432$, $1-\beta = .122$) or vignette Race, ($F [3, 63] = 1.49$, $p = .227$, $1-\beta = .374$. However, there was a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the problem child subscale ratings, ($F [3, 63] = 3.87$, $p = .013$, $1-\beta = .122$). Post hoc comparisons using the Bonferroni correction indicated that the mean rating for the White vignette (Mean difference = 3.93, SE = 1.9, $p = .043$) was significantly higher than the Latinx vignette. This finding indicates that middle SES participants were more likely to rate Michael higher on the problem child subscale if Michael was White than if he was Latinx.

For the upper SES participant group there were no significant main effects for vignette SES ($F [1, 32] = 1.71$, $p = .201$, $1-\beta = .245$) or vignette Race ($F [3, 32] = 2.00$, $p = .133$, $1-\beta = .467$). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette Race on the problem child subscale ratings, ($F [3, 32] = .909$, $p = .447$, $1-\beta = .226$). However, although the omnibus tests found no significant effects, pairwise comparisons performed on a post hoc basis using the Bonferroni correction did produce significant results. As described above, these differences can be attributed to the increased power of the pairwise analysis. The pairwise comparisons indicated that the mean rating for the Latinx vignette (Mean difference = 7.57, SE = 3.1, $p = .020$) was significantly higher than the Asian American vignette. Given the

absence of significant omnibus findings, these post-hoc results should only be interpreted at the level of trends. These trends suggest that, among upper SES participants, they were more likely to rate higher on the problem child subscale if Michael was Latinx than if he was Asian American.

Next, the data file was split according to the race of the participant using the three groups, Race Not Identified (RNI), Person of Color (POC), and White. Among the RNI group, a significant main effect was found for vignette race ($F [1, 63] = 13.2$, $p = .004$, $1-\beta = .960$) and vignette SES ($F [3, 63] = 20.3$, $p = .003$, $1-\beta = .970$). Post hoc comparisons using the Bonferroni correction indicated that the mean rating for the low SES vignette (Mean difference = 12.5, SE = 2.79, $p = .003$) was significantly higher than the high SES vignette. This main effect suggests that among RNI participants, they were more likely to rate Michael higher on the problem child subscale if Michael was low SES than if he was high SES. There was also a significantly higher mean rating for the White vignette as compared to the Asian American vignette (mean difference =12.643, SE = 3.16, $p = .005$) and the Latinx vignette (mean difference =15.6, SE = 3.44, $p = .003$). This main effect suggests that, among RNI participants, they were more likely to rate Michael higher on the problem child subscale if Michael was White than if he was Asian American or Latinx. For the RNI participant group, there was also a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette Race on the problem child subscale ratings ($F [2, 7] = 13.3$, $p = .004$, $1-\beta = .962$). This interaction suggests that RNI participants rated Michael differently based on his race and SES. However, this finding is not fully interpretable because high SES Latinx Michael did not appear for any of the RNI participants.

For the White participant group, there were no significant main effects for vignette SES ($F [1, 93] = 042$, $p = .838$, $1-\beta = .055$) or vignette Race ($F [3, 63] = 1.48$, $p = .225$, $1-\beta = .380$).

There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette Race on the problem child subscale ratings, (F [3, 93] = 1.95, p = .126 1-β = .489).

For the PoC participant group, there were no significant main effects for vignette SES (F [1, 14] = .417, p = .529, 1-β = .092) or vignette Race (F [3, 14] = 1.90, p = .176, 1-β = .387). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the problem child subscale ratings (F [3, 14] = 3.35, p = .050, 1-β = .629). However, although the omnibus tests found no significant effects, pairwise comparisons performed on a post hoc basis using the Bonferroni correction did produce significant results. Pairwise comparisons indicated that the mean rating for the White vignette (Mean difference = 10.8, SE = 4.74, p = .040) was significantly higher than the Asian American vignette. Given the absence of significant omnibus findings, these post-hoc findings should only be interpreted at the level of trends. These trends suggest that, among PoC participants, while there was no overall main effect for vignette race, they were more likely to rate higher on the problem child subscale if Michael was White than if he was Asian American.

Next the data file was split according to the training level of the participant using two groups: Professional (N = 86) and Trainee (N=50) and then the same two-way between-subjects ANOVA was done with this split file. For the Professional participant group, there were no significant main effect for vignette race (F [3, 78] = 163, p = .921, 1-β = .079) or vignette SES (F [2, 78] = .632, p = .429, 1-β = .123). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the prodigy subscale ratings, (F [3, 78] = 1.51, p = .219, 1-β = .383).

For the Trainee participant group, there was a significant main effect for vignette race (F [3, 42] = 3.48, p = .024, 1-β = .737). However, there was not a statistically significant main

effect for vignette SES (F [1, 42] = .442, p = .510, 1-β = .100) or interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the prodigy subscale ratings, (F [3, 42] = .912, p = .443, 1-β = .233).

Finally, the data file was split according to the occupation of the participant using two groups: Teacher (N = 78) and Counselor (N = 58), and then the same two-way between-subjects ANOVA was done with this split file. However, although the omnibus tests found no significant effects, pairwise comparisons performed on a post hoc basis using the Bonferroni correction did produce significant results. As described above, these differences can be attributed to the increased power of the pairwise analysis. The pairwise comparisons indicated that the mean rating for the Asian American vignette was significantly lower than the Black vignette (Mean difference = -6.81, SE = 2.95, *p* = .026), Latinx vignette (Mean difference = -8.49, SE = 2.85, *p* = .005), and White vignette (Mean difference = -8.30, SE = 3.22, *p* = .014). Given the absence of significant omnibus findings, these post-hoc results should only be interpreted at the level of trends. These trends suggest that trainee participants are more likely to rate lower on the problem child subscale if Michael was Asian American than all other racial groups.

Finally, the data file was split according to the occupation of the participant using two groups: Teacher (N = 78) and Counselor (N = 58) and then the same two-way between-subjects ANOVA was done with this split file. For the Teacher participant group, there were no significant main effect for vignette race (F [3, 70] = 1.38, *p* = .257, 1-β = .351) or vignette SES (F [1, 70] = .511, *p* = .477, 1-β = .109). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the prodigy subscale ratings, (F [3, 70] = 1.08, *p* = .363, 1-β = .280).

For the Counselor participant group, there were no significant main effect for vignette race (F [3, 50] = 2.65, *p* = .060, 1-β = .613) or vignette SES (F [1, 50] = 2.33, *p* = .133, 1-β =

.322). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the prodigy subscale ratings, (F [3, 50] = .289, p = .833, 1-β = .102). However, although the omnibus tests found no significant effects, pairwise comparisons performed on a post hoc basis using the Bonferroni correction did produce significant results. As described above, these differences can be attributed to the increased power of the pairwise analysis. The pairwise comparisons indicated that the mean rating for the Asian American vignette was significantly lower than the Black vignette (Mean difference = -6.82, SE = 2.79, p = .018) and Latinx vignette (Mean difference = -5.84, SE = 2.65, p = .032). Given the absence of significant omnibus findings, these post-hoc results should only be interpreted at the level of trends. These trends suggest that counselor participants are more likely to rate lower on the problem child subscale if Michael was Asian American than either Black or Latinx groups.

Sensitive child. A two-way between subjects ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of vignette SES and vignette race on the sensitive child subscale. There were no significant main effects for vignette SES (F [3, 128] = 2.84, p = .095, 1-β = .386) or vignette Race (F [3, 128] = .466, p = .707, 1-β = .142). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette Race on the problem child subscale ratings (F [3, 128] = .976, p = .406, 1-β = .261).

Next, the data file was split using the three levels of the participant SES (low, middle, and upper), and then the same two-way between-subjects ANOVA was done with this split file.

For the low SES participant group, there was not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette Race on the sensitive child subscale ratings (F [3, 16] = .249, p = .783, 1-β = .083). There were also no significant main effects for vignette SES (F [1, 16] = .061, p = .809, 1-β = .056) or vignette Race (F [3, 16] = .439, p = .728, 1-β = .119).

For the middle SES participant group, there were no significant main effects for vignette SES (F [1, 63] = .626, p = .432, 1-β = .122) or vignette Race (F [3, 63] = 1.49, p = .227, 1-β = .374).There was a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette Race on the sensitive child subscale ratings (F [3, 63] = 3.87, p = .013, 1-β = .800). Post hoc comparisons using the Bonferroni correction indicated that the mean rating for the White vignette (Mean difference = 3.93, SE = 1.90, p = .043) was significantly higher than the Latinx vignette. This finding indicates that, among middle SES participants, they were more likely to rate Michael higher on the sensitive child subscale if Michael was White than if he was Latinx.

For the upper SES participant group there were no significant main effects for vignette SES (F [1, 32] = 1.708, p = .201, 1-β = .245) or vignette Race (F [3, 32] = 2.01, p = .133, 1-β = .467). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette Race on the sensitive child subscale ratings (F [3, 32] = .909, p = .447, 1-β = .226). However, although the omnibus tests found no significant effects, pairwise comparisons performed on a post hoc basis using the Bonferroni correction did produce significant results. Pairwise comparisons indicated that the mean rating for the Latinx vignette (Mean difference = 7.57, SE = 3.10, p = .020) was significantly higher than the Asian American vignette. Given the absence of significant omnibus findings, these post-hoc findings should only be interpreted at the level of trends. These trends suggest that, among upper SES participants, they were more likely to rate higher on the sensitive child subscale if Michael was Latinx than if he was Asian American.

Next, the data file was split according to the race of the participant using the three groups, Race not identified (RNI), Person of Color (POC), and White. For the RNI participant group, there was a significant main effect for vignette race (F [1, 63] = 9.82, p = .009, 1-β = .891) but not for vignette SES (F [3, 63] = 2.61, p = .150, 1-β = .288). This finding suggests that RNI

participants rated Michael more highly on the sensitive child subscale based upon his race but not on his SES. Post hoc comparisons using the Bonferroni correction indicated that the mean rating for the White vignette (Mean difference = 7.68, SE = 2.48, p = .018) was significantly higher than the Asian American vignette. This finding is not fully interpretable as there was only one High SES Asian American Michael vignette posed to an RNI participant; nevertheless, it would indicate that RNI participants were more likely to rate Michael higher on the sensitive child subscale if Michael was White than if he was Asian American.

Although the same qualification applies, post-hoc comparisons also showed a significantly higher mean rating for the Latinx vignette (Mean different =12.25, SE = 2.86, p = .004) than the Asian American vignette. This finding would indicate that, among RNI participants, they were more likely to rate higher on the sensitive child subscale if Michael was Latinx than if he was Asian American.

There was also a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the sensitive child subscale ratings (F [2, 7] = 6.85, p = .022, 1-β = .755) for RNI participants. This finding indicates that RNI participants rated Michael differently on the sensitive child subscale based on both his SES and race when viewed in conjunction.

For the White participant group, there was a significant main effect for vignette SES (F [1, 93] = 4.22, p = .043, 1-β = .528) but not a significant main effect for vignette Race (F [3, 63] = 1.26, p = .293, 1-β = .327). This finding suggests that when viewed in isolation, White participants made significantly different ratings for Michael on the sensitive subscale based on his SES but not on his race. Post hoc comparisons using the Bonferroni correction indicated that the mean rating for the low SES vignette (Mean difference = 1.87, SE = .911, p = .043) was significantly higher than the high SES vignette. This finding indicates that White participants

were more likely to rate Michael higher on the sensitive child subscale if Michael was low SES than if he was high SES. There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette Race on the sensitive child subscale ratings (F [3, 93] = .519, p = .670, 1-β = .152). This finding indicates that White participants did not rate Michael differently on the sensitive child subscale based on both his SES and race when viewed together.

For the PoC participant group there were no significant main effects for vignette SES (F [1, 14] = .069, p = .797, 1-β = .057) or vignette Race (F [3, 14] = .325, p = .807, 1-β = .098). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette Race on the sensitive child subscale ratings (F [3, 14] = .436, p = .730, 1-β = .116).

Next the data file was split according to the training level of the participant using two groups: Professional (N = 86) and Trainee (N=50) and then the same two-way between-subjects ANOVA was done with this split file. For the Professional participant group, there were no significant main effect for vignette race (F [3, 78] = 993, p = .401, 1-β = .261) or vignette SES (F [2, 78] = 1.57, p = .214, 1-β = .236). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the prodigy subscale ratings, (F [3, 78] = .221, p = .882, 1-β = .090).

For the Trainee participant group, there were no significant main effect for vignette race (F [3, 42] = .632, p = .599, 1-β = .171) or vignette SES (F [1, 42] = .077, p = .783, 1-β = .058). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the prodigy subscale ratings, (F [3, 42] = 1.71, p = .180, 1-β = .414).

Finally, the data file was split according to the occupation of the participant using two groups: Teacher (N = 78) and Counselor (N = 58) and then the same two-way between-subjects ANOVA was done with this split file. For the Teacher participant group, there were no

significant main effect for vignette race (F [3, 70] = .818, p = .488, 1-β = .218) or vignette SES (F [1, 70] = .853, p = .359, 1-β = .149). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the prodigy subscale ratings, (F [3, 70] = .812, p = .491, 1-β = .217). For the Counselor participant group, there were no significant main effect for vignette race (F [3, 50] = 1.10, p = .357, 1-β = .280) or vignette SES (F [1, 50] = 2.40, p = .128, 1-β = .330). There was also not a statistically significant interaction between vignette SES and vignette race on the prodigy subscale ratings, (F [3, 50] = .406, p = .749, 1-β = .125).

3.3.4 Aim 4

Aim 4 specified the generation of hypotheses for future research based on directions found in the current proposal; suggested future research directions will be explored in Chapter 5.

Chapter IV - Discussion

In this chapter, the results of the data analysis will be discussed and placed into context based on the existing literature. First, the results will be explained and organized according to the aims of the study. Next, the findings will be examined within the context of existing research that either agrees with the current results, contradicts them, or fills a gap. Suggestions for future directions for researchers will follow. As one of the study's aims was to serve as a springboard for future research in this area (Aim 4), the future directions section also corresponds to the exploration of the study's aims. Moreover, tentative interpretations for post-hoc findings and trends will be offered, as these may point toward areas that warrant further research; such findings will be identified as such. Finally, the theoretical implications and limitations of this study will be presented, followed by concluding thoughts.

4.1 Discussion of Study Aims and Results

The following sections will offer a discussion of each of the study's findings, beginning with a brief contextual overview and concluding with a summary of highlights.

4.2 Overview

As discussed in previous chapters, counselors and teachers are not immune to holding some of the same assumptions and biases regarding racial-cultural identity that are present in the broader society. When such assumptions are in operation, even if unconsciously, they can undermine the development of a counseling alliance as well as interfere with students' scholastic achievement (Foxx et al., 2020). Foxx et al. (2020) argued for strategies that school counselors should utilize to better address academic achievement gaps that exist for culturally diverse populations. They argued that culturally responsive school counseling approaches are needed to

adequately address issues relevant to race, gender, and social class, identities that can all potentially adversely influence academic performance. Their focus was specifically on the influence of bias on students' school performance. Not only does bias have the potential to negatively influence students' academic performance, but it can also influence diagnostic impressions that may result from helping professionals' preconceptions (R. L. Owens et al., 2015). In turn, these biased impressions can affect subsequent referrals and service delivery (Minton, 2016) of said students. Owens et al. (2015) presented a model for assessment that addressed the influence of cultural biases, either negatively or positively, based on the information and preconceived notions that they have about the client. These biases were described as emerging from as little information as an intake document. The authors contended that these biases are most likely to reveal themselves when information is vague and/or complex.

