Theses and Dissertations

December 2017

Assessing the Relationships Between Multicultural Training, Cultural Identity, and Multicultural Counseling Competence Among Master's Level Counseling Students

Rachel Reinders
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

ASSESSING THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MULTICULTURAL TRAINING,

CULTURAL IDENTITY, AND MULTICULTURAL COUNSELING COMPETENCE

AMONG MASTER'S LEVEL COUNSELING STUDENTS

by

Rachel Reinders

A Dissertation Submitted in

Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in Educational Psychology

at

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

December 2017

ABSTRACT

ASSESSING THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MULTICULTURAL TRAINING,
CULTURAL IDENTITY, AND MULTICULTURAL COUNSELING COMPETENCE
AMONG MASTER'S LEVEL COUNSELING STUDENTS

by

Rachel Reinders

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2017
Under the Supervision of Professor Shannon Chavez-Korell, Ph.D.

The discrepancy between the demographics of the American population and mental
health providers means that providers will increasingly be called upon to work with clients who
are different from the provider. This study evaluated the relationship between multicultural
competence (MCC), ethnic identity, and worldview variables for Master's level counseling
students enrolled in an introductory multicultural counseling course. It also included an analysis
of course factors. A total of 201 students completed the survey at both the beginning and end of
the semester. Students reported higher levels of ethnic identity development at the end of the
semester as compared to the beginning of the semester. Students also reported higher levels of
MCC at the end of the semester on measures that assessed the attitudes underlying MCC, with no
difference reported in reported scores on the California Brief Multicultural Competence Scale.
Scores on the ColorBlind Racial Attitudes Scale were related to almost all measures of
multicultural competence. There were also significant differences noted between students who
identified as White or students of color. Results indicate that some self-report measures may
assess different aspects of competence or confudence. Colorblind racial attitudes may be
particularly important to address in introductory courses. Future research should further evaluate
the relationship between self-report measures of MCC and the attitudes underlying MCC, as well
as continuing to evaluate the relationship between ethnic identity development and MCC.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Chapter 1

Introduction

As the population of the United States continues to diversify, the counseling profession

has not kept pace with this change. While 62.2% of the U.S. population self-identified as

White/Non-Hispanic in 2014 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015), 83% of the members of the American

Counseling Association (ACA) who reported race self-identify as Caucasian (ACA membership

report, 2015). This discrepancy between the population and mental health providers means that

providers will increasingly be called upon to work with clients who are racially different from

the provider. Additionally, the percentage of the U.S. population that identifies as White is

expected to decline to less than 50% by the year 2044, at which point people of color are

expected to compose the majority of the population (U. S. Census Bureau, 2015). When other

aspects of identity are taken into account (e.g., gender, age, socio-economic status, etc.)

counselors will be working with someone who is culturally different from themselves frequently.

Unfortunately, members of ethnic minority groups are also likely to underutilize services that are

available (Pole, Gone, & Kulkarni, 2008). Health disparities between ethnic minority groups and

their White counterparts are due to inadequate service rather than structural barriers such as

accessibility (Smedley, Smith, & Nelson, 2003). Based on these statistics, it is important for

practitioners to be multiculturally competent in order to effectively provide services to an

underserved and important part of the U.S. population.

Multicultural Competence is the ability to work productively with others who are

culturally different from ourselves (Cross, Bazron, Dennis, & Isaacs, 1989), and involves several

different aspects, including being self-aware and knowledgeable about the role that culture plays

in our daily lives. Both the ACA and the American Psychological Association (APA) recognize

the importance of mental health professionals having and continually pursuing Multicultural

Competence, as both have endorsed Multicultural Competencies. The Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD) Multicultural Competencies (Arredondo, Toporek, Brown, Jones, Locke, Sanchez, & Stadler, 1996), which were endorsed by ACA in 2003, outline 30 competencies within three categories that demonstrate the requirements for multiculturally competent work with clients. More recently, AMCD and ACA endorsed the Multicultural and Social Justice Competencies (Ratts, Singh, Nassar-McMillan, Butler, & McCullough, 2015). These competencies recognize the multiple identities that each counselor and client possesses, and provide a framework for working within these complex relationships. The APA endorsed the Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training, Research, Practice, and Organizational Change for Psychologists (APA, 2003) which outline similar requirements for doctoral level psychologists. Both of these documents call for professionals to recognize personal power and privilege, as well as the ways the social, political, and historical contexts of power and privilege come into play in personal and professional lives. In order to implement these competencies in the context of training future counselors, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling & Related Education Programs (CACREP), the Masters in Psychology and Counseling Accreditation Council (MPCAC), and APA also outlined standards for Master's level counseling programs to include multicultural counseling course topics in their training programs and emphasize the importance of recognizing culture in providing quality mental health care (APA, 2003; CACREP, 2009; MPCAC, 2014). These standards for education and training as well as professional work emphasize the importance of all practitioners possessing Multicultural Competence and engaging in continuing education to maintain and improve competence in this domain, as well as providing a minimum standard for professionals in these competencies.

A semester-long required multicultural counseling course in a Master's training program is an important opportunity for counselors-in-training to begin to work towards Multicultural Competence while still engaged in school and is vital as a way to ensure all counselors leave their training programs with a basic understanding of multicultural issues. Because Multicultural Counseling classes are sometimes the only opportunity students will have to learn about multicultural competence in their formal training, the course is integral in promoting Multicultural Competence and encouraging a baseline level of competence for those students who choose not to pursue further training.

Research has examined multicultural counseling course factors (e.g., Priester, Jones, Jackson-Bailey, Jana-Masri, Jordan, & Metz), such as the inclusion of a service learning experience (Lee, Rosen, & McWhirter, 2014) or a portfolio assignment (Coleman, Morris, & Norton, 2006). There has also been an examination of how these course factors connect to student outcomes and competencies upon leaving the course (e.g., Castillo, Brossart, Reyes, Conoley, & Phoummarath, 2007; Sammons & Speight, 2008). However, there has been a relative lack of longitudinal research done to examine changes in competencies across the duration of the course (pre- and post-training). In addition, there has been limited examination of how multicultural training influences student development. For example, Sammons and Speight (2008) conducted a qualitative study after a course ended asking students what they felt led to any perceived changes in competence. Although this type of research is an important starting point for understanding how multicultural competence may change over the course of the semester and how the training influences the student, there are several problems with a retrospective approach. One is that it is based purely upon self-report. There is no demonstration that any change in competency occurred, nor that specific aspects of the course were related to

these changes. This lack of longitudinal research also means that it is not well understood in the literature how individual student factors, such as cultural identity, are related to multicultural competency over the course of the semester. A study examining how course factors and individual student factors interact to influence multicultural competence during a semester-long course will provide a better understanding of how these factors are related to Multicultural Competence as well as how they change over the course of a semester. This chapter will provide a rationale for completing such a study and a brief background about the topic of multicultural competence in the field of counseling.

Importance of Multicultural Competence

General counseling competence is important in providing the best services to clients. However, measuring general counseling competence may not present the whole story of how to be an effective counselor. There are many different aspects to being a competent counselor, and, based on the demographic statistics presented previously and the changing nature of the US population, multicultural competence can be one of the most important aspects of counseling competence that is superordinate to general counseling competence (Sue & Sue, 2013). In general, multicultural competence has a positive relationship with general counseling competence when measured by client report (Constantine, 2002a), which means counselors who were rated as more generally competent by clients were also likely to be rated highly on multicultural competence. This study also found a significant relationship between client satisfaction with their counselor and client ratings of that counselor's level of multicultural competence, which was significant even after accounting for client ratings of general competence. While there is still more research to be done in this area to fully understand the relationship between client satisfaction and client perceptions of general and multicultural

4

competence, this study demonstrated that multicultural competence is important above and beyond a counselor's general competence. This study also demonstrated the link between client satisfaction and multicultural competence, as those clients who rated their counselors more highly on multicultural competence were also more likely to be satisfied with their counseling experience (Constantine, 2002a).

Overall, counselors who are multiculturally competent have better outcomes with their clients (e.g. Constantine, 2002a), particularly true for clients of color (e.g. Fuertes & Brobst, 2002). Constantine (2002a) found multicultural competence predicted client satisfaction above and beyond general competence for clients of color. Fuertes and Brobst (2002) demonstrated that multicultural competence contributed more to client ratings of satisfaction with counseling for students of color than for students who identify as White, indicating that multicultural competence may be more important when working with communities that have traditionally been marginalized than with those who have had privilege. Again, more research is needed in this area to fully understand the relationship between client cultural factors and the importance of having a multiculturally competent counselor, but these studies demonstrate that being multiculturally competent is an important aspect of overall counselor competence and providing satisfactory services to clients.

Teaching Multicultural Competence

The importance of including a course devoted to multicultural counseling began to emerge in the 1950s and 1960s when various racial and ethnic minority groups fought in the civil rights movement (Abreu, Chung, & Atkinson, 2000). As this social and legal shift took place, counselors recognized the importance of tailoring services to groups other than White European Americans (Jackson, 1995). This led to the creation of professional organizations and eventually

the publication of the Multicultural Counseling Competencies (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). As the recognition of the importance of multicultural competence grew, it became increasingly ingrained in both doctoral (i.e., APA) and Master's (e.g. CACREP, MPCAC) accredited programs. By 1997, almost all doctoral programs in counseling psychology and counselor education required a multicultural counseling course (Ponterotto, 1997).

The inclusion of a course in graduate training programs is an important step forward because it is one of very few ways to target all members of the profession. While there are numerous other opportunities for training outside of a formal course in a graduate program, these programs are only some of the many different options for continued overall training. Therefore, likely only those professionals that are interested in the topic or have a reason to notice a skill deficit engage in continued education on this topic. Unfortunately, this typically means that those least aware of the impact that multicultural competence has on counseling are also the least likely to sign up for such training as they are unaware of its importance. Rogers-Sirin (2008) outlined several other problems with seeking multicultural training as a professional, including the lack of research on these training courses and lack of awareness of which programs are most effective. Having a required course as part of training ensures all professionals enter the profession with at least a basic understanding of the importance of multicultural competence and how to pursue further training as a professional in the future.

Importance of Training

Given the importance of multicultural counseling courses in training programs, much research has been done to address how to make these courses as effective as possible (e.g. Priester, Jones, Jackson-Bailey, Jana-Masri, Jordan, & Metz, 2008; Malott, 2010). There have been several limitations with this line of research, including disagreement about how to measure

multicultural competence (e.g. Spanierman, Poteat, Wang, & Oh, 2008), but one of the most important limitations is the relative lack of longitudinal research. Much research has demonstrated a relationship between the amount of training and multicultural competence (e.g. Chao, Wei, Good, & Flores, 2010; Smith, Constantine, Dunn, Dinehart, & Montoya, 2006), but has not looked at the effect of multicultural training on competence across time. Without assessing students at both the beginning and end of a course, it is difficult to know how one course influences counselor development and improves multicultural competence.

Another hole in the research has been the impact of student variables on multicultural training. While studies show a link between student variables, such as racial and ethnic identity development and multicultural competence (Chao, Wei, Good, & Flores, 2010; Hunley, Lidderdale, Thiagarajan, & Null, 2004), there is a lack of research on how students in various stages of identity development receive and are impacted by a multicultural training course. It would be expected that through a course focusing on multicultural competence, and multicultural awareness in particular, students would further develop in their understanding of their own identities as well as increase their multicultural competence. Understanding how multicultural counseling training, cultural identity development, and multicultural competence are related is important for understanding what role student factors play in multicultural competence.