Relatedly, Minton (2016) addressed the issues involved in enhancing the school engagement of Black students, presenting archival data that supported the idea that Black students are punished more harshly and more often in school settings than their White counterparts. This double impact results in more frequent expulsions from school and a general lack of student engagement with school. In general, attitudes and initial impressions of students can be seen to impact the ways that school personnel interact with them and/or exclude them from the school community.

4.3 Aim 1

The first aim of the study was to describe and analyze the behavioral ratings and service/programmatic intervention recommendations made by participants in response to the student vignette.

4.3.1 Dispositional Profiles

The first step in this process was analyzing the student vignette's 25 behavioral ratings (Appendix B). As described in previous chapters, a three-factor structure was derived to describe the analysis of these ratings, which led to the creation of three corresponding dispositional profiles. Based on their factor loadings, these profiles were then named *The Problem Child*, *The Prodigy*, and *The Sensitive Child*. The dispositional profiles described the different conceptual frameworks that a teacher/counselor might use when considering a given student. Before further discussion of these profiles, a brief exploration of student behavioral profile research will be reviewed to allow consideration of how the current profiles correspond to previous research on teachers' ideas and beliefs towards students.

The establishment of these profiles (and the educator attitudes and behaviors that they represent) can be contextualized within the existing literature. The importance of attitudinal research and its relationship to teachers' conceptual profiles of students is a longstanding area of investigation in education and school counseling. In an investigation of the attitudes that teachers hold towards students, Silberman (1969) found that four main conceptual types emerged: *attachment, concern, indifference*, and *rejection.* Attachment was emblematic of a student that was well-liked by the teachers, whereas concern was associated with students who were deemed to require extra attention from teachers. Indifference was associated with students that a teacher does not know very well, and rejection referred to students whom teachers would feel happy to have removed from their classrooms. Student participants who were also featured in the study were third-grade students who were mentioned during the interview with their teachers. The researchers then interviewed students who were spoken about during the teacher interview to understand how the student perceived the teacher's behaviors. Participants included ten third-

grade teachers, each with a class of between 24 and 30 students. Students in these classes were asked to rate what they believed their teacher's attitudes were toward them -- and the results indicated a high degree of correspondence between their ratings of themselves and the teachers' ratings. Both students and teachers were reluctant to identify themselves with the rejected student position, either as holding rejecting attitudes toward a student or being a rejected student. The accuracy of students' perceptions of teachers' attitudes despite teachers' presumed efforts to conceal their attitudinal disposition toward the student was a revelation at the time of this study. The results indicated that teachers indeed behave differently towards different students based on their own perceptions and attitudes toward the student.

Silberman's (1969) study suggested that only rejection was clearly related to differential treatment of students. The researchers determined this through observation and coding of the classroom behaviors exhibited by the teachers towards students they had identified as rejected. However, a replication study using first-grade classrooms by Good and Brophy (1972) found that all four attitudinal beliefs about students were related to differential behaviors expressed by teachers towards students. Once again, the researchers observed the teacher's interactions in the classroom with the students whom the teacher had spoken about in their initial interview. This finding was interpreted as having important implications: despite student behavior changing, a rejected student was often treated the same way by the teacher due to the inability of the teacher to shift their conceptual stance toward the student.

Findings that beliefs and attitudes held by teachers may be expressed toward students through unaware behaviors stimulated other research in the area. Lewin et al. (1983) did a study that built upon the previously mentioned research on attitudes toward disruptive students and framed it from the standpoint of the counselor. The authors argued that many teachers

recommend students to the school counselor's office if they exhibit disruptive classroom behavior. Counselors were then charged with helping the student change these behaviors; however, Lewin et al. highlighted an issue that potentially persisted in teachers. Even when a student's behavior changes, the way the teacher interprets the student's behavior may not; hence, even a well-behaved student who was previously disruptive in class could still be viewed as disruptive by the teacher and may therefore still receive the same treatment from the teacher. Again, researchers determined this by behavioral observation of teachers in classrooms with the identified student. This issue was particularly problematic for students whom teachers viewed with a rejecting or problematized attitude. The researchers argued that when working with students who are labeled with a negatively valanced attribution, counselors must specifically work to improve the student-teacher dyad because even if the student's behavior changes, the relational dynamic between the student and teacher must be altered; otherwise, the student will continue to be negatively affected by the attitudinal bias of the teacher.

Other researchers contributed to the idea of profiles for students and the associated conceptualizations that teachers hold about these students. Brophy and McCaslin (1992) interviewed a sample of experienced teachers about how they manage those whom they dubbed "problem students." Of note is the array of different profiles these teachers came up with for identifying various specific types of "problem students." These teachers identified twelve problem-student types: failure syndrome, perfectionist, underachieve/alienated, low achiever, hostile-aggressive, passive-aggressive, defiant, hyperactive, distractable, immature, peer rejected, and shy/withdrawn.

Researchers have also studied classroom management approaches that help teachers manage difficult student behaviors or “problem students.” Poulou et al. (2022) conducted a study

of kindergarten and first-grade teachers to see how their expressions of positive and negative emotions impacted student behaviors. The researchers found that when teachers expressed positive emotions toward their students, there were decreases in the aggression and anxiety in students, and students were more likely to behave in socially appropriate ways. Poulou et al. hypothesized that teachers' expression of positive emotion might help regulate emotionally dysregulated students who are experiencing anger or anxiety.

The Problem Child. Moving now to the current profiles, the first dispositional profile was named *Problem Child* as the contents of the survey items were all related to behavioral issues that might be considered problematic (for example, these items included poor self-control, physically aggressive, poor impulse control, acting out physically, defiant, antisocial, and argumentative). The items that comprise the problem child profile are similar to several of the profiles that were identified by Brophy and McCaslin (1992), who listed hostile-aggressive, passive-aggressive, defiant, hyperactive, and distractable. Brophy and McCaslin's student descriptors of hostile-aggressive and passive-aggressive profiles mainly referred to students who exhibit defiance toward either the teacher overtly (hostile) or covertly (passive). This defiance was understood to be non-compliance with a teacher's direction. The most closely linked items in this study would be the items physically aggressive, acting out physically, defiant, antisocial, and argumentative. Additional descriptors associated with the problem child profile in this study were poor self-control, possible attention deficient disorder, possible mental health diagnosis, and possible physical issues/problems. These descriptors most closely align with Brophy and McCaslin's hyperactive and distractable student profiles, which they considered to be associated with attention deficit hyperactivity (or ADHD) style symptoms. Such a student might be physically hypermobile (hyperactive) and/or might seem unable to concentrate for long enough

to complete tasks expected of them by their teacher (distractable). Along these lines, students characterized by the problem child profile are viewed as aggressive, acting out, defiant, argumentative, and/or potentially having a type of mental health diagnosis which could explain the student's behavior. Related research has noted that teachers are additionally concerned about a contagion effect of problem behaviors in their classrooms, meaning that not only is their concern about problem students, but there is also concern that misbehaviors could impact and spread to other students; therefore, effective classroom management skills are emphasized for teachers (Oliver et al., 2011; Safran & Safran, 1985). The emergence and identification of this dispositional profile, therefore, is consistent with existing literature.

The Prodigy. The second dispositional profile was named *The Prodigy*, which, in the context of the present study, refers to a student whose characteristics include being viewed as gifted and potentially as unchallenged and bored as a result. Accordingly, some of the characteristics associated with this profile were intelligent, gifted, needing more academic challenge, bored, creative, and ingenious. Brophy and McCaslin's (1992) profile of underachievers shared similar characteristics: they were considered to be students who, for reasons having to do with their high ability, have become disinterested in academic pursuit. Their idea of underachievers fits well with the prodigy disposition profile with regard to items relating to the need for more academic challenge and being bored. Responses in the current study suggested that there was something about such students' intelligence that created boredom in school due to classwork being too easy for them. Therefore, we might think of the prodigy as a student who needs to be challenged more and who might be acting out behaviorally as a result.

The prodigy profile corresponds to other findings regarding teachers' conceptions of students who are considered to be markedly intelligent or gifted. Barbier et al. (2022)

investigated the types of beliefs that teachers hold about high-ability students and how their beliefs influence how they engage with the student in the classroom. The researchers interviewed teachers about how they think about high-ability students and what they believed to be best practices in addressing the unique needs associated with teaching high-ability students. Similar to characteristics identified in the current prodigy dispositional profile, interviews of the teachers showed that they described this group of students as intelligent, gifted, creative, and ingenious. Counselors have emphasized how important it is for such students to be identified and provided with their own differentiated educational experiences so that their educational and emotional needs can be met (Kaya & Tortop, 2020).

One additional finding warrants mention in association with this profile, although it emerged only at a trend level. Performing below grade level was inversely correlated with the prodigy dispositional profile; while not statistically significant, this trend is conceptually coherent.

The Sensitive Child. The third and final dispositional profile was named *The Sensitive Child* because the items that coalesced around this factor seemed to imply that the child is being viewed as relatively more sensitive to their environment than other children. For example, this profile's characteristics included withdrawal, emotional distress, shyness, passivity, lack of parental involvement, and a stressful home environment. Furthermore, this child may be interpreted as the type of student that counselors and teachers are concerned about regarding the development of anxiety or depression due to individual and environmental risk factors. Therefore, these may be students who may appear to be predisposed toward a mental health diagnosis.

The emergence of this profile as a factor dovetails with existing literature, suggesting that perceptions of heightened sensitivity are a trait that is relevant for counseling professionals and teachers regarding their work with school children. Mendaglio (2002), for example, discussed the importance of recognizing what he called HMS students or students with heightened multifaceted sensitivity. One of the most critical dimensions of this work is the author's emphasis on leveraging this understanding to assist parents who may be distraught after trying many approaches to helping their sensitive child thrive at school. Additionally, Barr's (2013) study highlighted the importance of a teacher's empathy towards such students. Specifically, the researchers found that teachers who were more emotionally sensitive to the needs of students were better able to assist struggling students. In contrast, teachers unable to feel empathy towards these types of students were more likely to avoid them and were not as able to support the student in effective ways.

4.4 Aim 2

The second aim was to explore the relationship of service recommendations to individual participant characteristics such as social class, race, and professional field in the context of vignette conditions.

4.4.1 Choose-all Recommendations: Overall Trends

Participants had an opportunity to select every option that seemed as though it might be appropriate for their version of Michael, and the discussion of these findings will begin with analyzing the service recommendations across all vignette conditions. The most commonly chosen option across the board was supportive school counseling guidance, closely followed by school counselor consultation with the family. These choices were almost identical in their distribution and commonality. This finding has certain positive connotations. No matter what the

student's or the participant's background, everyone identified Michael as a student in need of additional support, specifically some type of counseling, and everyone was inclined to extend that support to Michael. This finding is consistent with other characterizations of common approaches by teachers and counselors working with troubled youth. For instance, Egger et al. (2003) studied students who refused to attend school and interviewed both their parents and the children. Their analysis showed that the students struggling to attend school tended overall to have some type of mental health condition that explained their difficulties. The researchers generally concluded that in all cases, students' issues should be addressed with early assessment and detection of distress in students. In other words, students exhibiting various kinds of concerning behaviors should be recommended for some type of counseling, even proactively. Given that in the present study, the overwhelming majority of participants recommended a variety of counseling among their top two service recommendations, it appears that participants were indeed thinking in these terms.

Overall, the third most commonly chosen category was the after-school art program, which might initially seem out of place as there may be no clear connection between art, troubled students, and counseling. However, the participants' choice here is in keeping with research regarding the connection between arts and mental health functioning in schools. Coholic et al. (2012) conducted a study among students who were provided an arts group for children in need of increased emotional resilience, which was operationalized as decreased emotional reactivity. The researchers evaluated a Holistic Arts-Based Group Program (HAP) against a control group and then measured resiliency using a standardized measure. They indeed found that children in the art-based program had increased their resiliency compared to those in the control group. Lindsey et al. (2018) assessed the impact of an expressive arts group in helping adolescents

manage their stress. They found that students who were provided the expressive art therapy improved in their ability to manage stress. Therefore, the literature supports participants' inclination to recommend arts programming for students in need of support. It did not seem to be valued at the same high priority as counseling was, as evidenced by its third-place status in the results of this study; however, it was widely seen as a beneficial option.

Participants' next tier of service recommendations was strategic behavior plans and family meetings about student performance. The family meeting on student performance is akin to the school counselor's consultation with the family; however, its more explicit focus on academic achievement makes it more teacher-centric. Therefore, participants may have chosen this option because of a desire to join the teacher and academic team together with the family in addressing the student's struggles. Additionally, a strategic behavior plan may tend to come up in conjunction with family meetings on performance because behavior plans are frequently discussed at such meetings. Therefore, there might be overlap in the participants' minds regarding these two interventions, and/or these two things are frequently co-occurring.

4.4.2 Race and Choose-All Services

Collapsing across vignette SES, service recommendations according to vignette race were consistent for the most part with the overall findings described above without differentiation according to Michael's race. Across all racial conditions for Michael, participants either wished to provide him with a family consultation with the counselor or with supportive school counseling and guidance as to their two top choices. This exemplifies the finding that all participants, regardless of the participant's background or the student's racial categorization, choose counseling as a first step in treatment. When vignettes were collapsed across SES, these

interventions were followed by after-school art programming, behavior plans, and family consultations as the other top choices at roughly the same rates across racial conditions.

Nevertheless, some non-significant trends can be observed regarding the relationship between the service recommendations offered and Michael's race; these trends are worth exploratory mention with regard to the possibilities that they may indicate for the focus of future research. One such trend that appeared in the post-hoc analyses was when Michael was Asian; participants' recommendations tended more toward accelerated advanced placement for him as compared to when he was Latinx. As Starck et al. (2020) noted, teachers are not immune to the biases present in the general population. These researchers conducted an analysis of national datasets of the Implicit Association Test (IAT). In this dataset, the researchers compared the biased rating of teachers who completed the IAT and the general population. They found that the implicit biases present in the general population were not significantly different from that of the teachers, supporting the idea that teachers are just as biased as the general population. Therefore, ideas and beliefs that are present in the general population will be present in the teaching population, and this referral for Asian Michael may be connected to the generally established bias known as the model minority myth. Wong and Halgin (2006) defined the model minority stereotype as including the assumptions that Asian Americans are exceptional academically and are especially gifted at math and science. It appears that the participants in the current study may have had the model minority myth activated via their more frequent recommendations of accelerated advanced placement for Asian Michael.

Along the same lines, when Michael was Latinx, participants appeared more likely to recommend a visit to the social worker than when he was White. Speculatively, one possible interpretation of this finding emerges from reflection on what it might mean for a student to be

referred to a social worker in this context. The student in the vignette is exhibiting problematic behaviors that are disrupting his educational process. When participants view this behavior as needing a remediation referral, these particular social work referrals might occur more often with the Latinx student because a specific microaggression is simultaneously being activated in association with Latinx populations. In other words, this microaggression may link social work visits more to Latinx children than to White children. For example, the public has generally linked the notion of social work practice to issues like homelessness and community organizing (e.g., LeCroy & Stinson, 2004). These issues may have called social work assistance to mind more readily for Latinx Michael and less readily for White Michael due to stereotypical notions about racial-cultural groups. More generally, as Jimenez (2008) noted in their study, which involved interviewing 123 Mexican Americans, the researcher found that participants experienced perpetual foreigner microaggression. Latinx participants were seen as needing additional attention due to assumptions based upon characteristics like the accent of the participant. Perhaps the activation of stereotypes triggered a referral to the social worker by the participants in the current study when they recommended services for Michael.

4.4.3 Socioeconomic Status and Choose-all Services

Similar to the situation with race, there were no significant differences in service recommendation frequencies across all participants between the two experimental conditions representing vignette SES (i.e., when vignette groups were collapsed across race). Trends emerged, however, that can be interpreted speculatively. When Michael was a High SES child, he was significantly less likely to receive a recommendation for accelerated advanced academic placement than was Low SES Michael. This may be an unexpected finding – it seems to imply that High SES students are being overlooked for advanced placement courses. This finding

contradicts other research that has examined bias in the delivery of advanced placement programming, such as that done by Hamilton et al. (2018). In their study of archival data of third and fourth graders from the Nation Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), they conducted regression analyses with attention to the students' socioeconomic status, the recommendation to gifted programs, and the student's achievement. They found that lower SES participants were significantly *less* likely to be recommended to gifted programs, even when their achievement scores were controlled for. In an exploratory sense, what could potentially account for such a counterintuitive finding? It may be that participants who might have thought to recommend advanced placement would have assumed that the High SES Michael was already in advanced placement programs if he merited them or that he would have already had the opportunity to receive enriched or accelerated programming. Another potential explanation might be related to Auwarter and Arugete's (2008) study, where teachers were asked to rate vignettes of a high and low SES student and rate the student on future expectations and the need for academic support services and personal characteristics. They found that teachers tended to rate the High SES vignettes as generally having a more promising future than the Low SES students. In the current study, participants might perhaps be recommending the Low SES student for academic enhancement and acceleration more often because they believe that this student may need it to succeed, while they might assume the High SES student’s prospects were sufficient without such intervention.

On the other hand, a finding that affirms previous research was that when Michael was Low SES, he was significantly more likely to have been recommended for a school counseling consultation with family than when he was High SES. We might surmise that this could be attributed to the fact that Low SES families are frequently seen as more in need of parental

support, while High SES parents are viewed in a more positive light and are not seen as needing a professional family consultation. This finding coincides with LaRocque et al.'s (2011) recommendations that low-income parents' engagement in the learning process needs to be facilitated to close the achievement gap in school systems. In general, it is common to see more of a focus on getting low-SES parents into the learning process. For example, Desimone (1999) studied race and socioeconomic status in connection with parental involvement. The researcher concluded that low SES families encountered more barriers with regard to coming to school and engaging in school activities that were not present for the high SES families. More recently, Ricks et al. (2020) studied the attitudes and attributions school counselors hold toward people in poverty and found that a major theme for the counselors was a belief that parents of children in poverty were ineffective or uninterested in support for student academic success. Hence the focus on family involvement in the current study is consistent with previous findings of attitudes and recommendations that stakeholders may make regarding these students.

A related difference between the two SES vignette conditions concerns trends in the recommendation for family meetings to support classroom performance. This option was chosen twice as often for the Low SES condition as it was for the High SES condition. A possible interpretation of this difference in frequencies may be that participants held biased assumptions regarding low-income families and their support for (or valuing of) academic achievement, perhaps believing that there was more need to intervene at the family level than for the High SES family. In fact, research on attitudes toward working-class families has found biases such as a deficit perspective held by teachers, administrators, and people working with children in schools. Bertrand et al. (2018) interviewed 667 elementary school principals about how they engaged with parents, and they found that the administrators generally targeted families of color and

working-class families for meetings due to a belief that those parents were deficient and were not adequately partnering with the school to support the children's education. Moreover, some principals assumed that these parents were illiterate and/or needed English language assistance. In the analysis of the narrative interviews of participants, it emerged that principals were also conflating race and social class in their thinking. Hence, there was a discussion of Latinx populations as being one and the same as working-class families, with the expressed belief that these working-class families needed to learn how to speak to their children at home in a manner that they believed was more similar to middle-class families. Such beliefs were assumed to at least partially explain the struggles that children were having at school. As mentioned, this focus on parental involvement among counselors was also found to be a concern by Ricks et al. with regard to students in poverty. The current study's finding that the Low SES student was recommended a family meeting twice as often as the High SES condition may reflect similar deficit-based thinking about parents.

Additionally, when Michael was Low SES, he was significantly less likely to have been recommended for special education teacher support services than when he was High SES. This particular aspect of special education support services is not settled in the literature. An integrative systemic review of the literature on disproportionality in special education noted that inconsistent methods had been used in these studies to define low-SES categories, and depending on what metric had used, both over-representation and under-representation in special educational service recommendations had been found (Cruz & Rodl, 2018). Furthermore, this review also found that these disproportionalities varied based on the U.S. location that was used in the sample. Speculatively, how might we think about the meaning of this finding? In other words, why might a higher-income Michael have been seen as more suitable for a special

education referral? An argument related to this question was offered by Cuccaro et al. (1996), who hypothesized that clinicians' differential vignette ratings and recommendations for a child with autism might be explained by the "ambiguity of low SES" in their understanding of the behaviors exhibited by the child. The researcher postulated that clinicians' bias in the Low SES vignette might lead them to explain the student's behaviors as being due to psychosocial factors; hence the developmental problems were not identified properly, as the environmental factors might have overridden their observation of the behavior. Since the High SES student might have been assumed to have been given superior environmental advantages, their failures to perform would be taken more at face value and made more immediately concerning for the evaluator; in the current study, the participants might have been prone to similar thinking. A more recent analysis came to similar conclusions. Cruz and Firestone (2022) conducted a discrete-time survival analysis of learning disability identification in a large urban school district. Their findings also showed that children with autism were more likely to be identified the higher the family's SES was. Additionally, these types of students are also found to be less well-liked by teachers and more likely to be avoided unless the teachers have specific training for children with autism(Chung et al., 2015).

It is also noticeable that High SES Michael was referred for both after-school art programming and after-school programs for at-risk students within the highest group of recommendations; these do not appear in the top choices for Low SES Michael. First, these trends may suggest that participants saw High SES Michael as having a different potential to benefit from art programming than did Low SES Michael. Why might a child from a low-income home be seen as a less-likely candidate for an art program? We could relate this trend to assumptions about the artistic interests of children from the low-income home. It could also be

speculated that despite participants potentially believing the Low SES students might benefit from an after-school program, they might be reacting to the potential lack of access that many Low SES students have to after-school arts programming. In their study, Whitson et al. (2020) conducted focus groups with parents and children engaged in an after-school art program that was made available to low-income students, concluding that these programs greatly benefited their participants. However, the researchers also lamented the fact that funding and availability for such programming are decreasing, especially in low-income and poorly resourced schools. This issue of scarcity might hinder the recommendations that occurred to the current study participants.

As mentioned, Michael's behaviors seemed less likely to trigger an association with risk status when he was perceived as a low-income child; conversely, he may have appeared more at risk as a high-income child. We might speculate that participants' expectations for the low-income child were lowered for reasons discussed previously; hence there was not such a strong association in their minds with a specific at-risk status. On the other hand, for the high-income child, there might have been an expectation that the child would engage with the school and teachers more effectively, allowing for the child's behavior to be more quickly identified as being at risk. This bias may relate to the previously-discussed research by Auwarter and Arugete (2008), which found that teachers tended to hold more favorable views regarding the expected future outlook for High-SES children as compared to Low-SES children.

4.4.4 Final Choice Recommendations, Vignette Race, and Vignette SES

When participants had a chance to offer their one, single-most-important recommendation, the picture was fairly similar to what appeared when they were allowed to pick all the choices they wanted. When pressed to choose only one option, the top choice was

supportive school counseling, followed by school counselors' consultation with family, family meetings to support classroom performance, and after-school art programs.

Looking more closely at Michael's varying demographics within vignettes, the top choice across all categories was supportive school counseling. No matter what the vignette condition, each one was referred to counseling, again highlighting the acumen of participants to surmise that Michael could benefit from counseling. Further choices made by the participants differed only slightly based on the vignette condition, and possible interpretations parallel the discussion above. For Asian American Michael, participants seemed more inclined to think Michael would benefit from a gifted classroom or placement in an inclusive classroom setting than other Michaels. In this case, what may be occurring is the activation of the model minority stereotype regarding Asian Americans, as discussed above. The other unique top recommendation also partially echoes the discussion of choose-all recommendations: school social worker support services were recommended only for Latinx or low SES Michael. Once again, participants may spontaneously be assuming that Latinx Michael is more in need of support, which might be due to assumed language, acculturation, and/or social class barriers; school counselors have been found to report higher involvement with families of color, especially in urban settings (Harris et al., 2018). As for Low SES Michael, he might be getting these services based on presumptions that his family requires the practical, supportive services that a school social worker might be able to provide.

4.5 Aim 3

The third research question concerned the relationship between disposition profiles and participant SES, race, or current professional field within vignette conditions. Student disposition

profile subscale scores (prodigy, problem child, and sensitive child) were examined in the context of participant demographics and participant professional status.

4.5.1 Race, Class, and Attitudes Toward Students.

The existence of particular non-overt racial discrimination behaviors toward students provides some context for the discussion that follows. Massey et al. (1975) conducted a study of this issue in urban schools. They contended that teachers are at times behaving extremely warmly toward Black students; however, this warmth is also playing out as decreased academic rigor. They argued that the previous overt racial discrimination that took place in urban schools towards minoritized students could shift into covert institutionalized discrimination and racism, taking the form of lowered academic expectations and increased warmth towards racial minorities in the classroom. The authors also argued that society at large expects Black students to have lowered academic performance. Finally, the authors contended that lowered academic expectations and lessened rigor of coursework are reactions to working in urban school systems that are faced with systemic issues that make educational staff feel unable to meet the needs of students.

The tendency to rate students from racially minoritized groups higher or provide them with more positive feedback has been extensively researched. Harber (1998) conducted some of the earliest studies of White teachers providing more lenient feedback to Black students. In the college setting, Harber found that White teachers were exhibiting less strict and less rigorous feedback to Black students on their assignments and essays as compared to White students. The researcher dubbed this the "Positive Feedback Bias." This bias type was later researched with an expanded racial categorization of White, Black, and Latinx students. In this subsequent study, Harber et al. (2012) examined the existence of a positive bias among teachers provided with

essays supposedly written by Latinx, Black, and White students. The researchers did indeed find that the positive feedback bias continued to exist for Black and Latinx students. Relatedly, Aronson and Inzlicht (2004) conducted a study on how stable African American college-aged students' sense of academic self-efficacy was. They found that African-American students' sense of academic ability was more variable and less stable over time as compared to White students. The researchers argued that this unstable academic self-efficacy prevents African-American students from accurately assessing their academic ability and ultimately negatively impacts their ability to understand themselves.

The sections that follow will address differential evaluations of Michael's profile among subgroups of participants according to their self-identified SES, racial, and professional groupings. First, low, middle, and high SES participant responses will be discussed, followed by the differential responses of PoC participants and White participants, trainee and professional participants, and counselor and teacher participants.

4.5.2 Low SES Participants

Participants in this study who fell into the lower SES grouping were no more likely to evaluate Michael's behavioral characteristics differently based on Michael's race or socioeconomic status. There were no differences of significance or trends of biased assumptions one way or another. This implies that the low SES participants may have been the least likely to harbor biased attitudes towards Michael regardless of his demographics.

4.5.3 Middle SES Participants

The participants in the middle SES group showed some differentiation in their evaluation of Michael based on the vignette that they received. These participants were more likely to rate Michael higher on the prodigy subscale when they evaluated Michael as a Black child than when

he was White. This finding seems to suggest that middle SES participants viewed the Black student as more intelligent and intellectually gifted than the White student. This finding might appear contrary to what would be expected; however, it fits in line with research mentioned earlier that shows that educators, in an attempt to counteract their implicit biases against Black students, teachers may over-correct by highly rating the work of Black students.

In light of this finding, one might surmise that there is something of a halo effect occurring for participants with regard to Michael when he is Black. In other words, if there is an implicit expectation that the Black student should be less intelligent, what would be considered normative intelligence in a White student is seen as brilliance in the Black student due to the lowered standards of achievement for Black students. This finding aligns with a body of other research examining the differing expectations of students based on their racial-cultural identities. Along these lines, Stiefel et al. (2007) conducted a study examining the racial achievement gap in New York City schools. In the analysis of the data, the authors made the case that teacher attitudes about students and their abilities might explain the differences in the racial achievement gap.

Middle SES participants were also more likely to rate Michael higher on the problem child subscale if Michael was White than if he was Latinx. This finding contradicts other research on how teachers and counselors perceive students of color in school settings. Typically, Latinx students appear to be reprimanded and punished at disproportionally high rates in school settings, as was highlighted in Skiba et al.'s (2011) archival analysis of disciplinary practices taking place in 364 elementary schools over the course of a year. They found that African American and Latinx students were significantly more likely to be referred to some type of disciplinary activity than their White counterparts. The current finding may stand in contrast to

such literature and might show a specific interaction that occurs when the SES of the participant is taken into account.

Finally, middle SES participants were more likely to rate Michael higher on the sensitive child subscale if Michael was White than if he was Latinx. The literature on perceptions of children's sensitivity and how either socioeconomic status or race may influence it is not well established. It might be speculated that the middle SES participants were identifying more with the White students' emotional needs and were correspondingly overlooking that of the Latinx student.

4.5.4 High SES Participants

Moving now to the upper SES group, these participants were more likely to rate Michael higher on the problem child subscale when he was Latinx than when he was Asian American. As in previous findings, this result might indicate activation of the model minority myth for Asian Americans, which could cause the Asian American student to be seen as more well-behaved regardless of their actions. Upper SES participants were also more likely to rate Michael higher on the sensitive child subscale when he was Latinx than when he was Asian American. It is possible that this difference is also derivative of the model minority myth but in a slightly unusual manner. The Asian American student may be perceived as less sensitive due to the stereotype that they will always be quiet and well-behaved (Poon et al., 2016); therefore, a relatively quiet Asian student might not be noticed as experiencing emotional difficulties.

4.5.5 People of Color Participants

Post-hoc trends among PoC participants suggested that they were more likely to evaluate Michael more highly on the problem child subscale if Michael was White than if he was Asian American. This finding is likely similar to the other areas where Asian American Michael’s

behavior is rated differently than the other racial groups. Again, the model minority myth may be active here, leading the PoC participants to rate the Asian American Michael as more well-behaved.

4.5.6 White Participants

White participants were more likely to rate Michael higher on the sensitive child subscale if Michael was low SES than if Michael was high SES. Why might White participants seem differently attuned to Michael's emotionality when he is portrayed as a high SES child? As discussed earlier, participants might be less alert to High SES Michael's emotional needs due to the assumption that High SES children have support and environmental advantages such that their emotional needs are being met. In fact, in their study on high school students in high-income areas, Luthar and Barkin (2012) took the view that High SES students are at risk for emotional difficulties that frequently go unrecognized. The other side of this coin is that White participants might have felt increased pity for low SES Michael, making them more likely to see him as emotionally sensitive or fragile, an interpretation that coincides with other studies of the attitudes and beliefs that school counselors have regarding students in poverty. For example, Ricks et al. (2020) found that counselors felt pulled toward pity for students who were in poverty; moreover, they endorsed beliefs that suggested that the reason that people are living in poverty corresponds to personal limitations and deficits. In contrast to the finding for PoC participants, White participants as a group did not produce different ratings for Michael based on his race. This finding seems to imply that while SES caught the attention of (and influenced the responses of) White participants to some extent, Michael's race did not. Either race was simply not a factor for these participants, or perhaps their awareness of race led to a form of diversity-

related impression management (Thomas, 2018) (as compared to relative blindness and lack of awareness of socioeconomic bias).