Proposed Study

The proposed study will address the gap in the literature of the relative lack of research across the course of the semester and provide an understanding of how students' cultural identity, multicultural competence, and multicultural training are interrelated. First, this study will examine whether cultural identity factors and multicultural competence change from the beginning to the end of a semester-long Multicultural Counseling course. If a change is evident,

this relationship will be further examined in order to better understand the process of change throughout the duration of the course. An example of these further analyses would include an evaluation of the relationship that various course factors (e.g., the inclusion of a service learning or immersion experience or reflective journaling) have with any potential changes in order to determine how they may impact multicultural competence. Second, it will examine how students' cultural identity and course factors interact to potentially influence a student's multicultural competence, because improving multicultural competence is the ultimate goal of multicultural counseling courses. Results of this study could provide a better understanding of how an individual student's cultural identity development may impact multicultural competence as well as how these factors change over the course of the semester.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

This chapter is organized into four topic areas: (a) the history of Multicultural Counseling and Competencies, (b) a literature review of research that has been done in Master's counseling programs examining how to improve Multicultural Competence through the Multicultural Counseling course, (c) a literature review of research examining how student factors, such as identity development, influence Multicultural Counseling Competence, and (d) the details of the proposed study. The first section will include a historical background of the importance of Multicultural Counseling, the development of the competencies, and how these competencies have been implemented by major organizations such as ACA, CACREP, and MPCAC. The second section will review literature regarding how to best assess Multicultural Competence, as well as how these assessments have been utilized in Multicultural Counseling courses. The third section will present a brief review of identity development models, including Cross' nigresence theory (1971) and Helms' White Racial Identity Development model (1996). The research regarding the relationship between identity development and multicultural competence will also be reviewed. The fourth section will present the details of the proposed study, including specific aims and hypotheses.

History of the Multicultural Counseling Competencies

During the Civil Rights movement of the 1950s and 60s, the importance of recognizing the different needs of racial groups other than White European Americans began to gain traction in the Counseling and Psychology fields. To promote this recognition and advocate for members of different racial and cultural groups, several professional organizations were formed including the Association for Black Psychologists in 1968 (Association of Black Psychologists, 2015) and

the Association for Non-White Concerns, which would eventually become the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development, in 1972 (Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development, 2015). These organizations served to bring to the forefront both the importance of recognizing the different needs of their communities as well as to highlight the ways that a counseling field focused only on the experiences of those from privileged groups can be damaging to all clients. To promote change in the field, researchers began to focus on how best to adapt both treatment and research to better represent marginalized groups in society.

Competenices. Although there are several different ways to conceptualize what Multicultural Competence means, one of the most influential has been that of D. W. Sue and colleagues (Sue et al., 1982; Sue & Sue, 2013). This model focuses on three domains of competence for counselors to strive towards multicultural competence: awareness, knowledge, and skills. Awareness includes awareness of one's self in regard to personal cultural history, social identities, and potential biases that may be influencing one's work. Knowledge encompasses specific information and facts about cultural groups different from one's own. Skills are specific skills that are necessary for working with culturally diverse populations. This model is based on a 'culturally different' framework (Sue & Sue, 2013) which emphasizes that, although there are differences between cultural groups, they are neither better nor worse than other groups. It is important to note that all models of multicultural competence emphasize that multicultural competence is an aspirational competence in that it is an area in which counselors must constantly work towards without ever arriving at a place where they can be deemed '100% multiculturally competent' and not have to progress further (Sue & Sue, 2013).

In keeping with the model of Sue and Sue (Sue, Bernier, Durran, Feinberg, Pedersen, Smith, & Vasquez-Nuttal, 1982; Sue & Sue, 2008), the Multicultural Counseling Competencies

(Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992) outlined three areas of importance to be a culturally competent counselor: awareness, knowledge, and skills. These competencies were initially developed by the Association for Multicultural Development (AMCD), a division of ACA, and were endorsed by ACA in 2003 after being endorsed by several divisions earlier (Arredondo et al., 1996). They served as the minimum benchmarks of competence for counselors to be multiculturally competent, and their endorsement by the ACA ensures that all members are held to these standards.

More recently, AMCD and ACA endorsed the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (Ratts et al., 2016). These competencies build on the importance of awareness, knowledge, and skills by including a framework that recognizes the complexity of identities on the part of both the counselor and the client. They also add to the base of competencies by including action along with awareness, knowledge, and skills.

Course Requirements. To address these competencies, the inclusion of coursework dedicated to multicultural counseling became a mandatory requirement by the American Psychological Association (APA), the Master's in Psychology and Counseling Accreditation Council (MPCAC), and Council for Accreditation for Counseling and Related Educational Program (CACREP) for accredited programs (APA, 1994; CACREP, 1994; MPCAC, 2014). Each of these groups also endorsed guidelines specifying expectations for multicultural education and training (APA, 2003; CACREP, 2009; MPCAC, 2014).

Both MPCAC and CACREP provide accreditation for Master's level counseling programs, and their requirements for coursework will be outlined here. MPCAC specifies that courses must include coursework that promotes competency in "the study of culture from ecological, contextual, multicultural, and social justice perspectives; evidence-based strategies

11

for working with diverse groups…and culturally competent counseling and social justice advocacy interventions" (MPCAC, 2014, pg. 24). They also outline how social justice and cultural competence must be included in other areas of coursework such as group theory, career development, and consultation. CACREP specifies that programs must include coursework that "provide an understanding of the cultural context of relationships, issues, and trends in a multicultural society" (CACREP, 2009, pg. 9). They also outline how this understanding should be applied to various areas of counseling work, including group work and advocacy. Another important inclusion in the coursework requirement is the emphasis on the role of the counselor in "eliminating biases, prejudices, and processes of intentional and unintentional oppression and discrimination" (CACREP, 2009, pg. 10). The accreditation standards of both accrediting bodies emphasize the importance of personal awareness and knowledge of other groups and incorporate the standards set forth by the Multicultural Competencies. However, both sets of standards lack an emphasis on the skills portion of the Multicultural Competencies. This may be due to the difficulty of operationalizing what skills are necessary for culturally competent counseling, as some have noted as a weakness of the Multicultural Competencies (e.g. Collins & Arthur, 2010).

Multicultural Counseling Training

Since the implementation of multicultural counseling courses within all accredited counseling programs, many studies (e.g. Coleman, Morris, & Norton, 2006; Lee, Rosen, & McWhirter, 2014) have evaluated effective strategies for increasing students' Multicultural Competence in terms of awareness, knowledge, and skills. Research has also evaluated whether Multicultural Counseling courses are effective in increasing competence (e.g. Castillo, Brossart, Reyes, Conoley, & Phoummarath, 2007; Chao, Wei, Good, & Flores, 2010; Neville, Heppner, Louis, Thompson, Brooks, & Baker, 1996). Several meta-analyses and literature reviews have

evaluated what the overall effect of multicultural training is and what the most effective strategies are for teaching the course.

Smith, Constantine, Dunn, Dinehart, and Montoya (2006) looked at 45 studies conducted on multicultural education between 1973 and 2002 and found overall multicultural counseling training (MCT) is effective in improving competence. Specifically, they found a moderate effect size in retrospective studies in which researchers evaluated prior training courses, and a large effect size in prospective studies in which training courses were evaluated directly at the end of the course. These results indicate that although the results of multicultural training courses are initially large, they may fade with time, although they remained significant. Interestingly, they also found courses that based their course material on a theoretical foundation had higher effect sizes than courses that did not.

Mallott (2010) conducted a literature review of research done between 1980 and 2008 to evaluate research specifically on semester-long multicultural counseling courses, such as those required in Master's level programs. Based on the nine identified studies, she had a similar recommendation to Smith et al. (2006) that courses should be rooted in a theoretical basis. She also noted that exposure to other cultures and examination of personal biases are important aspects of effective multicultural counseling courses, which mirror the recommendations of Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis (1994). She found that overall, positive changes were noted in self-report multicultural competence measures over the course of the semester. Most of the longitudinal studies used self-report measures to assess multicultural competence, which could be prone to issues of social desirability. Each of the studies reviewed also only looked at one course and was thus unable to compare changes across different teaching methods or course aspects (e.g. Brown, Yonker, & Parham, 1996; Castillo, Brossart, Reyes, Conoley, &

Phoummarath, 2007). Mallott (2010) also pointed out that many of these studies had very small sample sizes and did not consider program atmosphere, which may fail to account for all the multicultural training students receive. When taken together, both articles highlight the finding that overall, multicultural counseling courses are effective in promoting Multicultural Competence for students.

Assessing Multicultural Competence. One of the challenges of researching the effectiveness of multicultural training is the struggle to operationally define and measure multicultural competency. Without a consistent and reliable way to assess competency, it is very difficult to prove improvements. Several different methods, including surveys, observer ratings, and supervisor ratings, have been used to assess competency in working with clients with a different cultural background than the counselor. Each of these methods has benefits and challenges, which will be discussed below. Of these methods, self-report measures are used most commonly due to their accessibility, ease of use, and generally good psychometric properties.

Self-Report Scales. There have been several different types of self-report surveys created to assess perceived and actual multicultural competence. These include the Multicultural Awareness/Knowledge/Skills Survey (MAKSS; D'Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991), the Multicultural Counseling Inventory (MCI; Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin, & Wise, 1994), and the California Brief Multicultural Competence Scale (CBMCS; Gamst, Data, Der-Karabetian, Aregon, Arellano, Morrow, & Martenson, 2004), among others. While these scales have generally been shown to have good validity (Constantine & Ladany, 2000; Gamst etal, 2004), there has been concern that self-report measures do not accurately measure actual behaviors and are overly prone to the influence of social desirability (Pope-Davis & Dings, 1995; Sue, 1996). Sodowsky, Kuo-Jackson, Richardson, and Corey (1998) found social desirability was a

significant predictor of self-reported multicultural competencies. Constantine and Ladany (2000) found social desirability had a significant relationship with three of the four self-report scales that they examined, indicating that social desirability may have a larger impact on these scores than previously believed. However, Gamst et al. (2004) found that the CBMCS did not have a significant relationship with social desirability scales, indicating that this scale may be less susceptible to the effects of social desirability than others.

More recently, models of multicultural competence training have been expanded beyond counselor education. Mallingckrodt, Miles, Bhaskar, Chery, Choi, and Sung (2014) developed the Everyday Multicultural Competencies/Revised SEE (EMC/RSEE) to assess the multicultural competence of undergraduate students going through diversity training on campus. Unlike other self-report measures that ask participants to rate themselves specifically on skills, the EMC/RSEE assesses attitudes about specific groups and situations as well as level of comfort with different groups. This helps to combat the problem of inaccurate self-assessment of skills, as it does not specifically address counseling skills. It also expands the definition of multicultural competency beyond the counseling relationship. This scale seems to address the awareness portion of the competencies well, but does not address skills in working with clients. However, because awareness is such an integral part of overall competence, this scale can provide an important contribution to the multicultural competence literature.

Observer Ratings. Another way of assessing competence outside of self-report surveys has been observer ratings. These ratings were developed to assess actual behavior rather than rely on self-report data of hypothetical behavior, as well as to avoid the influence of social desirability. Constantine (2001) examined the relationship between self-report competency measures and observer ratings of sessions with clients of color. Using the Cross-Cultural

Counseling Inventory-Revised (CCCI-R; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Hernandez, 1991),

observers rated counseling sessions conducted by Black, Latino, and White counseling trainees.

Overall, they found Black and Latino counseling trainees were rated more highly by observers in

terms of multicultural competence than White trainees. They also found there was no

relationship between observer ratings of competence and self-report scores on the Multicultural

Counseling Inventory (MCI) overall. This, along with the findings of other studies such as

Constantine and Ladany (2000), suggests that observer ratings and self-report measures may be

tapping two different constructs when assessing multicultural competence.