4.5.7 Race Not Identified Participants

The discussion of RNI participant responses is not straightforward, as this was a very small category and contains participants with ambiguous responses to the racial self-identification question; on the other hand, it is possible that an unwillingness to report their race corresponded to particular perceptions among this group. Interpretations are offered only tentatively but begin with the observation that RNI participants were more likely to rate Michael higher on the problem child subscale if Michael was low SES than if he was high SES. This might reflect the general stereotype of low SES students behaving poorly in classroom settings, which has been noted in the literature (Smiley et al., 2022). For instance, Smiley et al. (2022) found that students who were from low SES families were more likely to receive in-school suspensions than other students. RNI participants were also more likely to rate Michael higher on the problem child subscale if Michael was White than if he was Asian American or Latinx. This finding may be another example of rating biases across the board for the Asian Michael as a result of the model minority stereotype.

For the RNI participant group, there was also a significant main effect for vignette race, with RNI participants evaluating Michael more highly on the sensitive child subscale based upon his race but not on his SES. In particular, RNI participants were more likely to rate Michael higher on the sensitive child subscale if Michael was White or Latinx than if he was Asian American. This may be another example of the under-rating of Asian Americans' emotional sensitivity; hence, participants overlooked the potential benefits of emotional support for this student.

4.5.8 Trainee and Professional Participants

Among the participant group who were trainees in their fields, there was a significant main effect for vignette race. In particular, trainee participants were more likely to rate Michael lower on the problem child subscale when he was Asian American as compared to all other racial groups. This result seems to repeat a consistent theme among the findings with regard to perceptions of Asian students.

The practicing professionals' group did not show any significant differences in how they evaluated Michael's dispositional profile based on his race or social class. One could surmise that this might be due to these participants' training and their experience in the field.

4.5.9 Counselor and Teacher Participants

Among **c**ounselors, participants were more likely to rate Michael lower on the problem child subscale if Michael was Asian American than either Black or Latinx groups to provide yet another example of this theme regarding Asian students. It is unclear how closely these results compare to other findings. For example, Dameron et al. (2019) found that their sample of counselors appeared to be unbiased by race, gender, or SES in making referrals for alternative learning programs based on student disciplinary-related issues; however, the variables correspond to race did not include an Asian condition. Participants who were teachers did not show any significant differences in how they evaluated Michael's disposition based on his demographics. Hence, they were no more likely to rate Michael as higher or lower on any of the three dispositional profiles. Why might teachers have been the one large grouping among participants to avoid the signs of model minority bias that characterized other groups? Speculatively, one possible interpretation of this finding is that the teachers as a group received more awareness training specifically targeting model minority myths since that is something they

are likely to encounter in their work regularly. As noted by Ratts et al. (2016), increased awareness has the potential to decrease bias regarding this issue.

4.6 Summary: Selected Highlights from Aims 1-3

A few highlights stand out from the array of results discussed above. Regarding service recommendations, participants overall thought some type of counseling would benefit the student. This recommendation is framed as school counseling or guidance directly with the student or in conjunction with an academic, behavioral plan that could include parental involvement and support. Repeatedly, a bias seemed to appear in participant perceptions of Asian Michael; specifically, the model minority myth seemed to be consistently activated across various participant demographic populations. Second, there are some indications of bias regarding Low SES students as well. Low SES Michael was at times seen as less likely to benefit from particular programming and more likely to behave poorly. Like Low SES Michael, Latinx Michael also received some degree of bias, specifically in having a high likelihood of being seen as a problem student. Latinx Michael was moreover assumed to be in need of social work services. Finally, there may have been a positive feedback bias occurring when Michael was Black with regard to how participants perceived the student's potential intelligence or ability.

4.7 Aim 4: Suggestions for Future Research

One of the aims of the study was to serve as a springboard for continuing research in the area of attitudes toward school children and their impact on service and programming referrals. Directions for future research are suggested below.

4.7.1 Dispositional Profiles

As described under Aim 1, a factor structure emerged from the current data that showed characteristic avenues for understanding how a teacher or counselor may view a student. These

various conceptions of students were defined as the problem child, the prodigy, and the sensitive child. This breakdown of categories was linked to the literature showing that teachers do indeed view students in coherent ways (J. Brophy & McCaslin, 1992; Good & Brophy, 1972; Safran & Safran, 1985). Teachers categorize students, either intentionally or not, which can influence how they treat and understand students' behavior. Existing research has used interviews of teachers to get a sense of how they might be categorizing their students, and the factor structure created by the questionnaire participants filled out in this dissertation's study supports the implications that teacher categorization of attitudes towards students could be ascertained via questionnaires.

To build on the work established in the current study on dispositional profiles, researchers could refine a questionnaire into a formal dispositional profile metric that could assess perceived student characteristics. In other words, the attitude items here could be further studied and refined to understand better the interpretation and usefulness of the three main factors: the problem child, the prodigy, and the sensitive child. This refinement process could also potentially establish and improve the stability of the factors.

A similar process could also occur with clinicians specifically in mind by developing an alternate framework. Questions could be modified to more specifically targeting concerns and issues relevant to treatment and diagnosis in clinic (rather than school) settings, as clinicians also hold attitudinal beliefs towards their clients. Currently, the attitudinal questionnaire is targeted specifically toward school-based personnel as that was the relevant population for the study; some of the questions that are specifically about schooling could be replaced with phrases more relevant to a clinical population. Under these circumstances, new dispositional profiles may reveal themselves or replace the current descriptors. The language might also need to change for this purpose, e.g., the problem child could be replaced with the problem patient.

4.7.2 Professional Attitudes and Biases

Another area that warrants further exploration relates to the preconceptions and biases that professionals may hold regarding students of color, in particular Asian American students. It appears the model minority myth can operate to prevent professionals from accurately observing the emotional and academic needs of these students, which could have diagnostic and service-related implications. As familiar as many professionals may be regarding model minority stereotyping, future research to continue exploring it, along with the creation of interventions by which to mitigate its negative influence, would be beneficial.

Other groups that appear to be the target of biases are the Latinx and low SES students. More research on how professionals view Latinx students would help tease out the overlap between low SES students and Latinx that seemed to exist in the minds of participants. Furthermore, research on the preconceptions that school personnel may hold regarding Low SES students, such as assumptions about their emotional sensitivity, is needed; the mechanisms and specifics of these beliefs should receive continued investigation.

The current study only provided vignettes of a student who was identified as a boy, but future research could expand upon this by adding gender expression and sexuality to the vignette descriptions. How might teacher and counselor factors be influenced by LGBTQ student characteristics with regard to their views of the student and the recommendations that they make? Hall and Rodgers (2019) found evidence of negative bias among teachers with regard to how they viewed LGBTQ people. Therefore, in addition to race and socioeconomic status, gender and sexuality would be ripe future avenues to expand upon.

Finally, future research should explore the existence of the positive feedback bias that was suggested in the present study regarding Black students. It is possible that the tendency to

lower standards or expectations for Black students might hold true for other marginalized identities, specifically those that are subject to negative stereotypes regarding academics. Also, given that those who are most likely to exhibit the positive feedback bias may also be those who want to improve their race-related relational skills, it is likely that they would be highly motivated to receive constructive feedback.

4.8 Study Implications

From a theoretical perspective, it was expected that service recommendations might be biased based on the participants' socioeconomic status, race, and/or professional status. However, what was discovered is that, when it comes to services recommended to students in a school setting, there is a fairly uniform response: counseling and family engagement. These are, in fact, best practices in school counseling when looking to address the needs of any troubled student, and it is encouraging that these recommendations were forthcoming across differences in social class or race. Therefore, from a theoretical perspective, the disparities that exist with regard to services made accessible to different racial groups and socioeconomic classes might sometimes have less to do with what services they think a student would benefit from and more to do with what is accessible and possible at a particular school. In practice, the teachers and counselors recommending these services might be faced with systemic barriers outside of their control. From a policy framework, then, interventions need to occur at a systemic level that will create access among all students to the services they need.

Where there could be more room for improvement and continuing education, though, is how teachers and counselors view their students from an attitudinal framework. The student dispositional profiles also appeared to interact at times with the characteristics of both the student and the participant. There is a longstanding history of researchers investigating training that

could improve biased attitudes teachers hold towards different types of students (Dettmer, 1981). Perhaps more awareness and training would be beneficial for counselors and teachers in practice and in training to address the likely unconscious biases taking place as they make snap judgments about their students. Educators' attitudes and beliefs are thought to be most receptive to change when they are provided with practices that teachers find to be effective and are backed by research (Guskey, 2020). Along these lines, there is research support for the potential of teachers in training to benefit from coursework that will limit their stereotyped views of such groups as low SES families and families of color (Amatea et al., 2012); similarly, counselors' training allowed them to begin seeing more potential in students whom they had previously considered to be problematic (Firat, 2021).

4.9 Limitations

The first limitation of the study is the sample size. Given the eight vignette conditions, the sample size was not large enough to show fine-grained significant findings for many of the research questions. Trends were observed; however, the interpretations of non-significant trends should be considered tentative and exploratory due to the limitation of the sample.

The next limitation regards the study's vignette, in which the student was always identified by gender as a boy. Participants might have responded differently to the student if he was of another gender presentation, such as non-binary or a girl. Therefore, the findings can only speak to how attitudes and service recommendations may correspond to male coded/presenting students.

Another limitation of the sample is that there were enough participants of color to form individual racial subgroups; hence participants of color were grouped together. This could have

added noise to the data in such a way that individual findings for specific racial groups were unable to be revealed. Additionally, some participants' race and social class groupings were smaller than others, such that those significant findings should be interpreted with caution due to the sample size.

An additional limitation relates to the way that service recommendations were reported. Participants were given a choice to respond with yes or no answers, but a Likert scale would have allowed for a more complex analysis to highlight underlying latent variables within related service recommendations (were they to be detected). This could then be used in conjunction with the disposition profiles to better describe the ways that students are viewed through the lens of service recommendations.

Another limitation that might be addressed in a future study concerns fine-tuning the prodigy dispositional profile. On this factor, one item showed an association yet did not load significantly enough to warrant inclusion in the disposition profile. The item was performing below grade level, and it was negatively correlated with the prodigy dispositional profile. Part of why this loading might not have been significant is due to the phrasing of the item. Perhaps teachers and counselors would more strongly relate to an item stated in the converse direction, such as *performing above grade level*. A future study could add this item to the additional survey to test this hypothesis and create a more stable factor structure model.

Finally, with regard to chronological context, the data was collected before the COVID-19 pandemic started. U.S. events during those years may potentially have influenced the way that participants responded to the study stimuli. During the years of recruitment, there were major national headlines regarding violence against Black persons, including the shooting of Trayvon Martin and the George Zimmerman case, and the police killings of individuals including Michael

Brown, Tamir Rice, Eric Garner, and Freddie Gray. Moreover, the Black Lives Matter movement became popularized as these killings of Black individuals took place. School shootings also occurred and made major news headlines across the nation. The effect that these contemporaneous events may have had on the collection of the data cannot be fully ascertained but should be borne in mind when interpreting the results.

4.10 Conclusion

The results of this study indicate that, in a general sense, many teachers and counselors are able to hold biases at bay when making service recommendations for students. This may be due to the training and guidance provided in the schools in which they work, and it represents an encouraging finding. Less encouraging were results that suggested the existence of some biased assumptions regarding students of color, particularly Asian Americans. These students seemed to be routinely affected by model minority stereotyping, which clouded the attributional ratings of the participants.

References

Abreu, R. L., Riggle, E. D. B., & Rostosky, S. S. (2020). Expressive Writing Intervention With Cuban-American and Puerto Rican Parents of LGBTQ Individuals. *The Counseling Psychologist,* 48(1), 106–134. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000019853240

Ahram, R., Fergus, E., & Noguera, P. (2011). Addressing racial/ethnic disproportionality in special education: Case studies of suburban school districts. *Teachers College Record*, *113*(10), 2233–2266.

Alegria, M., Vallas, M., & Pumariega, A. (2010). Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Pediatric Mental Health. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, *19*(4), 759–774. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chc.2010.07.001

Alexander, K. L., Entwisle, D. R., Blyth, D. A., & McAdoo, H. P. (1988). Achievement in the First 2 Years of School: Patterns and Processes. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, *53*(2), i–157. JSTOR. https://doi.org/10.2307/1166081

Amatea, E. S., Cholewa, B., & Mixon, K. A. (2012). Influencing Preservice Teachers' Attitudes About Working With Low-Income and/or Ethnic Minority Families. *Urban Education*, *47*(4), 801–834. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085912436846

American Counseling Association. (2018). *American Counseling Association Advocacy Competencies*. https://www.counseling.org/docs/default-source/competencies/aca-advocacy-competencies-updated-may-2020.pdf?sfvrsn=f410212c_4

American Psychological Association. (2003). Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training, Research, Practice, and Organizational Change for Psychologists. *The American Psychologist*, *58*(5), 377–402. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.58.5.377

American Psychological Association. (2017). *Multicultural Guidelines: An Ecological Approach to Context, Identity, and Intersectionality* [Data set]. American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/e501962018-001

American School Counselor Association. (2016). *ASCA ethical standards for school counselors*. https://www.schoolcounselor.org/asca/media/asca/Ethics/EthicalStandards2016.pdf

Anyon, Y., Zhang, D., & Hazel, C. (2016). Race, Exclusionary Discipline, and Connectedness to Adults in Secondary Schools. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *57*(3–4), 342–352. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12061

Aronson, J., & Inzlicht, M. (2004). The Ups and Downs of Attributional Ambiguity: Stereotype Vulnerability and the Academic Self-Knowledge of African American College Students. *Psychological Science*, *15*(12), 829–836.

Auwarter, A. E., & Aruguete, M. S. (2008). Effects of Student Gender and Socioeconomic Status on Teacher Perceptions. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *101*(4), 242–246. https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.101.4.243-246

Barbier, K., Struyf, E., & Donche, V. (2022). Teachers' beliefs about and educational practices with high-ability students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *109*, 103566. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103566

Barr, J. J. (2013). Student-Teachers' Attitudes toward Students with Disabilities: Associations with Contact and Empathy. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, *1*(8), 87–100. https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.61/2013.1.8/61.8.87.100

Beady, C. H., & Hansell, S. (1981). Teacher Race and Expectations for Student Achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, *18*(2), 191–206. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312018002191

Bell, D. A. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the Interest-Convergence Dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, *93*(3), 518–534.

Bertrand, M., Freelon, R., & Rogers, J. (2018). Elementary principals' social construction of parents of color and working class parents: Disrupting or reproducing conflicting and deficit orientations of education policy? *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *26*, 102. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.3546

Betters-Bubon, J., Brunner, T., & Kansteiner, A. (2016). Success for All? The Role of the School Counselor in Creating and Sustaining Culturally Responsive Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports Programs. *Professional Counselor*, *6*(3), 263–277.

Bigler, R. S., & Wright, Y. F. (2014). Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, and Racism? Risks and Benefits to Teaching Children About Intergroup Biases. *Child Development Perspectives*, *8*(1), 18–23. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12057

Bohrnstedt, G., Kitmitto, S., Ogut, B., Sherman, D., & Chan, D. (2015). School Composition and the Black-White Achievement Gap. NCES 2015-018. In *National Center for Education Statistics*. National Center for Education Statistics. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED560723

Borrero, N. E., & Yeh, C. J. (2013, March 28). *Social Class and School Counseling: A Collaborative, Asset-Based Approach*. The Oxford Handbook of Social Class in Counseling. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195398250.013.0019

Bradshaw, C. P., Mitchell, M. M., O'Brennan, L. M., & Leaf, P. J. (2010). Multilevel exploration of factors contributing to the overrepresentation of black students in office disciplinary referrals. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *102*(2), 508.

Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. L. (1970). Teachers' communication of differential expectations for children's classroom performance: Some behavioral data. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *61*(5), 365–374. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0029908

Brophy, J., & McCaslin, M. (1992). Teachers' Reports of How They Perceive and Cope with Problem Students. *The Elementary School Journal*, *93*(1), 3–68.