Case Conceptualization. A third way of assessing multicultural competence is evaluating

a counselor's ability to conceptualize a case in a multiculturally competent way. Ladany, Inman,

Constantine, and Hofheinz (1997) found no relationship between self-report measures and case

conceptualization ability. This indicates that case conceptualization methods may also be

tapping into a separate construct from self-report measures and observer ratings.

Influence of Course Factors on Multicultural Competence. Another important area of

research is the investigation of which specific aspects of a course are most effective in positively

influencing multicultural competence. Reynolds (1997) outlined a two-order change process that

occurs in multicultural counseling training. The first-order change is due to didactic

interventions, such as course books and presenting information to enhance knowledge, skills, and

awareness. Many of the academic aspects of a course are geared toward addressing this order of

change. The second-order change occurs on a more personal level and involves a shift in

perspective. This occurs when students are given a chance to reflect on the material and

challenge their underlying assumptions about the world at large. While the knowledge presented

in the course can be a catalyst for second-order change, it is not sufficient for challenging

awareness. Many multicultural counseling courses incorporate aspects of both first and second-order change, such as providing information about different cultural groups or societal injustices while at the same time encouraging self-reflection. This combination of factors would be the most productive way to influence Multicultural Competence under this model; however, ways to implement this strategy in the classroom are not always clear. A review of course topics and assignments and their connection to Multicultural Competence is necessary to understand how these course factors are related to overall Multicultural Competence.

Priester, Jones, Jackson-Bailey, Jana-Masri, Jordan, and Metz (2008) conducted a review of syllabi used in multicultural counseling courses to evaluate what strategies are most commonly used in addition to what topics are most commonly covered. Although this review did not include any assessment of how effective these aspects are in the courses, it is important to understand what is being taught and how to conduct the most effective evaluations of teaching methods. They found multicultural counseling courses typically include an emphasis on all three of the multicultural competency areas (awareness, knowledge, and skills), although with less focus on the skills aspect. The authors posit that this could be due to a lack of specific skills needed for multicultural competency rather than a general philosophic shift (Helms, 1997). Another explanation may be the introductory nature of the courses they examined. While skills may play a very important role, skills can only be gained after building an awareness of why they are important. Introductory courses may lay the groundwork for future skill attainment.

Sammons and Speight (2008) conducted a qualitative investigation asking students what they felt led to positive changes throughout the course of their semester-long multicultural counseling training course, and tried to address second-order change by asking about personal change. Students reported that they felt the changes could be attributed to interactive activities,

didactic activities, and the course as a whole. While information like this is needed to better understand how students receive and interpret course activities and information, it also leaves questions about actual changes because it is only looking at a student's self-report, which may not accurately reflect what changes occurred or why they did.

Research looking at specific aspects of courses (e.g. experiential learning or reflective journaling) has also assessed how they impact multicultural competence. Leaving the classroom setting to gain exposure to other cultures and potentially applying information learned in the classroom can be very important for students (Tomlinson-Clarke & Clarke, 2010). Lee, Rosen, and McWhirter (2014) looked specifically at the impact of service learning experiences on multicultural competence. Service learning is a unique aspect of training because it involves working outside of the classroom directly with communities. This study was not specifically connected to a course, but examined how students interpreted and reacted to the experience. The results about the impact of a service learning experience were mixed, and level of distress caused by the experience was shown to be an important factor in the relationship with multicultural competence. Students who demonstrated an increase in multicultural competence reported less distress than those who demonstrated a decrease in multicultural competence, indicating a negative relationship between competence and distress. Even students who did not demonstrate a change in multicultural competence in the quantitative self-report measures expressed experiencing a change in the qualitative portion of the study. This indicates that the complex impact of service learning or experiential aspects of multicultural training needs to be better understood.

Student Factors in Multicultural Competence and Training

      Studies (e.g. Constantine, Warren, & Miville, 2005; Ladany, Inman, Constantine, & Hofheinz, 1997; Todd, Spanierman, & Poteat, 2011) have demonstrated that multicultural counseling training is nuanced in terms of its effectiveness with different groups of students. Chao, Wei, Good, and Flores (2010) found the impact of multicultural training on students' awareness varies based on students' racial or ethnic identity. Specifically, they found students who identified as members of a racial or ethnic minority group with low levels of multicultural training had a higher level of multicultural awareness than their White colleagues. However, with high levels of training this difference was not present. They found that multicultural training had an impact on the multicultural awareness for White students, but no effect was found for students of color. This may be due to the tendency of White students to fail to notice injustices resulting from White privilege until confronted with this information in training. Students who are members of racial and ethnic minority groups may be confronted with these inequities on a regular basis, leading to a higher level of awareness at the beginning of a multicultural counseling class (Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994). In addition, Chao et al. (2010) found a significant relationship between color-blind racial attitudes and multicultural knowledge. For those with lower color-blindness, there was a higher effect of training on multicultural knowledge than for those with higher color-blindness. Those students who recognized the inequities rather than endorsing a color-blind attitude gained more in multicultural knowledge during their training than those who endorsed higher levels of color-blind racial attitudes. This also speaks to the importance of awareness in all aspects of multicultural competence as those who were more aware received more benefit from the training.

Toporek and Pope-Davis (2005) investigated the relationship between multicultural training and to what students attributed the cause of poverty. Attributions of poverty was used as an assessment of multicultural competence because of the importance of recognizing larger structural influences rather than individual choices in understanding power, privilege, and discrimination. If counselors fail to recognize the structural forces at play in their clients' lives, they may place too much blame or responsibility on their clients and be less effective overall (Morrow & Deidan, 1992). Overall, Toporek and Pope-Davis (2005) found that cognitive racial attitudes and level of multicultural training each accounted for a significant amount of the variance in structural explanations for poverty. They also found that those who had more sensitive cognitive racial attitudes were more likely to endorse structural explanations for poverty. However, these findings accounted for a small amount of the variance and may be as significant practically as they are theoretically. One explanation for the small effect size may be the retroactive nature of the study. Instead of investigating changes that take place during training, they asked about the total amount of training that had taken place in the past. Evaluating a change in attitudes across time may make changes that take place due to training more evident.

Identity Development Research. Overall, these studies highlight the importance of taking student factors into account in promoting multicultural competence through coursework. One aspect that emerged as important based on these studies is the student's understanding of power and privilege dynamics in society, as measured in several studies by use of color-blind attitudes measures. However, another important way to assess understanding of one's self and what it means in terms of the larger society is identity development.

While each individual has many different aspects of their identity, such as race, ethnicity, gender, or socio-economic status, much of the research on identity development has focused on

20

racial identity development. Although racial identity is often one of the most visible and salient for individuals, it is important to recognize the implications of all aspects of identity. Arredondo et al. (1996) describe the Dimensions of Personal Identity Model as a way of describing and recognizing multiple aspects of identity as well as how these identities differ in their relationships with others. Each individual has aspects of identity that they share with others and aspects that are unique to themselves. Recognizing how these aspects interact is an important part of multicultural competence; however, it can make creating models and conducting research more complicated. Thus, most research has been done with only one aspect of identity. This review of literature will focus on ethnic identity, as that will be the focus of this investigation.

Ethnic Identity Development. Ethnicity, and an individual's understanding of what their ethnicity means for them, is a separate concept from race (Cokley, 2007). Cokley described ethnicity as "a group of people…having a common ancestry, shared history, shared traditions, and shared cultural traits" (2007, pg. 225). Smedley (1999) stated that ethnicity is not based on physical characteristics and tends to be based more on choice when compared to race. Therefore, ethnic identity is a subjective feeling of belonging to a particular ethnic group. Models explaining how ethnic identity develops have been distinct from racial identity models, as racial identity models have focused on responses to a racist society while ethnic identity models focus on an individual's understanding of their culture (Phinney & Ong, 2007). As much of the research on ethnic identity has been with Latino or Asian participants, in contrast to racial identity research conducted mostly with White or African American participants (Cokley, 2007), the relationship between ethnic identity and acculturation has been heavily researched (Yoon, Langrehr, & Ong, 2011).

Erikson (1968) described a process through which individuals explore particular

identities, eventually achieving a state of personal identification with an identity, and this theory

has been used to explain the process of how individuals develop a sense of ethnic identity.

Marcia (1980) took this a step further and developed a theory that classified individuals into four

statuses based on their level of crisis (e.g., exploring) and commitment (e.g., reaching a personal

conclusion) to a particular identity. These four statuses were diffusion (no crisis or commitment),

foreclosure (commitment without crisis), moratorium (crisis without commitment), and

achievement (commitment after crisis).

The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM-R; Phinney & Ong, 2007) has been the

most widely used ethnic identity measure (Yoon, 2011) and was developed based on the identity

development models of Tajfel (1981), Erikson (1968), and Marcia (1980). The MEIM-R has two

subscales of exploration and commitment, and participants can be categorized into four

categories based on high or low scores on these subscales. However, there has been criticism that

this two-factor model neglects to include the importance of the distinction between affirmation

and resolution rather than simply commitment (Umaña-Taylor, Yazedjian, & Bamaca-Gomez,

2004).

To address the need for this third dimension, Umaña-Taylor, Yazedjian, & Bamaca-

Gomez (2004) developed the Ethnic Identity Scale (EIS). This distinction allows for a better

understanding of an individual's positive or negative evaluation of their identity. Phinney & Ong

(2007) state such distinctions may have more theoretical application than practical, as some of

the categories that emerge from these dimensions are extremely unlikely. For example, it is

unlikely that an individual would feel negatively toward their identity while at the same time

having a high level of commitment to it. However, the added dimension allows for a more

nuanced understanding of the complex process of ethnic identity development. The EIS has been shown to be consistent with its theoretical basis, in addition to having strong psychometric properties (Yoon, 2011).

   Impact of Identity on Multicultural Training. Investigating the link between an individual's identity development and multicultural training is important in recognizing how students who are in varying stages of identity development receive and interpret different aspects of a course. By understanding these dynamics, instructors can be more knowledgeable about how to target course objectives to the individual students they are working with and help their students make the most gain in multicultural competence throughout the course.

   Research on the link between identity development status and multicultural competence has been somewhat mixed. Neville, Heppner, Louie, Thompson, Brooks, and Baker (1996) found that completion of a multicultural counseling course was associated with movement to more advanced identity development stages. These changes were also stable for one year after the course ended. Ladany, Inman, Constantine, and Hofheinz (1997) found that identity status significantly predicted students' self-reported multicultural competence, but did not significantly predict case conceptualization ability. While this may be indicative of the complicated relationship between self-report measures and case conceptualization assessments, it may also indicate that the relationship between identity status and multicultural competence is not clear-cut.

   Past research has focused on general identity development in relation to multicultural competence, as opposed to a particular identity. Munley, Lidderdale, Thiagarajan, and Null (2004) found that identity development stage, measured by the Self-Identity Inventory (SII; Sevig, Highlen, & Adams, 2000), had a similar relationship with multicultural competence as

racial identity status. More advanced identity development stages in their study were associated with higher levels of self-reported multicultural competence, with less advanced stages being associated with lower levels of self-reported multicultural competence.

Todd, Spanierman, and Poteat (2011) investigated how undergraduate college students' affective reactions to racism, measured by the Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites scale (PRCW; Spanierman & Heppner, 2004), changed across their college experience. They found that students who entered college with higher color-blind racial attitudes had different patterns in the development of their affective responses throughout college. They also found that the type of exposure students had to multicultural and diversity experiences changed their affective responses. Students who engaged in specific diversity courses or endorsed having more cross-racial friendships than they had had previously had lower levels of White fear. Overall, exposure to training and cross-racial relationships was positively related to changes in affective response. While this research was done with undergraduate students and does not look specifically at becoming competent in providing services, it is important to consider because it indicates that positive changes took place due to training and exposure, both of which are important aspects in a Master's level multicultural counseling course.