Brown, C. S., Alabi, B. O., Huynh, V. W., & Masten, C. L. (2011). Ethnicity and gender in late childhood and early adolescence: Group identity and awareness of bias. *Developmental Psychology*, *47*(2), 463–471. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021819

Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (Supreme Court of the United States 1954). https://www.loc.gov/item/usrep347483/

Bryant, D., & Wilson, A. (2020). Factors Potentially Influencing Discipline Referral and Suspensions at an Affiliated Charter High School. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/10.5590/JERAP.2020.10.1.08

Carbado, D. W., & Roithmayr, D. (2014). Critical Race Theory Meets Social Science. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, *10*(1), 149–167. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-110413-030928

Carter, R. T., Lau, M. Y., Johnson, V., & Kirkinis, K. (2017). Racial Discrimination and Health Outcomes Among Racial/Ethnic Minorities: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *45*(4), 232–259. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12076

Cerezo, A., Williams, C., Cummings, M., Ching, D., & Holmes, M. (2020). Minority Stress and Drinking: Connecting Race, Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *48*(2), 277–303. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000019887493

Chung, W., Edgar-Smith, S., Palmer, R. B., Chung, S., DeLambo, D., & Weihe Huang. (2015). An Examination of In-Service Teacher Attitudes toward Students with Autism Spectrum Disorder: Implications for Professional Practice. *Current Issues in Education*, *18*(2), 1–10.

Clark, K. B. (1979). The Role of Social Scientists 25 Years after Brown. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *5*(4), 477–481. https://doi.org/10.1177/014616727900500408

Clark, K. B., Chein, I., & Cook, S. W. (2004). The Effects of Segregation and the Consequences of Desegregation A (September 1952) Social Science Statement in the Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka Supreme Court Case. *American Psychologist*, *59*(6), 495–501. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.6.495

Clayton, O. (1996). *An American Dilemma Revisited: Race Relations in a Changing World*. Russell Sage Foundation. http://muse.jhu.edu/book/38307

Coholic, D., Eys, M., & Lougheed, S. (2012). Investigating the Effectiveness of an Arts-Based and Mindfulness-Based Group Program for the Improvement of Resilience in Children in Need. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *21*(5), 833–844. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-011-9544-2

Coughlan, R. W. (2018). Divergent Trends in Neighborhood and School Segregation in the Age of School Choice. *Peabody Journal of Education*, *93*(4), 349–366. https://doi.org/10.1080/0161956X.2018.1488385

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

Cruz, R. A., & Firestone, A. R. (2022). Understanding the Empty Backpack: The Role of Timing in Disproportionate Special Education Identification. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, *8*(1), 95–113. https://doi.org/10.1177/23326492211034890

Cruz, R. A., & Rodl, J. E. (2018). An Integrative Synthesis of Literature on Disproportionality in Special Education. *The Journal of Special Education*, *52*(1), 50–63. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022466918758707

Cuccaro, M. L., Wright, H. H., Rownd, C. V., Abramson, R. K., Waller, J., & Fender, D. (1996). Brief report: Professional perceptions of children with developmental difficulties: The influence of race and socioeconomic status. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, *26*(4), 461–469. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02172830

Dameron, M. L., Foxx, S. P., & Flowers, C. (2019). The Impact of Race, Gender, and Socioeconomic Status on School Counselors' Alternative Learning Program Placement Decisions: An Experimental Study. *The Urban Review*, *51*(5), 699–723. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-019-00502-9

Dauber, S. L., Alexander, K. L., & Entwisle, D. R. (1993). Characteristics of Retainees and Early Precursors of Retention in Grade: Who Is Held Back? *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *39*(3), 326–343. JSTOR.

Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York University Press.

Delphin-Rittmon, M. E., Flanagan, E. H., Andres-Hyman, R., Ortiz, J., Amer, M. M., & Davidson, L. (2015). Racial-ethnic differences in access, diagnosis, and outcomes in public-sector inpatient mental health treatment. *Psychological Services*, *12*(2), 158.

DeMeis, D. K., & Turner, R. R. (1977). The usefulness of teachers' characteristics in predicting teachers' ratings of racially and linguistically different students. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *2*(4), 384–392.

Desimone, L. (1999). Linking Parent Involvement with Student Achievement: Do Race and Income Matter? *The Journal of Educational Research*, *93*(1), 11–30.

Dettmer, P. (1981). Improving Teacher Attitudes Toward Characteristics of the Creatively Gifted. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *25*(1), 11–16. https://doi.org/10.1177/001698628102500103

Eack, S. M., Bahorik, A. L., Newhill, C. E., Neighbors, H. W., & Davis, L. E. (2012). Interviewer-Perceived Honesty as a Mediator of Racial Disparities in the Diagnosis of Schizophrenia. *Psychiatric Services*, *63*(9), 875–880. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201100388

Egger, H. L., Costello, J. E., & Angold, A. (2003). School Refusal and Psychiatric Disorders: A Community Study. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *42*(7), 797–807. https://doi.org/10.1097/01.CHI.0000046865.56865.79

Firat, T. (2021). The change over time of the perceptions of school counsellor candidates related to students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Psychologists and Counsellors in Schools*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1017/jgc.2021.3

Ford, D. Y. (2012). Culturally Different Students in Special Education: Looking Backward to Move Forward. *Exceptional Children*, *78*(4), 391–405. https://doi.org/10.1177/001440291207800401

Foxx, S. P., Saunders, R., & Lewis, C. W. (2020). Race, Gender, Class and Achievement: A Culturally Responsive Approach to Urban School Counseling. *Professional School Counseling*, *23*(1_part_2), 2156759X19899184. https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X19899184

Ganao, J. S. D., Silvestre, F. S., & Glenn, J. W. (2013). Assessing the Differential Impact of Contextual Factors on School Suspension for Black and White Students. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *82*(4), 393–407. JSTOR. https://doi.org/10.7709/jnegroeducation.82.4.0393

Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (1972). Behavioral expression of teacher attitudes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *63*(6), 617–624. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0034069

Goodman-Scott, E., Betters-Bubon, J., Donohue, P., Betters-Bubon, J., & Donohue, P. (2019). *The School Counselor's Guide to Multi-Tiered Systems of Support*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315144467

Grey, L. (2019). The Impact of School-Based Mentoring on the Academic Achievement Gap. *Professional School Counseling*, *23*(1), 2156759X19890258. https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X19890258

Guskey, T. (2020). Flip the Script on Change: Experience Shapes Teachers' Attitudes and Beliefs. *The Learning Professional*, *41*(2). https://uknowledge.uky.edu/edp_facpub/45

Hall, W. J., & Rodgers, G. K. (2019). Teachers' attitudes toward homosexuality and the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer community in the United States. *Social Psychology of Education*, *22*(1), 23–41. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-018-9463-9

Hamilton, R., McCoach, D. B., Tutwiler, M. S., Siegle, D., Gubbins, E. J., Callahan, C. M., Brodersen, A. V., & Mun, R. U. (2018). Disentangling the Roles of Institutional and Individual Poverty in the Identification of Gifted Students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *62*(1), 6–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986217738053

Harber, K. D. (1998). Feedback to minorities: Evidence of a positive bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*(3), 622. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.622

Harber, K. D., Gorman, J. L., Gengaro, F. P., Butisingh, S., Tsang, W., & Ouellette, R. (2012). Students' race and teachers' social support affect the positive feedback bias in public schools. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *104*(4), 1149. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028110

Harris, P. N., Shillingford, M. A., & Bryan, J. (2018). Factors Influencing School Counselor Involvement in Partnerships With Families of Color: A Social Cognitive Exploration. *Professional School Counseling*, *22*(1), 2156759X1881471. https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X18814712

Haynes, N. M., Comer, J. P., & Hamilton-Lee, M. (1989). School climate enhancement through parental involvement. *Journal of School Psychology*, *27*(1), 87–90. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4405(89)90034-4

Horwitz, S. M., Bility, K. M., Plichta, S. B., Leaf, P. J., & Haynes, N. (1998). TEACHER ASSESSMENTS OF CHILDREN'S BEHAVIORAL DISORDERS: Demographic Correlates. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *68*(1), 117–125. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0080276

Hughes, J. N., Gleason, K. A., & Zhang, D. (2005). Relationship influences on teachers' perceptions of academic competence in academically at-risk minority and majority first grade students. *Journal of School Psychology*, *43*(4), 303–320. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2005.07.001

Humes, K. R., Jones, N. A., & Ramirez, R. R. (2011). *Overview of race and Hispanic origin: 2010*.

Jiménez, T. R. (2008). Mexican immigrant replenishment and the continuing significance of ethnicity and race. *American Journal of Sociology*, *113*(6), 1527–1567. https://doi.org/10.1086/587151

Johnson, E., Mellard, D. F., Fuchs, D., & McKnight, M. A. (2006). Responsiveness to Intervention (RTI): How to Do It.[RTI Manual]. *National Research Center on Learning Disabilities*.

Johnson, R., Leighton, L., & Caldwell, C. (2018). The Embodied Experience of Microaggressions: Implications for Clinical Practice. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *46*(3), 156–170. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12099

Kaya, N. G., & Tortop, H. S. (2020). Attitudes and Opinions of Counselors about Education of Gifted Students. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, *9*(4), 1017–1024.

Kim, S., & Cardemil, E. (2012). Effective Psychotherapy With Low-income Clients: The Importance of Attending to Social Class. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, *42*(1), 27–35. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10879-011-9194-0

Kunstman, J. W., Plant, E. A., & Deska, J. C. (2016). White ≠ Poor: Whites Distance, Derogate, and Deny Low-Status Ingroup Members. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *42*(2), 230–243. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167215623270

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice*, *34*(3), 159–165. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849509543675

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the Achievement Gap to the Education Debt: Understanding Achievement in U.S. Schools. *Educational Researcher*, *35*(7), 3–12. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X035007003

Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. John Wiley & Sons.

LaRocque, M., Kleiman, I., & Darling, S. M. (2011). Parental Involvement: The Missing Link in School Achievement. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, *55*(3), 115–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/10459880903472876

Lavell, F. (2018). Go Back to Your Trailer: Essential Social Class Awareness for Counsellors. In *Counselling in Cultural Contexts* (pp. 65–91). Springer.

LeCroy, C. W., & Stinson, E. L. (2004). The public's perception of social work: Is it what we think it is? *Social Work*, *49*(2), 164-. Gale OneFile: Health and Medicine.

Lee, S. D., & Temerlin, M. K. (1970). Social class, diagnosis, and prognosis for psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice*, *7*(3), 181.

Lewin, P., Nelson, R. E., & Tollefson, N. (1983). Teacher attitudes toward disruptive children. *Elementary School Guidance & Counseling*, *17*(3), 188–193.

Lindholm, B. W., Touliatos, J., & Rich, A. (1978). Racial differences in behavior disorders of children. *Journal of School Psychology*, *16*(1), 42–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-4405(78)90021-3

Lindsey, L., Robertson, P., & Lindsey, B. (2018). Expressive Arts and Mindfulness: Aiding Adolescents in Understanding and Managing Their Stress. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health*, *13*(3), 288–297. https://doi.org/10.1080/15401383.2018.1427167

Lofton, R., & Davis, J. E. (2015). Toward a Black Habitus: African Americans Navigating Systemic Inequalities within Home, School, and Community. *Journal of Negro Education*, *84*(3), 214–230. https://doi.org/10.7709/jnegroeducation.84.3.0214

Losen, D. J., & Gillespie, J. (2012). Opportunities Suspended: The Disparate Impact of Disciplinary Exclusion from School. In *Civil Rights Project / Proyecto Derechos Civiles*. Civil Rights Project / Proyecto Derechos Civiles. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED534178

Lott, B. (2002). Cognitive and behavioral distancing from the poor. *American Psychologist*, *57*(2), 100–110. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.2.100

Lott, B., & Bullock, H. E. (2001). Who are the poor? *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*(2), 189–206.

Luthar, S. S., & Barkin, S. H. (2012). Are affluent youth truly "at risk"? Vulnerability and resilience across three diverse samples. *Development and Psychopathology*, *24*(2), 429–449. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579412000089

Maccallum, R. C., Widaman, K. F., Zhang, S., Hong, S., Maccallum, R. C., Zhang, S., & Hong, S. (1999). Sample size in factor analysis. *Psychol. Methods*, 84–99.

Massey, G. C., SCOTT, M. V., & DORNBUSCH, S. M. (1975). RACISM WITHOUT RACISTS: Institutional Racism in Urban Schools. *The Black Scholar*, *7*(3), 10–19.

McFarland, J., Hussar, B., Zhang, J., Wang, X., Wang, K., Hein, S., Diliberti, M., Cataldi, E. F., Mann, F. B., & Barmer, A. (2019). The Condition of Education 2019. NCES 2019-144. In *National Center for Education Statistics*. National Center for Education Statistics. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED594978

McKown, C., & Strambler, M. J. (2009). Developmental Antecedents and Social and Academic Consequences of Stereotype-Consciousness in Middle Childhood. *Child Development*, *80*(6), 1643–1659. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2009.01359.x

Mendaglio, S. (2002). Heightened Multifaceted Sensitivity of Gifted Students: Implications for Counseling. *The Journal of Secondary Gifted Education: JSGE*, *14*(2), 72–82. http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.cul.columbia.edu/10.4219/jsge-2003-421

Minton, S. J. (2016). Evidence-Informed Recommendations to Promote Black Student Engagement. *Journal of School Counseling*, *14*(12). https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1124056

Oliver, R. M., Wehby, J. H., & Reschly, D. J. (2011). Teacher classroom management practices: Effects on disruptive or aggressive student behavior. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, *7*(1), 1–55. https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2011.4

Orfield, G., Ee, J., Frankenberg, E., & Siegel-Hawley, G. (2016). *BROWN AT 62: SCHOOL SEGREGATION BY RACE, POVERTY AND STATE*. 9.

Owens, A. (2020). Unequal Opportunity: School and Neighborhood Segregation in the USA. *Race and Social Problems*, *12*(1), 29–41. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12552-019-09274-z

Owens, R. L., Magyar-Moe, J. L., & Lopez, S. J. (2015). Finding Balance via Positive Psychological Assessment and Conceptualization: Recommendations for Practice. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *43*(5), 634–670. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000015584956

Payne, N., Ciclitira, K., Starr, F., Marzano, L., & Brunswick, N. (2015). Evaluation of long-term counselling at a community health service for women who are on a low income.

Counselling & Psychotherapy Research, *15*(2), 79–87. https://doi.org/10.1002/capr.12008

Pérez-Gualdrón, L. M., & Yeh, C. J. (2014, July 2). *Multicultural Counseling and Therapy Counseling for Social Justice*. The Oxford Handbook of Multicultural Identity. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199796694.013.020

Pérez-Gualdrón, L., Yeh, C., & Russell, L. (2016). Boys II Men: A Culturally-Responsive School Counseling Group for Urban High School Boys of Color. *Journal of School Counseling*, *14*(13). https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1126013

Peterson, J. S. (2015). School Counselors and Gifted Kids: Respecting Both Cognitive and Affective. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *93*(2), 153–162. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2015.00191.x

Pietrantoni, Z., & Glance, D. (2019). Multicultural Competency Training of School Counselor Trainees: Development of the Social Class and Classism Training Questionnaire. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *47*(1), 2–18. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12117

Pigott, R. L., & Cowen, E. L. (2000). Teacher Race, Child Race, Racial Congruence, and Teacher Ratings of Children's School Adjustment. *Journal of School Psychology*, *38*(2), 177–195. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-4405(99)00041-2

Platt, L. F. (2020). The Presenting Concerns of Transgender and Gender Nonconforming Clients at University Counseling Centers. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *48*(3), 407–431. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000019898680

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (Supreme Court Of The United States 1895). https://www.loc.gov/item/usrep163537/

Poon, O., Squire, D., Kodama, C., Byrd, A., Chan, J., Manzano, L., Furr, S., & Bishundat, D. (2016). A Critical Review of the Model Minority Myth in Selected Literature on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in Higher Education. *Review of Educational Research*, *86*(2), 469–502. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315612205

Poulou, M. S., Garner, P. W., & Bassett, H. H. (2022). Teachers' emotional expressiveness and classroom management practices: Associations with young students' social-emotional and behavioral competence. *Psychology in the Schools*, *59*(3), 557–573. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22631

Proctor, S. L., Graves Jr, S. L., & Esch, R. C. (2012). Assessing African American students for specific learning disabilities: The promises and perils of response to intervention. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *81*(3), 268–282.

Ratts, M. J., & Greenleaf, A. T. (2017). Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies: A Leadership Framework for Professional School Counselors.

Professional School Counseling, *21*(1b), 2156759X1877358. https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X18773582

Ratts, M. J., Singh, A. A., Nassar-McMillan, S., Butler, S. K., & McCullough, J. R. (2016). Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies: Guidelines for the Counseling Profession. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *44*(1), 28–48. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12035

Ricks, L., Carney, J., & Lanier, B. (2020). Attributes, Attitudes, and Perceived Self-Efficacy Levels of School Counselors toward Poverty. *Georgia School Counselors Association Journal*, *27*, 51–68.

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1968). Pygmalion in the classroom. *The Urban Review*, *3*(1), 16–20.

Rothstein, R. (2015). The Racial Achievement Gap, Segregated Schools, and Segregated Neighborhoods: A Constitutional Insult. *Race and Social Problems*, *7*(1), 21–30. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12552-014-9134-1

Safran, S., & Safran, J. (1985). Classroom Context and Teachers' Perceptions of Problem Behaviors. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *77*, 20–28. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.77.1.20

Schreiber, J. B. (2021). Issues and recommendations for exploratory factor analysis and principal component analysis. *Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy*, *17*(5), 1004–1011. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sapharm.2020.07.027

Shell, E. (2020). Exploring school counselors' preparation to address disproportionality of African American students in special education. *Teaching and Supervision in Counseling*, *2*(1). https://doi.org/10.7290/tsc020108

Shin, R. Q., Welch, J. C., Kaya, A. E., Yeung, J. G., Obana, C., Sharma, R., Vernay, C. N., & Yee, S. (2017). The intersectionality framework and identity intersections in the Journal of Counseling Psychology and The Counseling Psychologist: A content analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *64*(5), 458–474. https://doi.org/10.1037/cou0000204

Shure, L., West-Olatunji, C., & Cholewa, B. (2020). Investigating the Relationship between School Counselor Recommendations and Student Cultural Behavioral Styles. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *88*(4), 454–466. JSTOR. https://doi.org/10.7709/jnegroeducation.88.4.0454

Silberman, M. L. (1969). Behavioral expression of teachers' attitudes toward elementary school students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *60*(5), 402–407. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0028315

Skiba, R. J., Chung, C.-G., Trachok, M., Baker, T. L., Sheya, A., & Hughes, R. L. (2014). Parsing Disciplinary Disproportionality: Contributions of Infraction, Student, and School

Characteristics to Out-of-School Suspension and Expulsion. *American Educational Research Journal*, *51*(4), 640–670. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831214541670

Skiba, R. J., Horner, R. H., Chung, C.-G., Rausch, M. K., May, S. L., & Tobin, T. (2011). Race Is Not Neutral: A National Investigation of African American and Latino Disproportionality in School Discipline. *School Psychology Review*, *40*(1), 24.

Skiba, R. J., Peterson, R. L., & Williams, T. (1997). Office Referrals and Suspension: Disciplinary Intervention in Middle Schools. *Education and Treatment of Children*, *20*(3), 295–315. JSTOR.

Smiley, C., Browne, A., & Battle, J. (2022). Latinx Parents, Latinx Students, and In-School Suspension: A Quantitative Study of School Discipline. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *0*(0), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348431.2022.2026223

Smith, L. (2005). Psychotherapy, classism, and the poor: Conspicuous by their absence. *American Psychologist*, *60*(7), 687.

Smith, L., Foley, P. F., & Chaney, M. P. (2008). Addressing Classism, Ableism, and Heterosexism in Counselor Education. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *86*(3), 303–309. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2008.tb00513.x

Smith, L., & Mao, S. (2012). Social class and psychology. In *APA handbook of counseling psychology, Vol. 1: Theories, research, and methods* (pp. 523–540). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/13754-020

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

Starck, J. G., Riddle, T., Sinclair, S., & Warikoo, N. (2020). Teachers Are People Too: Examining the Racial Bias of Teachers Compared to Other American Adults. *Educational Researcher*, *49*(4), 273–284. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20912758

Stein, L. S., Green, B. L., & Stone, W. N. (1972). Therapist attitudes as influenced by AB therapist type, patient diagnosis, and social class. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *39*(2), 301.

Stiefel, L., Schwartz, A. E., & Ellen, I. G. (2007). Disentangling the Racial Test Score Gap: Probing the Evidence in a Large Urban School District. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, *26*(1), 7–30.

Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. John Wiley & Sons.

Sue, D. W. (2011). The Challenge of White Dialectics: Making the "Invisible" Visible. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *39*(3), 415–422. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000010390702

Sue, D. W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. J. (1992). Multicultural Counseling Competencies and Standards: A Call to the Profession. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *20*(2), 64–88. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.1992.tb00563.x

Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist*, *62*(4), 271.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (2015). *Counseling the Culturally Diverse: Theory and Practice*. John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/columbia/detail.action?docID=4189578

Sullivan, A. L., & Proctor, S. L. (2016). *The Shield or the Sword? Revisiting the Debate on Racial Disproportionality in Special Education and Implications for School Psychologists*. 11.

Szymanski, D. M. (2020). Sexual Objectification, Internalization, and College Women's Depression: The Role of Shame. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *48*(1), 135–156. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000019878847

Thomas, J. M. (2018). Diversity Regimes and Racial Inequality: A Case Study of Diversity University. *Social Currents*, *5*(2), 140–156. https://doi.org/10.1177/2329496517725335

Toth, S. L., Rogosch, F. A., Oshri, A., Gravener-Davis, J., Sturm, R., & Morgan-López, A. A. (2013). The efficacy of interpersonal psychotherapy for depression among economically disadvantaged mothers. *Development and Psychopathology*, *25*(4pt1), 1065–1078. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579413000370

Volpe, V. V. (2019). *Bringing psychological science to bear on racial health disparities: The promise of centering Black health through a critical race framework.* Translational Issues in Psychological Science; US: Educational Publishing Foundation. https://doi.org/10.1037/tps0000205

Wadsworth, M. E. (2012). Working with Low-income Families: Lessons Learned from Basic and Applied Research on Coping with Poverty-related Stress. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, *42*(1), 17–25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10879-011-9192-2

White, R. B., Polly, D., & Audette, R. H. (2012). A Case Analysis of an Elementary School's Implementation of Response to Intervention. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, *26*(1), 73–90. https://doi.org/10.1080/02568543.2011.632067

Whitson, M. L., Robinson, S., Valkenburg, K. V., & Jackson, M. (2020). The benefits of an afterschool music program for low-income, urban youth: The music haven evaluation project. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *48*(2), 426–436. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.22263

Winter, J. C. F. de, Dodou, D., & Wieringa, P. A. (2009). Exploratory Factor Analysis With Small Sample Sizes. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *44*(2), 147–181. https://doi.org/10.1080/00273170902794206

Wong, F., & Halgin, R. (2006). The "Model Minority": Bane or Blessing for Asian Americans? *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, *34*(1), 38–49. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2006.tb00025.x

Wu, L.-T., Ringwalt, C. L., Yang, C., Reeve, B. B., Pan, J.-J., & Blazer, D. G. (2009). Construct and Differential Item Functioning in the Assessment of Prescription Opioid Use Disorders Among American Adolescents. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, *48*(5), 563–572. https://doi.org/10.1097/CHI.0b013e31819e3f45

Appendix A

Table 1

Participant Demographics

Gender	N
Male	20
Female	114

Participant Age	
Mean	Median
31.23	28

Years with professional certificate/license	
Mean	Median
9.87	7

Type of School	N
Public	100
Charter	10
Private/Independent	17

School Level	N
High school	69
Middle school/junior high	32
Elementary	39

Majority SES of School	N
Low-income/poverty	44
Working-class	27
Lower-middle class	14
Middle-class	24
Upper-middle-class	10
Upper-class/wealthy	11

Majority Race/Ethnicity of School	N
African American/Black	21
Native American or Pacific Islander	1
Latinx/a	26
Asian/Asian American	5
White	71

School Involvement of Participant	N
I am a teacher	58
I am a school counselor	28
I am a graduate student in a teacher education program and/or a student teacher	20
I am a graduate student in a psychology or counseling program and/or a counseling trainee	30

Table 2

Self-Reported Socioeconomic Status of Participants

SES	N
Low-income/poverty	4
Working-class	5
Lower-middle class	14
Middle class	71
Upper-middle-class	36
Upper class/wealthy	4

Table 3

Participant Race Condensed

Race	N	%
Black	14	10.3
Asian	8	5.9
White	101	74.3
Total	123	90.4
Not Reported	13	9.6
Total	136	100

Table 4

Socioeconomic Status of Participants Reduced

SES	N
Low-income/poverty	4
Working Class	5
Middle Class	85
Upper Class	40
Not Reported	2
Total	136

Table 5

Vignettes

Counselor Vignette Type	*n*	Teacher Vignette Type	*n*
Low SES Black	10	Low SES Black	9
Low SES Asian American	9	Low SES Asian American	6
Low SES Latinx	8	Low SES Latinx	8
Low SES White	9	Low SES White	6
High SES White	10	High SES Black	5
High SES Black	12	High SES Asian American	9
High SES Asian American	10	High SES Latinx	8
High SES Latinx	10	High SES White	7
Total	78		58

Table 6

Vignette SES and Race

Condition	*n*
Low SES Black	19
Low SES Asian American	15
Low SES Latinx	16
Low SES White	15
High SES Black	15
High SES Asian American	21
High SES Latinx	18
High SES White	17
Total	136

Table 7

Attitudes Factors Eigenvalues

Factors	Eigenvalue	Proportion of Variance
1	4.744	18.977
2	2.545	10.179
3	2.065	8.260
4	1.711	6.843
5	1.512	6.049
6	1.357	5.426
7	1.193	4.772
8	1.063	4.253
9	.999	3.995

Table 8

Attitude Rating Factor Structure

	Factor		
Attitude	The Problem Child	The Prodigy	The Sensitive Child
Poor self-control	0.754*	0.016	0.091
Physically aggressive	0.707*	-0.24	0.14
Poor impulse control	0.682*	0.088	0.077
Acts out physically	0.613*	-0.298	0.064
Possible attention deficit disorder	0.544*	-0.045	-0.039
Defiant	0.54*	0.022	0.03
Antisocial	0.426*	-0.057	0.313*
Argumentative	0.416*	-0.043	-0.206
Possible mental health diagnosis	0.412*	0.033	0.128
Possible psychological issues/problems	0.342*	-0.083	0.193
Compliant	-0.24	-0.215	-0.181
Easily influenced	0.207	0.077	0.062
Intelligent	-0.258	0.665*	0.023
Gifted	-0.008	0.642*	-0.09
Needs more academic challenge	0.009	0.57*	-0.023
Bored	0.215	0.564*	-0.093
Creative	-0.369	0.492*	-0.017
Ingenious	-0.061	0.333*	-0.018
Performing below grade level	0.039	-0.24	-0.141
Withdrawn	0.081	0.064	0.74*
Stressful home environment	0.079	-0.261	0.605*
Passive	0.271	-0.028	0.525*
Lacks parental involvement	0.356*	-0.282	0.481*
Shy	-0.107	0.214	0.433*
Emotionally distressed	-0.019	-0.252	0.36*

Note. * are significant p > .05

Table 9

Service Recommendation (Check all that apply) Frequencies

Service Recommendation	*n*	Percent
Supportive school counseling guidance	118	9.7%
School counselor consultation family	111	9.1%
After school art program	91	7.5%
Strategic behavior plan	85	7.0%
Family meeting on student performance	85	7.0%
General Education	71	5.8%
School social worker support	70	5.7%
Community organizations services	66	5.4%
School based mental health treatment counseling	61	5.0%
Assessment possible learning disability	61	5.0%
After school program for at risk students	49	4.0%
After school sports participation	47	3.9%
Parenting skills workshop	44	3.6%
After school academic remediation	37	3.0%
Special Education Cooperative Team Teaching	32	2.6%
Special Education Teacher Support Services	25	2.1%
Mental health clinic referral	22	1.8%
Unstructured Montessori style classroom	21	1.7%
Private tutor	21	1.7%
Gifted Class	20	1.6%
Placement with special ed teacher paraprofessional	19	1.6%
School chess team	19	1.6%
Accelerated advanced academic placement	17	1.4%
Science club	16	1.3%
Medical assessment	11	0.9%

Table 10

Rankings of Choose-All Service Recommendations by Vignette Type

Rank	African American	Asian	Latinx	White	Low SES	High SES
1	School counselor consultation family (9.60%)	Supportive school counseling guidance (9.90%)	Supportive school counseling guidance (9.20%)	Supportive school counseling guidance (10.20%)	School counselor consultation family (10.41%)	Supportive school counseling guidance (9.20%)
2	Supportive school counseling guidance (9.20%)	School counselor consultation family (8.10%)	School counselor consultation family (8.50%)	School counselor consultation family (10.20%)	Supportive school counseling guidance (10.10%)	School counselor consultation family (7.80%)
3	After school art program (7.90%)	Family meeting on student performance (7.50%)	School social worker support (7.60)	After school art program (7.40%)	Family meeting on student performance (7.40%)	After school art program (7.80%)
4	Strategic behavior plan (7.60%)	After school art program (7.10%)	After school art program (7.30%)	Family meeting on student performance (6.70%)	After school art program (7.00%)	Strategic behavior plan (7.20%)
5	Family meeting on student performance (6.90%)	Strategic behavior plan (6.80%)	General Education (7.00%)	Strategic behavior plan (6.40%)	Strategic behavior plan (6.70%)	Family meeting on student performance (6.60%)

Table 11

School social worker support

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
School social worker support	No	16	20	10	20	66
	Yes	18	16	24	12	70
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Table 12

Accelerated advanced academic placement

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Accelerated advanced academic placement	No	31	26	33	29	119
	Yes	3	10	1	3	17
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Table 13

School counselor consultation family

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
School counselor consultation family	Yes	61	50	111
	No	4	21	25
Total		65	71	136

Table 14

Special Education Teacher Support Services

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
Special Education Teacher Support Services	Yes	6	19	25
	No	59	52	111
Total		65	71	136

Table 15

Accelerated advanced academic placement

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
Accelerated advanced academic placement	Yes	4	13	17
	No	61	58	119
Total		65	71	136

Table 16

Service Recommendation (choose one) Frequencies

	n	Percent
Supportive school counseling and/or guidance	31	22.8
School counselor's consultation with family	17	12.5
Family meeting(s) for support of classroom performance	14	10.3
After-school art program	9	6.6
School social worker support	9	6.6
After-school program for at-risk students	8	5.9
School-based mental health treatment or counseling	7	5.1
Assessment for possible learning disability	6	4.4
Gifted classroom	4	2.9
Placement in an inclusive classroom setting (i.e., Special Education Cooperative Team Teaching)	4	2.9
Strategic behavior plan	4	2.9
Parenting skills workshop for family members	4	2.9
General education	3	2.2
Placement in resource setting (i.e., Special Education Teacher Support Services)	3	2.2
Placement in resource setting that provides a special education teacher and a paraprofessional	2	1.5
Off-site mental health clinic referral	2	1.5
Medical assessment	2	1.5
After-school academic remediation	2	1.5
Community organizations/services (Boys/Girls Club, etc.)	2	1.5
Unstructured or Montessori-style classroom	1	.7
Private tutor	1	.7
Accelerated/advanced academic placement	1	.7
Total	136	100.0