The Current Study

Based on the research and literature presented previously, there are several gaps in the literature that the proposed study will address. First, there has been little research evaluating changes across the course of enrollment in Multicultural Counseling courses in relation to the amount of retrospective research done on the impact of such a course after the fact. Investigating how and what changes take place over the course of the semester is an important aspect of understanding the relationship between competence and training. A second gap in the literature is

the incorporation of identity development in changes in competence over the course of the semester. In addition to understanding how competence changes with training, it is important to better understand how a student's understanding of their racial identity will mediate that relationship. Other student factors such as color-blind racial attitudes may also play a role in mediating the relationship between competence and training, and evaluating these factors at both the beginning and end of the semester is the best way to assess these complex relationships.

Research Questions and Hypotheses. This study investigated the relationship between Master's level counseling students' cultural identities and worldviews, course factors in a multicultural counseling course, and multicultural competencies and attitudes.

Research Question 1. How do cultural identity and worldview variables and multicultural competence change across the course of the semester?

Hypotheses 1. It was expected that students would demonstrate a change in identity status throughout the semester, with students moving towards a more advanced understanding of themselves and how they fit in the larger society. However, because identity status is a stable concept, any changes observed were expected to be very small.

Hypothesis 2. It was also expected that multicultural competence, as measured by the CBMCS, would increase over the course of the semester, as would students' endorsement of multicultural competencies on the EMC.

Research Question 2. How do cultural identity and worldview variables, course factors, and multicultural competence interact over the course of the semester?

Hypothesis 1. Students who were more advanced in their racial or ethnic identity development were expected to also have higher multicultural competence.

Hypothesis 2. This relationship was expected to be mediated by the experience of the semester-long course, such that an interaction between race and competence over the course of the semester was expected. Students who identify as members of a racial or ethnic minority group were expected to have higher multicultural competence scores than their White classmates at the beginning of the semester, but this difference was not expected at the end of the semester. It was expected that this difference would be based on identity development status because ethnic or racial minority students may initially have had more advanced identity development statuses.

Hypothesis 3. Cultural and identity worldview variables and course factors were expected to be significant predictors of multicultural competence at the end of the semester. Students who had a more advanced understanding of themselves as cultural beings and the role that privilege and discrimination plays in the lives of others were expected to have higher multicultural competence. Students enrolled in courses that have higher emphasis on the four areas of multicultural counseling competence and incorporate more of the four teaching strategies were also expected to have higher multicultural competence at the end of the semester.

Chapter 3

Methods

This chapter includes detailed information about research participants, recruitment procedures, research design and data collection procedures, measures used in the study, and an explanation of the data analysis procedures.

Participants

Participants who completed the initial Time 1 survey were 296 Master's level counseling students recruited from 34 counseling education programs across the country (See Table 1). All programs that were invited to participate met requirements for their respective state licensure process. A total of 46 programs agreed to participate and forward the survey to their students, but 12 programs had no students participate. Data collection took place across three semesters between January 2016 and May 2017.

The average age of participants was 27.66 (SD = 7.65, Minimum 21, Maximum 61). The gender identity of participants was primarily female, with 242 participants (80.7%) identifying as female, 56 (18.7%) identifying as male, and 2 (0.7%) identifying as "other." Participants were primarily White, with 233 (77.7%) identifying as White or Caucasian, 20 (6.7%) identifying as Black or African American, 10 (3.3%) identifying as Asian or Pacific Islander, 12 (4.0%) identifying as Latino/a or Hispanic, 2 (0.7%) identifying as Native American or Alaska Native, 4 (1.3%) identifying as other, and 17 (5.7%) identifying multiple racial heritages. Due to the low numbers of participants from various racial and ethnic minority groups, analyses were conducted with students of color combined as one group. A recent CACREP survey (2016) found 60.55% of students enrolled in CACREP accredited Master's programs identified as Caucasian/White,

and 82.54% identified as female. Based on these statistics, the demographics of the current study

are fairly consistent with the overall population of counseling students.

Table 1

Number of Participants From Counseling Programs

Program	Number of Participants
Arizona State University	2
Bowling Green State University	18
California State University Northridge	1
Cardinal Stritch University	10
Cleveland State University	2
East Tennessee University	2
Husson University	1
Immaculata University	1
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	4
Lehigh University	1
Marquette University	26
Minnesota State University Mankato	9
Minnesota State University Moorhead	9
Mississippi College	9
Mt Mary University	36
Northeastern State University	4
Oakland University	1
Purdue University	2
San Francisco State University	4
Southern Connecticut State University	4
SUNY Buffalo	8
SUNY Old Westbury	4
Teachers College	1
Texas A&M University Commerce City	3
University of California Santa Barbara	3
University of Central Florida	4
University of Colorado Denver	30
University of North Dakota	1
University of Central Missouri	1
University of LaVerne	2
University of Wisconsin Milwaukee	77
Villanova University	2
Washington State University	5
Waynesburg University	6
Youngstown State University	6

A total of 201 participants completed the second survey. There were no significant differences between participants who completed both surveys and those who only completed one survey regarding age (F= 0.70, $p = 0.40$) or identifying race as White or a student of color (X^2 (1, N = 298) = 3.06, $p = 0.80$). Participants who identified as female were more likely to complete the second survey than those who identified as male or other (X^2 (2, N = 300) = 7.40, $p = 0.25$). Participants who were enrolled in MPCAC accredited programs were more likely to complete the second survey than those enrolled in CACREP accredited programs or programs that were not accredited by either MPCAC or CACREP (X^2 (3, N = 300) = 19.26, $p < 0.01$). This difference is likely due to the exceptionally high completion rate of UWM students as compared with students from other programs, as UWM was the only MPCAC accredited program that participated in this study.

Procedure

Programs were invited by email by this researcher to participate. Programs were initially identified where this researcher had personal contacts, with subsequent programs identified through a list of CACREP and MPCAC accredited programs. Instructors who were teaching a Multicultural Counseling course in the upcoming semester received an email inviting them to collaborate on this project by forwarding an email to their students. Instructors who were interested in receiving more information about this project had private conversations with this researcher. Instructors were asked to forward the email to their students, as well as announce the study in class if possible. The email was forwarded to students before the course began or within the first week of the course. In the final two weeks of the course, participants received a follow-up email with a personalized link requesting that they complete the post-survey.

During the first semester of data collection, participants were given the opportunity to be entered into a raffle to win one of 10 $25 gift cards after completion of each of the first and second surveys. Due to a low participation rate, the incentive was amended to provide a small incentive for each participant rather than using a raffle. During the second semester of data collection, participants were given the opportunity to enter the raffle for one of 10 $25 gift cards after completion of the first survey. After completion of the second survey, they were given the option to enter the raffle again or to receive a $5 Starbucks gift card. During the third semester of data collection, all participants received a $5 Starbucks gift card after completion of both the first and second survey.

Measures

A demographic questionnaire, four self-report measures, and a syllabus review were used in the study. The four self-report measures include the Ethnic Identity Scale (EIS; Umaña-Taylor, Yazedjian, & Bamaca-Gomez, 2004), the Color Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS; Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000), the Everyday Multicultural Competencies Scale (EMC; Mallinckrodt, Miles, Bhaskar, Chery, Choi, & Sung, 2014), and the California Brief Multicultural Competence Scale (CBMCS; Gamst, Dana, Aghop, Der-Karabetian, Arellano, Morrow, & Martenson, 2004).

Demographics. Demographic information included participant's age, gender, program, the number of courses completed in their program, expected graduation date, and race (See Appendix A). Participants were also asked about past experience with clinical work and multicultural education outside of the program. Experiences were coded on a 3-point system based on their level of previous experience. They received a score of 1 if they reported no clinical work or additional multicultural training, a score of 2 if they reported less than 3

experiences of clinical work or additional multicultural training, or a score of 3 if they reported 3 or more experiences of clinical work or additional multicultural training.

Ethnic Identity Scale (EIS). The EIS (Umaña-Taylor, Yazedijian, & Bamaca-Gomez, 2004; see Appendix B) was developed to measure ethnic identity attitudes based on Erikson's understanding of identity by separating this concept into exploration of what an identity means to an individual as well as level of commitment to that identity. The 17 items are scored on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*does not describe me at all)* to 4 (*describes me very well)* and higher scores represent higher levels of identity development on each of the subscales. An overall score is not calculated. The EIS consists of three subscales: exploration, resolution, and affirmation. Exploration (seven items, e.g. "I have attended events that have helped me learn more about my ethnicity") describes how much a person has explored what their ethnicity is as well as what it means to them personally. Resolution (four items, e.g. "I have a clear sense of what my ethnicity means to me") describes whether an individual has come to a conclusion regarding their ethnicity and how they personally feel about it. Affirmation (six items, e.g. "I wish that I were of a different ethnicity") describes whether an individual feels positively or negatively about their ethnicity.

In the current study, reliability estimates were high for each of the three subscales. Cronbach's alpha was .90 for the Exploration subscale, .90 for the Affirmation subscale, and .94 for the Reliability subscale. This is consistent with past research demonstrating good reliability.

Internal reliability has been shown to be high for each of the three subscales (Umaña-Taylor & Shin, 2007; Umaña-Taylor, Vargas-Chanes, Garcia, & Gonzales-Backen, 2008; Umaña-Taylor, Yazedjian, & Bamaca-Gomez, 2004; Yoon, 2011), although it is more variable for the affirmation subscale. Cronbach's alphas were .91 for the exploration subscale, .92 for the

resolution subscale, and .86 for the affirmation subscale (Umaña-Taylor, Yazedjian, & Bamaca-Gomez, 2004). Yoon (2011) found that, for undergraduate and graduate students, reliability estimates were also similar for European American and ethnic minority participants.

Yoon (2011) demonstrated that the EIS has good construct validity when administered to both European American and ethnic minority participants. The factor structure is the same and factors loaded as intended for both of these population groups. Umaña-Taylor and Shin (2007) found the exploration and resolution subscales had good external validity with diverse samples as there were positive correlations between these subscales and self-esteem for most groups, although their support for the affirmation subscale was more varied.

Color Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS). The CoBRAS (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee, & Browne, 2000; see Appendix C) is a 20-item measure designed to assess cognitive aspects of color-blind racial attitudes, which includes ideas that race is not important or that being 'colorblind' is a desirable outcome. This scale has three subscales: Unawareness of Racial Privilege, Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination, and Unawareness of Blatant Racial Issues. The Unawareness of Racial Privilege subscale has seven items and assesses a lack of awareness of White privilege (e.g. "Racial and ethnic minorities do not have the same opportunities as White people in the U.S."). The Unawareness of Institutional Discrimination subscale has seven items and assesses a lack of awareness of institutional policies that lead to discrimination and exclusion (e.g. "Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against White people"). The Unawareness of Blatant Racial Issues subscale has six items and assesses a general lack of awareness of the pervasiveness of racial discrimination that occurs in society today (e.g. "Racism may have been a problem in the past, but it is not an important problem today"). Items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (*not at all*

appropriate or clear) to 5 (*very appropriate or clear)* with higher scores indicating higher levels of color-blindness.

Along with the overall score, these three subscales were shown to have good reliability with undergraduate student populations when it was initially developed, with alpha coefficients of .83, .81, .76, and .91 respectively (Neville et al., 2000). This measure has also been shown to have good concurrent validity with measures of belief in a just world, as well as not being strongly related to measures of socially desirable responding (Neville et al., 2000). It also has been shown to have good test-retest reliability for the Racial Privilege (.80) and Institutional Discrimination (.80) subscales, although it was slightly lower for the overall CoBRAS (.68) and was much lower for the Blatant Racial Issues subscale (.34). In the current study, Cronbach's alpha internal reliability estimates were .86 for Racial Privilege, .78 for Institutional Discrimination, .73 for Blatant Racial Issues, and .82 for the overall score.

Everyday Multicultural Competencies Scale/Revised Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (EMC/RSEE). The EMC/RSEE (Mallinckrodt, Miles, Bhaskar, Chery, Choi, & Sung, 2014; see Appendix D) was developed to assess the effectiveness of college multicultural programming on undergraduate student attitudes and understanding of multicultural and diversity issues. The goals of this type of programming are very similar to the desired outcomes of many Master's level multicultural counseling courses as they emphasize empathy, awareness of racism and privilege, and intergroup understanding (Mallinckrodt et al., 2014).

The EMC/RSEE has 48 items in six subscales: Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn, Resentment and Cultural Dominance, Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy, Empathic Perspective-Taking, Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege, and Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally. The Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn subscale consists of 10 items

such as "I would like to work in an organization where I get to work with individuals from diverse backgrounds". The Resentment and Cultural Dominance subscale has 10 items such as "I think members of the minority blame White people too much for their misfortunes". The Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy subscale has seven items such as "I am afraid that new cultural experiences might risk losing my own identity". The Empathic Perspective-Taking subscale has five items such as "I can relate to the frustration that some people feel about having fewer opportunities due to their racial or ethnic backgrounds". The Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege subscale has 8 items such as "I can see how other racial or ethnic groups are systematically oppressed in our society". The Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally subscale has eight items such as "I get disturbed when other people experience misfortunes due to their racial or ethnic background". Items are scored on a six-point Likert-type scale with response options of 1 (*strongly disagree), 2 (moderately disagree)*, 3 (*slightly disagree),* 4 (*slightly agree)*, 5 (*moderately agree*), and 6 (*strongly agree).* Responses on each of the six subscales are tallied and an overall score is not used combining across subscales. Higher scores on the Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn, Empathic Perspective-Taking, Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege, and Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally subscales indicate higher levels of cultural empathy and openness. Lower scores on the Resentment and Cultural Dominance and Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy subscales also indicate higher levels of cultural empathy and openness.

In the current study, internal reliability was good, with Cronbach's alpha being .90 for the Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn subscale, .87 for the Resentment and Cultural Dominance subscale, .63 for the Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy subscale, .70 for the Empathic Perspective-Taking subscale, .89 for Awareness of Contemporary Racism and

Privilege, and .78 for the Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally subscale. Internal reliabilities

on the subscales in previous research ranged from .92 (Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn) to

.69 (Empathic Perspective-Taking) for an undergraduate sample. Test-retest reliability was

shown to be moderately stable, ranging from .80 to .62, although many participants were

experiencing their first semester of college and would therefore be expected to be experiencing

many changes in the factors that the scale assesses. For older participants who were likely to

have been in school for longer, test retest reliabilities were improved for the scales that had lower

test-retest reliability overall. The EMC/RSEE was shown to have good external validity as

demonstrated by positive relationships between the scale and measures of openness to diversity.

There was also no strong correlation between the EMC/RSEE and measures of impression

management.

California Brief Multicultural Competence Scale (CBMCS). The CBMCS (Gamst,

Dana, Aghop Der-Karabetian, Aragon, Arellano, Morrow, & Martenson, 2004; see Appendix E)

is a 21-item scale designed to measure a counselor's level of multicultural competence. This

measure was developed based on four commonly used measures of multicultural competence:

Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised (LaFromboise, Coleman, & Hernandez, 1991),

Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, Skills Survey (D'Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991),

Multicultural Awareness Scale-Form B (Ponterotto & Alexander, 1996), and the Multicultural

Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (Ponterotto, Gretchen, Utsey, Rieger, & Austin,

2002). There are four subscales on the CBMCS: Sociocultural Diversities, Awareness of Cultural

Barriers, Multicultural Knowledge, and Sensitivity and Responsiveness to Consumers. The

Sociocultural Diversities subscale (seven items; e.g. "I have an excellent ability to assess

accurately the mental health needs of persons with disabilities") assesses an individual's self-

rated ability to work with different cultural groups. Awareness of Cultural Barriers (six items; e.g. "I am aware that being born a minority in this society brings with it certain challenges that White people do not have to face.") assesses how aware an individual reports to be of cultural barriers that exist in society. Multicultural Knowledge (five items; e.g. "I can discuss research regarding mental health issues and culturally different populations.") assesses an individual's self-reported knowledge regarding important aspects of multicultural awareness. Sensitivity and Responsiveness to Consumers (three items; e.g. "I am aware of institutional barriers that affect the client.") assesses how aware an individual reports to be of multicultural issues specifically in the context of their applicability with their clients.

In the current study, reliability estimates ranged from acceptable to high for each of the subscales and the full scale. Cronbach's alpha was .86 for the Multicultural Knowledge subscale, .78 for the Awareness of Cultural Barriers subscale, .75 for the Sensitivity and Responsiveness to Consumers subscale, .90 for the Socio-Cultural Diversities subscale, and .90 for the full scale. In previous research, the Cronbach's coefficient alpha for the overall score was .89, indicating good overall reliability (Gamst et al., 2004). Each of the four subscales was also in the acceptable to high range for reliability, ranging from .75 to .90. This study also demonstrated that the scale has good construct validity, with the subscales appearing to measure their intended constructs, as demonstrated through correlations with subscales of the original scales from which items were pulled. It also showed that participants with higher levels of training had higher scores on the measure, indicating that those who would be expected to be more proficient in multicultural competencies did indeed receive higher scores. The scale has also shown high levels of convergent validity with other relevant measures (Gamst, Liang, & Der-Karabetian, 2011).

Syllabus Review. Syllabi were requested from participating instructors in order to account for course variables that may differ between courses (e.g. experiential learning versus exclusively content based). A total of 37 syllabi were collected from instructors. Several of the instructors who did not provide syllabi had no students from their class participate. However, there were a total of 11 participants from four programs for whom syllabus information was not provided and was not included in the analyses. Information obtained from these syllabi included instructional methods, whether certain aspects such as journaling and immersion experiences were included, which textbook was used, and topics covered in the course. Syllabus elements were coded according to a scheme adapted from Priester, Jones, Jackson-Bailey, Jana-Masri, Jordan, and Metz (2008) in their content analysis of multicultural counseling courses.

Syllabi were rated on their relative level of emphasis of each of the four areas (i.e., Awareness, Knowledge, Skills, and Action) of the Multicultural Counseling Competencies. Courses received a rating of "low emphasis" if they mentioned a topic but did not have any significant assignments or discussions regarding it (e.g. assigning to read a chapter on Skills but not having any assignments or planned discussions on the topic). They received a rating of "medium emphasis" if they had one relatively minor assignment or discussion regarding the topic (e.g. including one reflective journal assignment on personal awareness that accounts for less than 15% of the overall grade). Courses were classified as "high emphasis" if they had multiple assignments regarding the topic, if they had one major assignment addressing the topic, or if the topic was addressed multiple times in the course (e.g. including multiple assignments and discussions on knowledge of various cultural groups). These scores were added together to create one variable of emphasis on the categories of multicultural competence.

Teaching strategies were classified according to four categories, adapted from work by Priester et al (2008). The authors identified the most common teaching strategies present in multicultural counseling courses. Those elements that were present in more than 10% of the courses they studied will be included here, and they fit into four broad categories: Personal Awareness, Knowledge of Cultural Groups, Experiential Learning, and Application. Personal Awareness included assignments such as reflective journaling, writing a cultural self-examination paper, and creating a plan to increase multicultural awareness. Knowledge of Cultural Groups included aspects such as doing a class presentation or research paper on a specific cultural group or conducting a literature review on a multicultural topic. Experiential Learning included aspects such as attendance at a cultural event, interviewing a member of a different cultural group, and writing a reaction to a piece of art (artwork, book, or film). Application included things such as critiquing or preparing a research proposal and doing a clinical case presentation. Each category was coded based on whether one or more assignments in that area were included in the course. These strategies were added together to create one variable incorporating the use of these varied teaching strategies.

Chapter 4

Results

This chapter includes detailed information about the data management procedures, descriptive statistics of the measures, results of the data analysis, and an interpretation of how these results inform conclusions about the study's hypotheses.

Data Management

Participants. A total of 338 participants initiated the survey and completed the Time 1 consent form. Of those who began participation, a total of 296 participants completed all aspects of the survey at Time 1. A total of 43 participants were excluded from analyses due to varying levels of incomplete data, ranging from not answering any questions to missing one entire scale. Participants who skipped only some questions but ultimately completed all measures were included as complete participants. Only participants who had complete Time 1 data were invited to participate in the second (Time 2) survey. A total of 222 participants initiated the Time 2 survey and completed the consent form. Of those participants, a total of 201 completed all sections of the survey at both Time 1 and Time 2. These 201 participants were used for data analyses for the purposes of this study.

Data Characteristics. Analyses were conducted to verify that assumptions for analyses were met, including normal distribution of the independent variables. These analyses were conducted separately for each subscale or overall scale, based on what was being used in the analyses. Analyses were conducted separately for each scale at Time 1 and Time 2, but no significant differences were found in distribution between the two timepoints. The majority of scales were generally normally distributed, including the EIS Exploration and Resolution subscales, the EMC/RSEE Empathic Perspective-Taking and Empathic Feeling and Acting as an

Ally subscales, and the CBMCS overall score. Several scales were negatively skewed, including the EIS Affirmation subscale, and the EMC/RSEE Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn and Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege subscales. The CoBRAS overall score and the EMC/RSEE Resentment and Cultural Dominance and Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy subscales showed a somewhat positive skew. Overall, the majority of scales that were not normally distributed showed minor deviations from a normal distribution.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics, including means, standard deviations, correlations, and reliability estimates of the scores, were generated. Demographic variables were examined and analyzed first to determine demographic characteristics of the sample and determine generalizability of the data. These descriptive statistics, including scale means, standard deviations, and reliability estimates of scores for the Ethnic Identity Scale subscales, Colorblind Racial Attitudes Scale, Everyday Multicultural Competence Scale subscales, and California Brief Multicultural Competence Scale are reported in Table 2. These statistics will also be discussed for course variables. Bivariate correlations are reported in Tables 3, 4, and 5. EIS means ranged from 11.70 (Resolution) to 21.26 (Affirmation) for Time 1 and from 12.13 (Resolution) to 21.64 (Exploration) at Time 2. Reliability estimates for the EIS ranged from .90 (Exploration) to .94 (Resolution). The mean score on the CoBRAS was 44.43 at Time 1 and 39.59 at Time 2, with a reliability estimate of .82. Mean scores on the EMCS ranged from 13.00 (Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy) to 55.21 (Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn) at Time 1, and 12.40 (Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy) to 55.93 (Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn) at Time 2. Reliability estimates for the EMCS ranged from .63 (Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy) to .90 (Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn). The mean on the

CBMCS was 57.22 at Time 1 and 64.31 at Time 2, with a reliability estimate of .90. Overall,

there was a moderate level of emphasis in the course variables that were measured as part of this

study, with the average score being 8.02 (SD = .96) out of a maximum of 12 for level of

emphasis in each of the four areas of multicultural competence, and an average of 2.88 (SD =

.63) out of a maximum of 4 for the inclusion of teaching strategies.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics

Scale	Reliability Estimate	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
		Time 1		Time 2	
Ethnic Identity Scale					
Exploration	.90	20.58	4.70	21.64	4.83
Affirmation	.90	21.26	3.20	21.12	3.45
Resolution	.94	11.70	2.84	12.13	2.80
Color Blind Racial Attitudes Scale	.82	44.43	13.65	39.59	13.63
Everyday Multicultural Competence Scale					
Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn	.90	55.21	5.60	55.93	5.87
Resentment and Cultural Dominance	.87	18.25	6.75	16.84	6.75
Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy	.63	13.00	4.59	12.40	4.52
Empathic Perspective-Taking	.71	18.51	4.86	19.72	4.97
Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege	.89	40.73	6.33	42.78	5.99
Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally	.78	38.75	5.90	41.11	5.57
California Brief Multicultural Competence Scale	.90	57.22	8.13	64.31	8.12

Table 3

Time 1 Bivariate Correlations

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. EIS Exploration	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2. EIS Affirmation	.03	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	(p = .7)										
3. EIS Resolution	.44**	.22**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	(p < .01)	(p < .01)									
4. CoBRAS	-.13*	.09	.09	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	(p = .03)	(p = .15)	(p = .13)								
5. EMC Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn	.14*	.10	.06	-.44**	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	(p = .02)	(p = .10)	(p = .29)	(p <.01)							
6. EMC Resentment and Cultural Dominance	-.12	.02	-.01	.70**	-.52**	--	--	--	--	--	--
	(p = .04)	(p = .70)	(p = .86)	(p <.01)	(p < .01)						
7. EMC Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy	-.12*	-.16**	-.21**	.27**	-.44**	.32**	--	--	--	--	--
	(p = .04)	(p =.01)	(p < .01)	(p <.01)	(p < .01)	(p <.01)					
8. EMC Empathic Perspective-Taking	.24**	.07	.28**	-.06	.14*	-.14*	-.17**	--	--	--	--
	(p < .01)	(p = .26)	(p < .01)	(p = .28)	(p =.01)	(p = .02)	(p <.01)				
9. EMC Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege	.09	-.03	-.05	-.78**	.43**	-.64**	-.29**	.12*	--	--	--
	(p = .14)	(p = .61)	(p =.42)	(p < .01)	(p < .01)	(p < .01)	(p <.01)	(p = .03)			
10. EMC Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally	.02	-.01	.05	-.38**	.46**	-.32**	-.37**	.26**	.46**	--	--
	(p = .74)	(p =.92)	(p =.44)	(p < .01)	(p < .01)	(p < .01)	(p <.01)	(p <.01)	(p <.01)		
11. CBMCS	.01	.03	.14*	-.21**	.21**	-.14**	-.28**	.33**	.23**	.34**	--
	(p = .08)	(p = .64)	(p = .02)	(p < .01)	(p < .01)	(p = .02)	(p <.01)	(p <.01)	(p <.01	(p <.01)	

Note. *p ≤ .05, two-tailed. **p ≤ .01, two-tailed.

Table 4

Time 2 Bivariate Correlations

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. EIS Exploration	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2. EIS Affirmation	.21 (*p* = .77)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
3. EIS Resolution	.48** (*p* < .01)	.07 (*p* = .29)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
4. CoBRAS	-.09 (*p* = .20)	.10 (*p* = .16)	-.06 (*p* = .43)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
5. EMC Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn	.15* (*p* = .03)	-.05 (*p* = .51)	.08 (*p* = .27)	-.48** (*p* <.01)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6. EMC Resentment and Cultural Dominance	-.11 (*p* = .11)	.01 (*p* = .94)	-.05 (*p* = .49)	.72** (*p* <.01)	-.53** (*p* < .01)	--	--	--	--	--	--
7. EMC Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy	-.28** (*p* <.01)	-.08 (*p* =.24)	-.25** (*p* < .01)	.29** (*p* <.01)	-.27** (*p* < .01)	.37** (*p* <.01)	--	--	--	--	--
8. EMC Empathic Perspective-Taking	.21** (*p* < .01)	-.04 (*p* = .55)	.28** (*p* < .01)	-.19** (*p* <.01)	.10 (*p* =.14)	-.20** (*p* < .01)	-.34** (*p* <.01)	--	--	--	--
9. EMC Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege	.11 (*p* = .11)	.02 (*p* = .75)	.12 (*p* =.81)	-.80** (*p* <.01)	.43** (*p* < .01)	-.67** (*p* < .01)	-.36** (*p* <.01)	.21** (*p* <.01)	--	--	--
10. EMC Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally	.07 (*p* = .07)	-.11 (*p* =.11)	.15* (*p* =.03)	-.41** (*p* < .01)	.31** (*p* < .01)	-.37** (*p* < .01)	-.34** (*p* <.01)	.27** (*p* <.01)	.46** (*p* <.01)	--	--
11. CBMCS	.13 (*p* = .06)	-.05 (*p* = .45)	.20** (*p* = .01)	-.35** (*p* < .01)	.27** (*p* < .01)	-.30** (*p* <.01)	-.35** (*p* <.01)	.28** (*p* <.01)	.38** (*p* <.01)	.36** (*p* <.01)	--

Note. *p* ≤ .05, two-tailed. **p* ≤ .01, two-tailed.

Table 5

Bivariate Correlations between Time 1 and Time 2

Variable- Time 1	1-T2	2-T2	3-T2	4-T2	5-T2	6-T2	7-T2	8-T2	9-T2	10-T2	11-T2
1. EIS Exploration	.56**	.01	.27**	-.12	.15*	-.11	-.28**	.21**	.11	.07	.13
	($p < .01$)	($p= .87$)	($p < .01$)	($p = .11$)	($p = .03$)	($p = .11$)	($p< .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p= .11$)	($p= .11$)	($p= .06$)
2. EIS Affirmation	.05	.55**	.12	.04	-.05	.01	-.08	-.04	.02	-.11	-.05
	($p = .47$)	($p < .01$)	($p = .09$)	($p = .55$)	($p = .51$)	($p = .94$)	($p= .24$)	($p = .55$)	($p= .75$)	($p= .11$)	($p= .45$)
3. EIS Resolution	.29**	.14*	.43**	.08	.08	-.05	-.25**	.28**	.12	.15*	.20**
	($p < .01$)	($p= .04$)	($p < .01$)	($p = .27$)	($p = .27$)	($p = .49$)	($p< .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p= .81$)	($p= .03$)	($p< .01$)
4. CoBRAS	-.03	.07	-.03	.76**	-.45**	.64**	.27**	-.16*	-.66**	-.32**	-.31**
	($p = .68$)	($p = .33$)	($p = .65$)	($p < .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p = .02$)	($p< .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p< .01$)
5. EMC Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn	.16*	-.08	.21**	-.40**	.49**	-.42**	-.44**	.27**	.33**	.38**	.25**
	($p = .02$)	($p = .27$)	($p < .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p< .01$)
6. EMC Resentment and Cultural Dominance	-.12	.07	-.15*	.61**	-.41**	.76**	.37**	-.27**	-.57**	-.32**	-.27**
	($p = .10$)	($p = .36$)	($p = .03$)	($p < .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p< .01$)
7. EMC Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy	-.20**	-.09	-.24**	.18*	-.26**	.25**	.64**	-.29**	-.22**	-.31**	-.29**
	($p < .01$)	($p =.22$)	($p < .01$)	($p = .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p< .01$)
8. EMC Empathic Perspective-Taking	.13	-.07	.19**	-.13	.09	-.06	-.18**	.57**	.07	.22**	.27**
	($p =.07$)	($p = .34$)	($p < .01$)	($p = .08$)	($p = .19$)	($p = .37$)	($p< .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p= .30$)	($p< .01$)	($p< .01$)
9. EMC Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege	.04	.04	.08	-.74**	.37**	-.60**	-.34**	.21**	.71**	.44**	.30**
	($p = .60$)	($p = .55$)	($p =.24$)	($p < .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p< .01$)
10. EMC Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally	.07	-.11	.14*	-.32**	.25**	-.22**	-.34**	.35**	.29**	.63**	.29**
	($p = .40$)	($p =.12$)	($p =.05$)	($p < .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p< .01$)
11. CBMCS	.03	-.02	.11	-.13	.25**	-.27**	-.29**	.27**	.30**	.29**	.45**
	($p = .69$)	($p = .80$)	($p = .12$)	($p = .07$)	($p < .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p < .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p< .01$)	($p< .01$)

Note. *$p \le .05$, two-tailed. **$p \le .01$, two-tailed.

Bivariate correlations. Bivariate correlations were evaluated in order to determine relationships between scale and subscale scores before analysis of the study hypotheses. Preliminary analyses of intercorrelations among study variables revealed some interesting findings. For the sake of clarity, results will be presented here first for Time 1 (see Table 3), then for Time 2 (see Table 4), and finally between the two time points (see Table 5).

Time 1. For the EIS, individuals who reported higher levels of Exploration at Time 1 reported lower levels of Color Blind Racial Attitudes ($r = -.13$, $p =.03$) than students who reported lower levels of exploration of their ethnic identities. They also reported higher levels of Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn ($r = .14$, $p =.02$) and Empathic Perspective-Taking ($r = .24$, $p < .001$), and lower levels of Resentment and Cultural Dominance ($r = -.12$, $p =.04$) and Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy ($r = -.12$, $p =.04$) on the EMC than students who reported lower levels of exploration of their ethnic identity. Individuals who reported higher levels of Affirmation on the EIS reported lower levels of Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy ($r = -.16$, $p =.01$) on the EMC than those who reported lower levels of Affirmation. Individuals who reported higher levels of Resolution on the EIS reported lower levels of Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy ($r = -.16$, $p =.01$), and higher levels of Empathic Perspective-Taking ($r = .28$, $p < .001$) on the EMC than those who reported lower levels of Resolution. They also reported higher overall multicultural competence on the CBMCS ($r = .14$, $p =.02$).

Participants who reported higher levels of Color-blind Racial Attitudes reported higher levels of Resentment and Cultural Dominance ($r = .70$, $p =< .001$) and Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy ($r = .27$, $p = < .001$), and lower levels of Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn ($r = -.44$, $p < .001$), Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege ($r = -.78$,

p < .001), and Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally (*r* = -.38, *p* < .001) on the EMC than those who reported lower levels of Color-blind Racial Attitudes. They also reported lower levels of overall multicultural competence on the CBMCS (*r* = -.21, *p* < .001).

Participants who reported higher levels of overall multicultural competence on the CBMCS reported higher levels of Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn (*r* = .21, *p* < .001), Empathic Perspective-Taking (*r* = .33, *p* < .001), Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege (*r* = .23, *p* < .001), and Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally (*r* = .34, *p* < .001) on the EMC than those who reported lower levels of overall multicultural competence. They also reported lower levels of Resentment and Cultural Dominance (*r* = -.14, *p* =.02) and Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy (*r* = -.28, *p* < .001).

Time 2 Participants who reported higher levels of Exploration on the EIS reported higher levels of Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn (*r* = .15, *p* =.03) and Empathic Perspective-Taking (*r* = .21, *p* =.003), and lower levels of Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy (*r* = -.28, *p* < .001) on the EMC than participants who reported lower levels of exploration of their ethnic identity. Participants who reported higher levels of Resolution on the EIS reported higher levels of Empathic Perspective-Taking (*r* = .28, *p* < .001) and Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally (*r* = .15, *p* =.03), and lower levels of Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy (*r* = -.25, *p* < .001) than those who reported lower levels of Resolution. They also reported higher levels of overall multicultural competence on the CBMCS (*r* = .20, *p* =.01).