Table 17

Rankings of Final Service Recommendations by Vignette Type

Rank	African American	Asian American	Latinx	White	Low SES	High SES
1	Supportive School Counseling (20.6%)	Supportive School Counseling (23.1%)	Supportive School Counseling (20.6%)	Supportive School Counseling (28.1%)	Supportive School Counseling (23.1%)	Supportive School Counseling (22.5%)
2	Family meeting(s) for support of classroom performance (14.7%)	After-school art program (11.1%)	School counselor's consultation with family (20.6%)	School counselor's consultation with family (12.5%)	School counselor's consultation with family (15.4%)	School counselor's consultation with family (9.9%)
3	School-based mental health treatment or counseling (11.8%)	Family meeting(s) for support of classroom performance (11.1%)	School social worker support (11.8%)	Family meeting(s) for support of classroom performance (9.4%)	Family meeting(s) for support of classroom performance (13.8%)	After-school art program (7%)
4	School counselor's consultation with family (11.8%)	Gifted classroom (8.3%)	After-school art program (8.8%)	School-based mental health treatment or counseling (6.3%)	School-based mental health treatment or counseling (9.2%)	After-school program for at-risk students (7%)
5	After-school program for at-risk students (8.8%)	Placement in an inclusive classroom setting (i.e., Special Education Cooperative Team Teaching) (8.3%)	After-school program for at-risk students (8.8%)	Assessment for possible learning disability (6.3%)	School social worker support (7.7%)	Family meeting for support of classroom performance (7%)

Table 18

Rankings of Final Service Recommendations by Vignette Race

	Vignette Race				
	Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Supportive school counseling and/or guidance	7	8	7	9	31
School counselor's consultation with family	4	2	7	4	17
Family meeting(s) for support of classroom performance	5	4	2	3	14
School social worker support	0	3	4	2	9
After-school art program	1	4	3	1	9
After-school program for at-risk students	3	0	3	2	8
School-based mental health treatment or counseling	4	1	0	2	7
Assessment for possible learning disability	0	2	2	2	6
Parenting skills workshop for family members	1	1	1	1	4
Strategic behavior plan	2	1	0	1	4
Placement in an inclusive classroom setting (i.e., Special Education Cooperative Team Teaching)	0	3	1	0	4
Gifted classroom	0	3	0	1	4
Placement in resource setting (i.e., Special Education Teacher Support Services)	1	1	0	1	3
General education	2	0	1	0	3
Community organizations/services (Boys/Girls Club, etc.)	0	1	1	0	2
After-school academic remediation	0	1	1	0	2
Medical assessment	0	1	0	1	2
Off-site mental health clinic referral	1	0	0	1	2
Placement in resource setting that provides a special education teacher and a paraprofessional	1	0	0	1	2
Accelerated/advanced academic placement	1	0	0	0	1
Private tutor	1	0	0	0	1
Unstructured or Montessori-style classroom	0	0	1	0	1
Total	34	36	34	32	136

Table 19

Rankings of Final Service Recommendations by Vignette SES

	Vignette SES		
	Low SES	High SES	Total
Supportive school counseling and/or guidance	15	16	31
School counselor's consultation with family	10	7	17
Family meeting(s) for support of classroom performance	9	5	14
School social worker support	5	4	9
After-school art program	4	5	9
After-school program for at-risk students	3	5	8
School-based mental health treatment or counseling	6	1	7
Assessment for possible learning disability	3	3	6
Parenting skills workshop for family members	1	3	4
Strategic behavior plan	3	1	4
Placement in an inclusive classroom setting (i.e., Special Education Cooperative Team Teaching)	1	3	4
Gifted classroom	1	3	4
Placement in resource setting (i.e., Special Education Teacher Support Services)	0	3	3
General education	0	3	3
Community organizations/services (Boys/Girls Club, etc.)	1	1	2
After-school academic remediation	1	1	2
Medical assessment	1	1	2
Off-site mental health clinic referral	0	2	2
Placement in resource setting that provides a special education teacher and a paraprofessional	0	2	2
Accelerated/advanced academic placement	0	1	1
Private tutor	0	1	1
Unstructured or Montessori-style classroom	1	0	1
Total	65	71	136

Appendix B

Vignettes

Vignette 1: Low SES African American Student

The example below describes a new student for whom the classroom teacher may want to recommend a special service or program. As you read the example, please think about what kinds of services or programs might best help such a student. You are a third grade teacher at a school in a large U.S. city, and Michael, an African American nine¬year¬old, was recently added to your class roster. The first few days that Michael was in your class, he seemed quiet, on time, and observant of rules, although you notice that he seems to be interested only in playing and drawing by himself. Today, however, Michael comes to school 90 minutes late, saying he and his mother have been sleeping at his aunt's and he had farther to walk to school. You happen to notice that Michael has worn the same clothing each time that you have seen him. As the rest of the class begins doing math warm¬ups, Michael is hesitant to participate, telling you "This stuff is easy. I already know how to do it!" However, later in the day as Michael takes a math quiz with the rest of the class, he is only able to complete 3 out of the 10 questions. During the test, you observe that Michael is staring off into space, and you have to refocus him several times. Of the 3 questions that he finished, you notice that he seemed to have the right concept but made many careless mistakes. When Michael sees his low grade on the quiz, he responds, "Who cares? I don't like math anyway!" You remind Michael that his quiz must be signed by a parent, and he tells you that he can't because his mom has to clean the hospital tonight. As you review Michael's file from the previous school year, you learn that he enjoys writing and has written several comic books and a short story. You also learn that he is extremely sensitive, and that when he believes he is right, he does not back down. At times, he yells at classmates who

disagree with him, and has stormed off crying when he does not get his way. Although his 2nd grade teacher believed Michael was bright, she noted that he could be overactive and seemed not to complete work that he didn't find interesting. Furthermore, she noted that he often went from project to project without completing one. The only time Michael kept still, she commented, was when he was working on his comic books.

Vignette 2: Low SES Asian American Student

The example below describes a new student for whom the classroom teacher may want to recommend a special service or program. As you read the example, please think about what kinds of services or programs might best help such a student. You are a third grade teacher at a school in a large U.S. city, and Michael, an Asian American nine¬year¬old, was recently added to your class roster. The first few days that Michael was in your class, he seemed quiet, on time, and observant of rules, although you notice that he seems to be interested only in playing and drawing by himself. Today, however, Michael comes to school 90 minutes late, saying he and his mother have been sleeping at his aunt's and he had farther to walk to school. You happen to notice that Michael has worn the same clothing each time that you have seen him. As the rest of the class begins doing math warm¬ups, Michael is hesitant to participate, telling you "This stuff is easy. I already know how to do it!" However, later in the day as Michael takes a math quiz with the rest of the class, he is only able to complete 3 out of the 10 questions. During the test, you observe that Michael is staring off into space, and you have to refocus him several times. Of the 3 questions that he finished, you notice that he seemed to have the right concept but made many careless mistakes. When Michael sees his low grade on the quiz, he responds, "Who cares? I don't like math anyway!" You remind Michael that his quiz must be signed by a parent, and he tells you that he can't because his mom has to clean the hospital tonight. As you review

Michael's file from the previous school year, you learn that he enjoys writing and has written several comic books and a short story. You also learn that he is extremely sensitive, and that when he believes he is right, he does not back down. At times, he yells at classmates who disagree with him, and has stormed off crying when he does not get his way. Although his 2nd grade teacher believed Michael was bright, she noted that he could be overactive and seemed not to complete work that he didn't find interesting. Furthermore, she noted that he often went from project to project without completing one. The only time Michael kept still, she commented, was when he was working on his comic books.

Vignette 3: Low SES Latinx Student

Student Example The example below describes a new student for whom the classroom teacher may want to recommend a special service or program. As you read the example, please think about what kinds of services or programs might best help such a student. You are a third grade teacher at a school in a large U.S. city, and Michael, a nine¬year¬old Latinx student, was recently added to your class roster. The first few days that Michael was in your class, he seemed quiet, on time, and observant of rules, although you notice that he seems to be interested only in playing and drawing by himself. Today, however, Michael comes to school 90 minutes late, saying he and his mother have been sleeping at his aunt's and he had farther to walk to school. You happen to notice that Michael has worn the same clothing each time that you have seen him. As the rest of the class begins doing math warm¬ups, Michael is hesitant to participate, telling you "This stuff is easy. I already know how to do it!" However, later in the day as Michael takes a math quiz with the rest of the class, he is only able to complete 3 out of the 10 questions. During the test, you observe that Michael is staring off into space, and you have to refocus him several times. Of the 3 questions that he finished, you notice that he seemed to have the right

concept but made many careless mistakes. When Michael sees his low grade on the quiz, he responds, “Who cares? I don’t like math anyway!” You remind Michael that his quiz must be signed by a parent, and he tells you that he can’t because his mom has to clean the hospital tonight. As you review Michael’s file from the previous school year, you learn that he enjoys writing and has written several comic books and a short story. You also learn that he is extremely sensitive, and that when he believes he is right, he does not back down. At times, he yells at classmates who disagree with him, and has stormed off crying when he does not get his way. Although his 2nd grade teacher believed Michael was bright, she noted that he could be overactive and seemed not to complete work that he didn’t find interesting. Furthermore, she noted that he often went from project to project without completing one. The only time Michael kept still, she commented, was when he was working on his comic books.

Vignette 4: Low SES White Student

The example below describes a new student for whom the classroom teacher may want to recommend a special service or program. As you read the example, please think about what kinds of services or programs might best help such a student. You are a third grade teacher at a school in a large U.S. city, and Michael, a White nine¬year¬old student, was recently added to your class roster. The first few days that Michael was in your class, he seemed quiet, on time, and observant of rules, although you notice that he seems to be interested only in playing and drawing by himself. Today, however, Michael comes to school 90 minutes late, saying he and his mother have been sleeping at his aunt’s and he had farther to walk to school. You happen to notice that Michael has worn the same clothing each time that you have seen him. As the rest of the class begins doing math warm¬ups, Michael is hesitant to participate, telling you “This stuff is easy. I already know how to do it!” However, later in the day as Michael takes a math quiz

with the rest of the class, he is only able to complete 3 out of the 10 questions. During the test, you observe that Michael is staring off into space, and you have to refocus him several times. Of the 3 questions that he finished, you notice that he seemed to have the right concept but made many careless mistakes. When Michael sees his low grade on the quiz, he responds, "Who cares? I don't like math anyway!" You remind Michael that his quiz must be signed by a parent, and he tells you that he can't because his mom has to clean the hospital tonight. As you review Michael's file from the previous school year, you learn that he enjoys writing and has written several comic books and a short story. You also learn that he is extremely sensitive, and that when he believes he is right, he does not back down. At times, he yells at classmates who disagree with him, and has stormed off crying when he does not get his way. Although his 2nd grade teacher believed Michael was bright, she noted that he could be overactive and seemed not to complete work that he didn't find interesting. Furthermore, she noted that he often went from project to project without completing one. The only time Michael kept still, she commented, was when he was working on his comic books.

Vignette 5: High SES White Student

The example below describes a new student for whom the classroom teacher may want to recommend a special service or program. As you read the example, please think about what kinds of services or programs might best help such a student. You are a third grade teacher at a school in a large U.S. city, and Michael, a nine¬year¬old White student, was recently added to your class roster. The first few days that Michael was in your class, he seemed quiet, on time, and observant of rules, although you notice that he seems to be interested only in playing and drawing by himself. Today, however, Michael comes to school 90 minutes late, saying he and his mother had spent the weekend at their other house and they had driven all the way in from

the beach for school. As the rest of the class begins doing math warm¬ups, Michael is hesitant to participate, telling you "This stuff is easy; I already know how to do it!" However, later in the day as Michael takes a math quiz with the rest of the class, he is only able to complete 3 out of the 10 questions. During the test, you observe that Michael is staring off into space, and you have to refocus him several times. Of the 3 questions he finishes, you notice that he seemed to have the right concept but made many careless mistakes. When Michael sees his low grade on the quiz, he responds, "Who cares? I don't like math anyway!" You remind Michael that his quiz must be signed by a parent, and he tells you that he can't because his mom is a doctor and she has to deliver babies at night. As you review Michael's file from the previous school year, you learn that he enjoys writing and has written several comic books and a short story. You also learn that he is extremely sensitive, and that when he believes he is right, he will not back down. At times, he yells at classmates who disagree with him, and has stormed off crying when he does not get his way. Although his 2nd grade teacher believed Michael was bright, she noted that he could be overactive and seemed not to complete work that he didn't find interesting. Furthermore, she noted that he often went from project to project without completing one. The only time Michael kept still, she commented, was when he was working on his comic books.

Vignette 6: High SES African American Student

The example below describes a new student for whom the classroom teacher may want to recommend a special service or program. As you read the example, please think about what kinds of services or programs might best help such a student. You are a third grade teacher at a school in a large U.S. city, and Michael, a nine¬year¬old African American student, was recently added to your class roster. The first few days that Michael was in your class, he seemed quiet, on time, and observant of rules, although you notice that he seems to be interested only in

playing and drawing by himself. Today, however, Michael comes to school 90 minutes late, saying he and his mother had spent the weekend at their other house and they had driven all the way in from the beach for school. As the rest of the class begins doing math warm¬ups, Michael is hesitant to participate, telling you "This stuff is easy; I already know how to do it!" However, later in the day as Michael takes a math quiz with the rest of the class, he is only able to complete 3 out of the 10 questions. During the test, you observe that Michael is staring off into space, and you have to refocus him several times. Of the 3 questions he finishes, you notice that he seemed to have the right concept but made many careless mistakes. When Michael sees his low grade on the quiz, he responds, "Who cares? I don't like math anyway!" You remind Michael that his quiz must be signed by a parent, and he tells you that he can't because his mom is a doctor and she has to deliver babies at night. As you review Michael's file from the previous school year, you learn that he enjoys writing and has written several comic books and a short story. You also learn that he is extremely sensitive, and that when he believes he is right, he will not back down. At times, he yells at classmates who disagree with him, and has stormed off crying when he does not get his way. Although his 2nd grade teacher believed Michael was bright, she noted that he could be overactive and seemed not to complete work that he didn't find interesting. Furthermore, she noted that he often went from project to project without completing one. The only time Michael kept still, she commented, was when he was working on his comic books.

Vignette 7: High SES Asian American Student

The example below describes a new student for whom the classroom teacher may want to recommend a special service or program. As you read the example, please think about what kinds of services or programs might best help such a student. You are a third grade teacher at a school in a large U.S. city, and Michael, a nine¬year¬old Asian American student, was recently

added to your class roster. The first few days that Michael was in your class, he seemed quiet, on time, and observant of rules, although you notice that he seems to be interested only in playing and drawing by himself. Today, however, Michael comes to school 90 minutes late, saying he and his mother had spent the weekend at their other house and they had driven all the way in from the beach for school. As the rest of the class begins doing math warm¬ups, Michael is hesitant to participate, telling you "This stuff is easy; I already know how to do it!" However, later in the day as Michael takes a math quiz with the rest of the class, he is only able to complete 3 out of the 10 questions. During the test, you observe that Michael is staring off into space, and you have to refocus him several times. Of the 3 questions he finishes, you notice that he seemed to have the right concept but made many careless mistakes. When Michael sees his low grade on the quiz, he responds, "Who cares? I don't like math anyway!" You remind Michael that his quiz must be signed by a parent, and he tells you that he can't because his mom is a doctor and she has to deliver babies at night. As you review Michael's file from the previous school year, you learn that he enjoys writing and has written several comic books and a short story. You also learn that he is extremely sensitive, and that when he believes he is right, he will not back down. At times, he yells at classmates who disagree with him, and has stormed off crying when he does not get his way. Although his 2nd grade teacher believed Michael was bright, she noted that he could be overactive and seemed not to complete work that he didn't find interesting. Furthermore, she noted that he often went from project to project
without completing one. The only time Michael kept still, she commented, was when he was working on his comic books.