Participants who reported higher levels of Color-blind Racial Attitudes reported higher levels of Resentment and Cultural Dominance (*r* = .72, *p* < .001) and Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy (*r* = .29, *p* < .001) than those who reported lower levels of Color-blind Racial Attitudes. They also reported lower levels of Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn

(r = -.48, p < .001), Empathic Perspective-Taking (r = -.19, p =.01), and Empathic Feeling and

Acting as an Ally (r = -.14, p < .001). They reported lower levels of overall multicultural

competence on the CBMCS (r = -.35, p < .001).

Participants who reported higher levels of multicultural competence on the CBMCS

reported higher levels of Cultural Desire and Openness to Learn (r = .31, p < .001), Empathic

Perspective-Taking (r = .28, p < .001), Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege (r =

.38, p < .001), and Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally (r = .36, p < .001) on the EMC than

those who reported lower levels of overall multicultural competence. They reported lower levels

of Resentment and Cultural Dominance (r = -.30, p < .001) and Anxiety and Lack of

Multicultural Self-Efficacy (r = -.35, p < .001).

Correlations between time points. Participants who reported higher levels of Exploration

on the EIS at Time 1 reported higher levels of Empathic Perspective-Taking on the EMC at Time

2 (r = .16, p =.02). Participants who reported a higher level of Resolution on the EIS at Time 1

also reported a higher level of Empathic Perspective-Taking on the EMC at Time 2 (r = .25, p <

.001).

Participants who reported higher levels of Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn on the

EMC at Time 1 reported higher levels of Resolution on the EIS at Time 2 (r = .21, p =.002) than

those who reported lower levels of openness to learning about other cultures. Participants who

reported higher levels of Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy on the EMC at Time 1

reported lower levels of Exploration (r = -.20, p =.004) and Resolution (r = -.24, p < .001) on the

EIS at Time 2 than those who reported lower levels of anxiety. Participants who reported higher

levels of Empathic Perspective-Taking (r = .19, p =.007) and Empathic Feeling and Acting as an

Ally ($r = .14$, $p = .05$) on the EMC at Time 1 reported higher levels of Resolution on the EIS at Time 2 than those who reported lower levels of empathic perspective-taking.

Participants who reported higher levels of Color-blind Racial Attitudes at Time 1 reported higher levels of Resentment and Cultural Dominance ($r = .64$, $p < .001$) and Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy ($r = .27$, $p < .001$) on the EMC at Time 2 than participants who reported lower levels of Color-blind Racial Attitudes. They also reported lower levels of Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn ($r = -.45$, $p < .001$), Empathic Perspective-Taking ($r = -.16$, $p = .02$), Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege ($r = -.66$, $p < .001$), and Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally ($r = -.32$, $p < .001$). In addition, they reported lower levels of overall multicultural competence on the CBMCS at Time 2 ($r = -.31$, $p < .001$).

Participants who reported higher levels of Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn ($r = -.40$, $p < .001$; $r = .21$, $p < .001$), Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege ($r = -.74$, $p < .001$; $r = .33$, $p < .001$), and Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally ($r = -.32$, $p < .001$; ($r = .34$, $p < .001$) on the EMC at Time 1 reported lower levels of Color Blind Racial Attitudes and higher levels of overall multicultural competence on the CBMCS, respectively, at Time 2 than participants who reported lower levels of competence in these areas. Participants who reported higher levels of Empathic Perspective-Taking at Time 1 also reported higher levels of multicultural competence ($r = .33$, $p < .001$) at Time 2 than those who reported lower levels of Empathic Perspective-Taking. Participants who reported higher levels of Resentment and Cultural Dominance ($r = .61$, $p < .001$; $r = -.14$, $p = .02$) and Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy ($r = .18$, $p = .01$; $r = -.28$, $p < .001$) on the EMC at Time 1 reported higher levels of Color-blind Racial Attitudes and lower levels of multicultural competence on the CBMCS at Time 2 than those who reported lower levels of resentment and anxiety. Participants who

reported higher levels of multicultural competence on the CBMCS at Time 1 reported higher

levels of Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn ($r = .16$, $p = .03$), Empathic Perspective-Taking

($r = 20$, $p = .01$), and Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally ($r = .21$, $p = .004$) on the EMC at

Time 2 than those who reported lower levels of overall multicultural competence. They also

reported lower levels of Anxiety and Multicultural Self-Efficacy ($r = -.26$, $p < .001$) at Time 2.

Independent samples *t*-tests were also conducted to evaluate if there were any differences

on the measures between students who identified as male and students who identified as female,

as well as differences between students who identified as White and students who identified as

students of color. These details will be described below.

Differences by Gender Identity. Scores were evaluated for differences based on gender

in order to determine if gender is an important factor in the relationship between cultural and

worldview variables and multicultural competence. On the majority of the measures, there were

no significant differences in scores between those who identified as female and those who

identified as male. In Time 1, participants who identified as female had higher scores on

Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally ($M = 39.14$, $SD = 5.87$), than those who identified as

male ($M = 36.86$, $SD = 5.70$), $t(293) = -2.63$, $p = .009$. This difference was also evident in Time

2, with participants who identified as female having higher levels of Empathic Feeling and

Acting as an Ally ($M = 40.60$, $SD = 5.36$) than those who identified as male ($M = 37.61$, $SD =$

1.06), $t(202) = -2.87$, $p = .005$. Participants who identified as male reported higher levels of

multicultural competence at Time 1 ($M = 59.17$, $SD = 8.38$) than those who identified as female

($M = 56.72$, $SD = 7.98$), $t(278) = 1.99$, $p = .05$. This difference was not evident at Time 2. At

Time 2, participants who identified as male had higher scores on the EIS Exploration scale ($M =$

23.24, *SD* = 4.63) than those who identified as female (*M* = 21.34, *SD* = 4.83), *t*(205) = 2.09, *p* = .04.

Differences by Race. See Table 6 for a summary of means and standard deviations for participants based on race across time points.

In Time 1, participants who identified as White had significant differences from those who identified as students of color on almost every measure. White students reported lower levels of Exploration (*M* = 19.88, *SD* = 4.57) than students of color (*M* = 23.06, *SD* = 4.27), *t*(294) = -5.00, *p* < .001, lower levels of Affirmation (*M* = 21.03, *SD* = 3.29) than students of color (*M* = 22.02, *SD* = 2.76), *t*(294) = -2.20, *p* = .03, and lower levels of Resolution (*M* = 11.27, *SD* = 2.78) than students of color (*M* = 13.26, *SD* = 2.51), *t*(296) = -5.23, *p* < .001, on the EIS. White students had higher levels of Color Blind Racial Attitudes (*M* = 45.31, *SD* = 14.15) than students of color (*M* = 41.08, *SD* = 11.35), *t*(287) = 2.17, *p* = .03. White students had lower levels of Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn (*M* = 54.78, *SD* = 5.99) than students of color (*M* = 56.80, *SD* = 3.62), *t*(291) = -2.57, *p* = .01, higher levels of Resentment and Cultural Dominance (*M* = 18.88, *SD* = 7.07) than students of color (*M* = 16.17, *SD* = 5.01), *t*(293) = 2.89, *p* = .004, higher levels of Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy (*M* = 13.33, *SD* = 4.64) than students of color (*M* = 11.92, *SD* = 4.30), *t*(294) = 2.18, *p*= .03, lower levels of Empathic Perspective-Taking (*M* = 17.45, *SD* = 4.31) than students of color (*M* = 22.39, *SD* = 4.78), *t*(292) = -7.92, *p* < .001, lower levels of Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege (*M* = 40.17, *SD* = 6.61) than students of color (*M* = 42.69, *SD* = 4.91), *t*(292) = -2.85, *p* = .005, and lower levels of Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally (*M* = 38.92, *SD* = 5.94) than students of color (*M* = 40.50, *SD* = 5.53), *t*(293) = -2.67, *p* = .008. There was no significant

difference between White students and students of color in overall multicultural competence on

the CBMCS.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics by Student Race Identification

Scale	White Students	Students of Color	White Students	Students of Color
	Time 1		Time 2	
Ethnic Identity Scale				
Exploration	19.88 (4.57)	23.06 (4.27)	21.09 (4.75)	26.27 (2.49)
Affirmation	21.03 (3.29)	22.02 (2.76)	21.82 (3.17)	20.97 (3.49)
Resolution	11.27 (2.78)	13.26 (2.51)	11.65 (2.71)	14.91 (1.70)
Color Blind Racial Attitudes Scale	45.31 (14.15)	41.08 (11.35)	37.94 (12.77)	39.91 (13.80)
Everyday Multicultural Competence Scale				
Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn	54.78 (5.99)	56.80 (3.62)	56.36 (4.87)	55.84 (6.05)
Resentment and Cultural Dominance	18.88 (7.07)	16.17 (5.01)	17.03 (6.58)	16.80 (6.80)
Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy	13.33 (4.64)	11.92 (4.30)	12.06 (3.96)	12.46 (4.63)
Empathic Perspective-Taking	17.45(4.31)	22.39(4.78)	18.78 (4.64)	23.27 (4.43)
Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege	40.17(6.61)	42.69(4.91)	43.45 (4.92)	42.65 (6.18)
Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally	38.92(5.94)	40.50(5.53)	37.61 (6.07)	40.60 (5.36)
California Brief Multicultural Competence Scale	57.01 (7.89)	58.08 (9.08)	65.22 (8.19)	64.13 (8.12)

In Time 2, there were fewer differences between White students and students of color.

White students had lower levels of Exploration ($M = 21.09$, $SD = 4.75$) than students of color (M

$= 26.27$, $SD = 2.49$), $t(78) = -3.58$, $p < .001$, and lower levels of Resolution ($M = 11.65$, $SD =$

51

2.71) than students of color ($M = 14.91$, $SD = 1.70$), $t(177) = -3.93$, $p < .001$. They also had

lower levels of Empathic Perspective-Taking ($M = 18.78$, $SD = 4.64$) than students of color ($M = 23.27$, $SD = 4.43$), $t(175) = -3.12$, $p = .002$.

Hypotheses Findings

Findings will be presented here based on the research questions and specific hypotheses

Research Question 1. Repeated measures ANOVA analyses were used to evaluate how cultural identity, worldview variables, and multicultural competence changed over the course of the semester. Based on previous research showing racial differences in multicultural competence, racial identity (White or student of color) was included as a between-subjects factor.

Hypothesis 1. To assess changes in cultural identity and worldview across the course of the semester, a repeated measures ANOVA was conducted with the subscale scores on the EIS. The dependent variable was the post-test data, with the independent variable being the pre-test data. It was expected that students would demonstrate a change in identity status across the semester, with students moving towards a more advanced understanding of themselves and how they fit in the larger society. Because there are three subscales, a *p*-value of .017 was used in place of .05 for level of significance. See Table 7 for a summary of ANOVA results.

There was a significant difference in scores on the Exploration subscale of the EIS between Time 1 and Time 2, $F(1, 195) = 6.89$, $p = .009$. Students had higher scores on Exploration at Time 2 ($M = 21.61$, $SD = 4.76$) than at Time 1 ($M = 20.40$, SD 4.72). Students reported higher levels of exploration of what their ethnic identity meant to them at the end of the semester than they did at the beginning of the semester. The effect size was small, with Cohen's $d = .26$. There was also a main effect of race, $F(1, 195) = 16.00$, p $< .001$. Students who identified as White reported lower levels of Exploration ($M = 20.48$, $SD = 4.47$) than students

52

who identified as a student of color ($M = 23.47$, $SD = 9.60$). This is also a small effect size, with Cohen's $d = .40$. There was no interaction between race and time, $F(1, 195) = .15$, $p = .70$.