Vignette 8: High SES Latinx Student

The example below describes a new student for whom the classroom teacher may want to recommend a special service or program. As you read the example, please think about what kinds of services or programs might best help such a student. You are a third grade teacher at a school in a large U.S. city, and Michael, a nine¬year¬old Latinx student, was recently added to your class roster. The first few days that Michael was in your class, he seemed quiet, on time, and observant of rules, although you notice that he seems to be interested only in playing and drawing by himself. Today, however, Michael comes to school 90 minutes late, saying he and his mother had spent the weekend at their other house and they had driven all the way in from the beach for school. As the rest of the class begins doing math warm¬ups, Michael is hesitant to participate, telling you "This stuff is easy; I already know how to do it!" However, later in the day as Michael takes a math quiz with the rest of the class, he is only able to complete 3 out of the 10 questions. During the test, you observe that Michael is staring off into space, and you have to refocus him several times. Of the 3 questions he finishes, you notice that he seemed to have the right concept but made many careless mistakes. When Michael sees his low grade on the quiz, he responds, "Who cares? I don't like math anyway!" You remind Michael that his quiz must be signed by a parent, and he tells you that he can't because his mom is a doctor and she has to deliver babies at night. As you review Michael's file from the previous school year, you learn that he enjoys writing and has written several comic books and a short story. You also learn that he is extremely sensitive, and that when he believes he is right, he will not back down. At times, he yells at classmates who disagree with him, and has stormed off crying when he does not get his way. Although his 2nd grade teacher believed Michael was bright, she noted that he

could be overactive and seemed not to complete work that he didn't find interesting. Furthermore, she noted that he often went from project to project without completing one. The only time Michael kept still, she commented, was when he was working on his comic books.

Appendix C

Follow-Up Behavioral Ratings

Now that you have learned a bit about Michael, please provide your impressions about him by answering the following questions. It's okay if Michael isn't the kind of student with whom you usually work -- please provide your best guess if you aren't completely sure about the answer.

Do you agree that Michael exhibits any (or all) of the following behavioral characteristics or syndromes? Please respond to each item with a number that reflects your degree of agreement along the following scale:

1	2	3	4
Disagree strongly	Disagree slightly	Agree slightly	Agree strongly

____ argumentative

____ creative

____ shy

____ acts out physically

____ ingenious

____ poor impulse control

____ easily influenced

____ performing below grade level

____ intelligent

____ possible psychological issues/problems

____ withdrawn

____ needs more academic challenge

____ compliant

____ antisocial

____ stressful home environment

____ poor self-control

____ possible attention deficit disorder

____ physically aggressive

____ possible mental health diagnosis

____ lacks parental involvement

____ passive

____ gifted

____ emotionally distressed

____ bored

____ defiant

Appendix D

Service Recommendations (All That Apply)

Assume that all of the supports, programs, and services listed below are available for Michael. Which do you believe are the MOST appropriate for him? Please check all that apply.

____General education

____Gifted classroom

____ Placement in resource setting (i.e., Special Education Teacher Support Services)

____ Placement in inclusive classroom setting (i.e., Special Education Cooperative Team Teaching)

____ Placement in resource setting that provides a special education teacher and a paraprofessional

____ Supportive school counseling and/or guidance

____ Strategic behavior plan

____ School-based mental health treatment or counseling

____ Off-site mental health clinic referral

____ After-school art program

____ Assessment for possible learning disability

____ Medical assessment

____ Inpatient treatment

____ Unstructured or Montessori-style classroom

____ School counselor's consultation with family

____ After-school program for at-risk students

____ After-school sports participation

____Private tutor

____Family meeting(s) for support of classroom performance

____School social worker support

____After-school academic remediation

____ Accelerated/advanced academic placement

____ Science club

____ Parenting skills workshop for family members

____ School chess team

____Community organizations/services (Boys/Girls Club, etc.)

____ Religious organization or programming

____Other (please specify) _____

Appendix E

Service Recommendations (Single Choice)

Now that you've considered this group of potentially helpful services for Michael, which of them would you recommend as the MOST important if you could choose only one? (The list below is the same list that you saw in the previous item.)

____General education

____Gifted classroom

____ Placement in resource setting (i.e., Special Education Teacher Support Services)

____ Placement in inclusive classroom setting (i.e., Special Education Cooperative Team Teaching)

____ Placement in resource setting that provides a special education teacher and a paraprofessional

____ Supportive school counseling and/or guidance

____ Strategic behavior plan

____ School-based mental health treatment or counseling

____ Off-site mental health clinic referral

____ After-school art program

____ Assessment for possible learning disability

____ Medical assessment

____ Inpatient treatment

____ Unstructured or Montessori-style classroom

____ School counselor's consultation with family

____ After-school program for at-risk students

____ After-school sports participation

____Private tutor

____Family meeting(s) for support of classroom performance

____School social worker support

____After-school academic remediation

____ Accelerated/advanced academic placement

____ Science club

____ Parenting skills workshop for family members

____ School chess team

____Community organizations/services (Boys/Girls Club, etc.)

____ Religious organization or programming

____Other (please specify) _____

Appendix F

Testing the Significance of Choose-All Service Recommendations by Vignette Race

Supportive school counseling guidance. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of supportive school counseling guidance. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = 1.20, p = .754).

Table 1

Supportive school counseling guidance

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Supportive school counseling guidance	No	6	4	5	3	18
	Yes	28	32	29	29	118
Total		34	36	34	32	136

School counselor consultation family. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of school counselor consultation family. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = 4.27, p = .234).

Table 2

School counselor consultation family

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
School counselor consultation family	No	5	10	7	3	25
	Yes	29	26	27	29	111
Total		34	36	34	32	136

After school art program. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of after school art program. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = .388, p = .943).

Table 3

After school art program

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
After school art program	No	10	13	11	11	45
	Yes	24	23	23	21	91
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Strategic behavior plan. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of strategic behavior plan. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = 1.02, p = .800).

Table 4

Strategic behavior plan

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Strategic behavior plan	No	11	14	12	14	51
	Yes	23	22	22	18	85
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Family meeting on student performance. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of family meeting on student performance. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = .416, p = .937).

Table 5

Family meeting on student performance

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Family meeting on student performance	No	13	12	13	13	51
	Yes	21	24	21	19	85
Total		34	36	34	32	136

General Education. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of general education classroom. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = 5.28, p = .152).

Table 6

General Education Class Vignette Race

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
General Education Class	No	19	15	12	19	65
	Yes	15	21	22	13	71
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Community organizations services. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of community organizations services. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = 2.38, p = .498).

Table 7

Community organizations services

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Community organizations services	No	16	22	15	17	70
	Yes	18	14	19	15	66
Total		34	36	34	32	136

School based mental health treatment counseling. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of school based mental health treatment counseling. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = 1.59, p = .662).

Table 8

School based mental health treatment counseling

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
School based mental health treatment counseling	No	18	23	18	16	75
	Yes	16	13	16	16	61
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Assessment possible learning disability. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of assessment possible learning disability. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = 2.46, p = .482).

Table 9

Assessment possible learning disability

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Assessment possible learning disability	No	21	17	21	16	75
	Yes	13	19	13	16	61
Total		34	36	34	32	136

After school program for at risk students. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of after school program for at risk students. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = 3.96, p = .270).

Table 10

After school program for at risk students

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
After school program for at risk students	No	24	24	17	22	87
	Yes	10	12	17	10	49
Total		34	36	34	32	136

After school sports participation. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of after school sports participation. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = .987, p = .804).

Table 11

After school sports participation

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
After school sports participation	No	23	25	20	21	89
	Yes	11	11	14	11	47
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Parenting skills workshop. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of parenting skills workshop. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = 3.70, p = .300).

Table 12

Parenting skills workshop

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Parenting skills workshop	No	21	28	20	23	92
	Yes	13	8	14	9	44
Total		34	36	34	32	136

After school academic remediation. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of after school academic remediation. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = .929, p = .818).

Table 13

After school academic remediation

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
After school academic remediation	No	23	26	25	25	99
	Yes	11	10	9	7	37
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Special education cooperative team teaching. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of special education cooperative team teaching. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = 1.55, p = .670).

Table 14

Special Education Cooperative Team Teaching

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Special Education Cooperative Team Teaching	No	28	26	27	23	104
	Yes	6	10	7	9	32
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Special education teacher support services. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of special education teacher support services. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = 6.62, p = .085).

Table 15

Special Education Teacher Support Services

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Special Education Teacher Support Services	no	24	30	32	25	111
	yes	10	6	2	7	25
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Mental health clinic referral. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of mental health clinic. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = 7.54, p = .057).

Table 16

Mental Health Clinic

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Mental Health Clinic Referral	Yes	4	3	5	10	22
	No	30	33	29	22	114
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Unstructured Montessori style classroom. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of Unstructured Montessori style classroom. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = 3.22, p = .359).

Table 17

Unstructured Montessori style classroom

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Unstructured Montessori style classroom	No	27	29	29	30	115
	Yes	7	7	5	2	21
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Private tutor. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of private tutor. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = 1.87, p = .601).

Table 18

Private tutor

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Private tutor	No	29	29	31	26	115
	Yes	5	7	3	6	21
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Gifted class. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of gifted class. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = 2.87, p = .412).

Table 19

Gifted Class

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Gifted Class	No	28	30	32	26	116
	Yes	6	6	2	6	20
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Placement with special ed teacher paraprofessional. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of placement with special ed teacher paraprofessional. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = .838, p = .840).

Table 20

Placement with special ed teacher paraprofessional

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Placement with special ed teacher paraprofessional	No	30	32	28	27	117
	Yes	4	4	6	5	19
Total		34	36	34	32	136

School chess team. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of school chess team. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = 1.06, p = .788).

Table 21

School chess team

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
School chess team	No	31	30	29	27	117
	Yes	3	6	5	5	19
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Science club. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of science club. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [3, N = 136) = 3.48, p = .324).

Table 22

Science club

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Science club	No	32	29	31	28	120
	Yes	2	7	3	4	16
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Medical assessment. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette race and the recommendation of medical assessment. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = .499, p = .480).

Table 23

Medical assessment

		Vignette Race				
		Black	Asian American	Latinx	White	Total
Medical assessment	No	31	33	30	31	125
	Yes	3	3	4	1	11
Total		34	36	34	32	136

Appendix G

Testing the Significance of Choose-All Service Recommendations by Vignette Race

Supportive school counseling guidance. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of supportive school counseling guidance. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = 1.74, p = .187).

Table 24

Supportive school counseling guidance

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
Supportive school counseling guidance	Yes	59	59	118
	No	6	12	18
Total		65	71	136

After school art program. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of after school art program. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = .827, p = .363).

Table 25

After school art program

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
After school art program	Yes	41	50	91
	No	24	21	45
Total		65	71	136

Strategic behavior plan. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of strategic behavior plan. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = .322, p = .564).

Table 26
Strategic behavior plan

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
Strategic behavior plan	Yes	39	46	85
	No	26	25	51
Total		65	71	136

Family meeting on student performance. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of family meeting on student performance. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = .709, p = .400).

Table 27
Family meeting on student performance

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
Family meeting on student performance	Yes	43	42	85
	No	22	29	51
Total		65	71	136

General Education. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of mental health clinic. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = .001, p = .982).

Table 28
General Education Class

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
General Education	Yes	34	37	71
Class	No	31	34	65
Total		65	71	136

School social worker support. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of school social worker support. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = .764, p = .382).

Table 29

School social worker support

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
School social worker	Yes	36	34	70
support	No	29	37	66
Total		65	71	136

Community organizations services. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of community organizations services. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = .712, p = .400).

Table 30

Community organizations services

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
Community	Yes	34	32	66
organizations services	No	31	39	70
Total		65	71	136

School based mental health treatment counseling. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of

school based mental health treatment counseling. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = 1.76, p = .184).

Table 31

School based mental health treatment counseling

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
School based mental health treatment counseling	Yes	33	28	61
	No	32	43	75
Total		65	71	136

Assessment possible learning disability. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of assessment possible learning disability. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = .003, p = .957).

Table 32

Assessment possible learning disability

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
Assessment possible learning disability	Yes	29	32	61
	No	36	39	75
Total		65	71	136

After school program for at risk students. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of after school program for at risk students. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = .022, p = .881).

Table 33

After school program for at risk students

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
After school program for at risk students	Yes	23	26	49
	No	42	45	87
Total		65	71	136

After school sports participation. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of after school sports participation. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = .308, p = .579).

Table 34

After school sports participation

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
After school sports participation	Yes	24	23	47
	No	41	48	89
Total		65	71	136

Parenting skills workshop. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of parenting skills workshop. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = .127, p = .722).

Table 35

Parenting skills workshop

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
Parenting skills workshop	Yes	22	22	44
	No	43	49	92
Total		65	71	136

After school academic remediation. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of after school academic remediation. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = .070, p = .792).

Table 36
After school academic remediation

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
After school academic remediation	Yes	17	20	37
	No	48	51	99
Total		65	71	136

Special education cooperative team teaching. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of special education cooperative team teaching. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = 1.78, p = .182).

Table 37
Special Education Cooperative Team Teaching

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
Special Education Cooperative Team Teaching	Yes	12	20	32
	No	53	51	104
Total		65	71	136

Mental health clinic referral. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of mental health clinic. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = .499, p = .480).

Table 38

Mental Health Clinic

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
Mental Health Clinic	Yes	9	13	22
Referral	No	56	58	114
Total		65	71	136

Unstructured Montessori style classroom. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of Unstructured Montessori style classroom. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = .0001, p = .986).

Table 39

Unstructured Montessori style classroom

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
Unstructured Montessori style classroom	Yes	10	11	21
	No	55	60	115
Total		65	71	136

Private tutor. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of private tutor. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = .870, p = .351).

Table 40

Private tutor

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
Private tutor	Yes	12	9	21
	No	53	62	115
Total		65	71	136

Gifted class. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of gifted class. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = .073, p = .786).

Table 41

Gifted Class

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
Gifted Class	Yes	9	11	20
	No	56	60	116
Total		65	71	136

Placement with special ed teacher paraprofessional. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of placement with special ed teacher paraprofessional. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = .286, p = .592).

Table 42

Placement with special ed teacher paraprofessional

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
Placement with special ed teacher paraprofessional	Yes	8	11	19
	No	57	60	117
Total		65	71	136

School chess team. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of school chess team. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = 1.062, p = .303).

Table 43

School chess team

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
School chess team	Yes	7	12	19
	No	58	59	117
Total		65	71	136

Science club. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of science club. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = 1.99, p = .158).

Table 44

Science club

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
Science club	Yes	5	11	16
	No	60	60	120
Total		65	71	136

Medical assessment. A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relationship between vignette SES and the recommendation of medical assessment. The relationship between these variables was not significant (X^2 [1, N = 136) = .026, p = .871).

Table 45

Medical assessment

		Vignette SES		
		Low SES	High SES	Total
Medical assessment	Yes	5	6	11
	No	60	65	125
Total		65	71	136