There was no significant difference in scores on the Affirmation subscale of the EIS between Time 1 and Time 2, $F(1, 195) = 2.53$, $p = .11$. Students reported similar levels of affirmation at Time 2 ($M = 21.25$, $SD = 3.21$) than they did at Time 1 ($M = 21.08$, $SD = 3.34$). Students felt similarly positively about their ethnic identity at the end of the semester as they did at the beginning of the semester. There was also no difference in Affirmation based on racial identity, $F(1, 195) = 1.17$, $p = .28$. White students reported similar levels of Affirmation ($M = 21.06$, $SD = .23$) as students of color ($M = 21.64$, $SD = .48$). There was no interaction between time and racial identity, $F(1, 195) = 2.32$, $p = .13$.

There was a significant difference in Resolution between Time 1 and Time 2, $F(1, 198) = 11.56$, $p = .001$. Students reported lower levels of Resolution at Time 1 ($M = 11.43$, $SD = 2.84$) than they did at Time 2 ($M = 12.11$, $SD = 2.78$). The effect size for this difference was small, with Cohen's $d = .25$. Students reported higher levels of understanding what their identity meant to them at the end of the semester than they did at the beginning of the semester. There was also a main effect of race, $F(1, 198) = 25.60$, $p < .001$. Students who identified as White reported lower levels of resolution ($M = 11.38$, $SD = 2.49$) than students of color ($M = 13.42$, $SD = 5.13$). This effect size was moderate, with Cohen's $d = .51$. There was no interaction between racial identity and time, $F(1, 198) = 2.09$, $p = .15$.

Hypothesis 2. Repeated measure ANOVA analyses were run to evaluate change in multicultural competence over the course of the class. The overall scores on the CBMCS and subscale scores on the EMC at the pre- and post-semester assessments were evaluated to see if there has been any significant change in these variables over the course of the semester.

Assumptions for the ANOVA analysis were checked, including normal distribution of the variables and homoscedasticity or equal variance across group levels. For this analysis, scores from the post-semester survey were the dependent variables with the initial scores as the independent variables. It was expected that students would have higher levels of multicultural competence at the end of the semester than they did at the beginning of the semester, as measured by both the CBMCS and the EMC. Again, racial identity was included as a between-subjects factor in all analyses. Because there are 7 total analyses (overall CBMCS score and 6 EMC subscales), a p-value of .007 was used. See Table 7 for a summary of ANOVA results.

There was no difference in Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn from Time 1 to Time 2, $F(1, 195) = .86$, $p = .36$. Participants reported similar levels of openness to learning about the cultures of others at the beginning of the semester ($M = 54.64$, $SD = 6.08$) as they did at the end of the semester ($M = 55.87$, $SD = 5.89$). There was also no main effect of race, $F(1, 195) = 2.48$, $p = .12$. Students of color reported similar levels of openness to other cultures ($M = 54.98$, $SD = 5.71$) as White students ($M = 56.46$, $SD = 11.87$). There was no interaction between race and time, $F(1, 195) = 4.47$, $p = .04$.

There was a significant difference in Resentment and Cultural Dominance, $F(1, 195) = 15.53$, $p < .001$. Students reported higher levels of resentment at the beginning of the semester ($M = 19.01$, $SD = 7.07$) than at the end of the semester ($M = 16.88$, $SD = 6.74$). This effect size was small, with Cohen's $d = .31$. There was no effect of race on level of resentment, $F(1, 195) = 3.80$, $p = .05$. Students of color reported similar levels of resentment ($M = 16.12$, $SD = 14.64$) as White students ($M = 18.38$, $SD = 7.16$). There was also no interaction between race and time, $F(1, 195) = 2.46$, $p = .12$.

There was no difference in Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy between Time 1 and Time 2, $F(1, 194) = 6.50$, $p = .01$. Participants reported similar levels of anxiety about interacting with others who are different from themselves at Time 1 ($M = 13.34$, $SD = 4.55$) as they did at Time 2 ($M = 12.43$, $SD = 4.53$). There was also no effect of racial identity, $F(1, 194) = 5.21$, $p = .02$. Students who identified as White reported similar levels of anxiety ($M = 13.20$, $SD = 4.49$) as did students of color ($M = 11.49$, $SD = 9.48$).

There was a significant difference in Empathic Perspective-Taking, $F(1, 195) = 12.89$, $p < .001$. Students reported higher levels of empathic perspective-taking at the end of the semester ($M = 19.68$, $SD = 4.95$) than at the beginning of the semester ($M = 18.81$, $SD = 4.74$). The effect size was small, with Cohen's $d = .18$. There was also a significant difference by race, $F(1, 195) = 47.77$, $p < .001$. Students of color reported higher levels of empathic perspective-taking ($M = 22.82$, $SD = 8.90$) than White students ($M = 17.96$, $SD = 4.28$). This effect size was moderate, with Cohen's $d = .70$. There was no interaction between race and time, $F(1, 195) = .26$, $p = .61$.

There was a significant difference across the semesters in Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege, $F(1, 195) = 20.10$, $p < .001$. Participants reported higher levels of awareness of the impact of contemporary racism and privilege in society at Time 2 ($M = 42.84$, $SD = 5.98$) than they did at Time 1 ($M = 40.52$, $SD = 6.36$). The effect size for this was small, with Cohen's $d = .38$. There was also a significant difference by race, $F(1, 195) = 8.19$, $p = .005$. White students reported lower levels of awareness ($M = 41.12$, $SD = 6.23$) than students of color ($M = 44.01$, $SD = 12.76$). This effect size was small, with Cohen's $d = .29$. There was no interaction between time and race, $F(1, 195) = 2.49$, $p = .12$.

There was a significant difference across the semester in Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally, $F(1, 194) = 7.83$, $p = .006$. Participants reported higher levels of engaging in acting as

an ally to communities of color at Time 2 ($M = 40.04$, $SD = 5.57$) than they did at Time 1 ($M = 38.32$, $SD = 6.02$). The effect size was also small, with Cohen's $d = .30$. There was no difference between members of different racial groups, $F(1, 194) = 2.64$, $p = .11$. White students reported similar levels of empathic feeling ($M = 38.89$, $SD = 5.78$) as students of color ($M = 40.46$, $SD = 12.18$). There was also no interaction between time and race, $F(1, 194) = 2.32$, $p = .13$.

Participants also reported a significant difference in overall multicultural competence between the two time points, $F(1, 188) = 95.02$, $p < .001$. Participants reported higher levels of multicultural competence at Time 2 ($M = 64.46$, $SD = 7.86$) than they did at Time 1 ($M = 56.56$, $SD = 8.35$). The effect size was large, with Cohen's $d = .97$. There was no difference based on race, $F(1, 188) = .12$, $p = .73$. White students reported similar levels of overall multicultural competence ($M = 60.43$, $SD = 7.72$) as students of color ($M = 60.87$, $SD = 16.13$). There was no interaction between race and time, $F(1, 188) = .09$, $p = .76$.

Table 7

Results of ANOVA Analyses

Scale	dF	F	p	dF	F	p
		Effect of Time			Effect of Race	
Ethnic Identity Scale						
Exploration	1	6.89	.009*	1	15.997	.00*
Affirmation	1	2.53	.11	1	1.17	.28
Resolution	1	11.56	.001*	1	25.60	.00*
Everyday Multicultural Competence Scale						
Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn	1	.86	.36	1	2.48	.12
Resentment and Cultural Dominance	1	15.54	.00*	1	3.80	.05
Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy	1	6.50	.01	1	5.21	.02
Empathic Perspective-Taking	1	12.89	.00*	1	47.77	.00*
Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege	1	20.10	.00*	1	8.19	.005*
Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally	1	7.83	.006*	1	2.64	.11
California Brief Multicultural Competence Scale	1	95.02	.00*	1	.12	.73

Note: *$p \leq .007$, two-tailed*

Research Question 2. To assess how cultural identity and worldview variables interact with multicultural competence over the course of the semester, ANOVA analyses and multiple regression analyses were conducted.

Hypothesis 1. It was expected that participants who endorsed overall higher levels of the ethnic identity attitudes of affirmation, exploration, and resolution, or higher amounts of change on these subscales, would also have higher levels of multicultural competence on the CBMCS. Regression analyses were done separately at each time point. For both times separately, scores on the EIS subscales were entered as predictors of Time 1 CBMCS. All three subscales were entered as the same step. Gender was included as a first step in order to control for the influence

of gender identity, based on the gender difference in scores on the CBMCS during the analysis of demographic variables.

At Time 1, ethnic identity development was not a significant predictor of multicultural competence, $F(4, 182) = 2.53$, $p = .04$. R^2 for the full model was only .05, indicating that the model only accounted for 5% of the variance in overall multicultural competence. Level of ethnic identity development did not influence overall level of multicultural competence at the beginning of the semester. Ethnic identity development was also not a significant predictor of multicultural competence at Time 2, $F(4, 189) = 2.20$, $p = .07$. The R^2 for the full model was only .045, indicating that the model only accounted for 4.5% of the variance in CBMCS overall score. Students who reported higher levels of ethnic identity development, and higher levels of resolution of what that identity means to them, reported similar levels of multicultural competence as students who had lower levels of ethnic identity development scores on the subscale.

Hypothesis 2. A regression analysis was run with changes in scores on the EIS as independent variables and the overall score on the CBMCS at Time 2 as the dependent variable. Gender was entered as a first step in order to control for the influence of gender, based on the difference in CBMCS score as shown in the analysis of demographic variables. The change scores of the EIS (how much the EIS scores changed across the semester) were entered as the next step. The dependent variable was the post-test overall score on the CBMCS. It was hypothesized that there would be an impact of the change in EIS subscale scores on CBMCS overall multicultural competence scores at Time 2, such that participants with greater levels of change in ethnic identity development would also report greater multicultural competence at the end of the semester.

There was no significant relationship between multicultural competence and level of change of ethnic identity development after controlling for gender, $F(4, 185) = .90$, $p = .47$. Participants who reported greater levels of change in ethnic identity development reported similar levels of overall multicultural competence to those who reported less change in ethnic identity development.

Hypothesis 3. It was hypothesized that cultural identity and worldview variables would be significant predictors of multicultural competence at the end of the semester, such that students who had a more advanced understanding of their own cultural identity (e.g., world view, ethnic identity) would demonstrate higher levels of multicultural competence. It was also hypothesized that students who were enrolled in courses with higher levels of emphasis on the four areas of multicultural counseling competence and with greater incorporation of the four identified teaching strategies would report higher levels of multicultural competence at the end of the semester.

A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine how cultural identity and worldview variables contribute to multicultural competence using the CBMCS overall multicultural competence score at Time 2 as the dependent variable. Assumptions for multiple regression analysis were checked, including normal distribution of the variables, assessment of a linear relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variables, and homoscedasticity or equal variance across the levels of the variables. The first step in the regression was demographic characteristics to control for the influence of these factors. The second step included the three subscales of the EIS at Time 2. The third step was the overall score on the CoBRAS, and the final step was the course variables.

Separate hierarchical multiple regression analyses were done with the same steps to predict multicultural competence using the EMC subscales as the dependent variables. As the EMC also purports to measure multicultural competence but has not yet been used in this capacity, these analyses are important in establishing whether there is a relationship between the EMC and the multicultural counseling competencies. Again, the first step in the regression analysis was be demographic variables, followed by subscale scores from the EIS in the second step. The third step included the overall CoBRAS score, and the fourth step included the course variables. See Table 8 for a summary of the results of the regression analyses.

Table 8

Results of the Multiple Regression Analyses by measure of multicultural competence

Scale	t	p	β	F	df	p	adj. R^2
Everyday Multicultural Competence Scale							
Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn				30.15	2, 196	<.001*	.23
CoBRAS	-7.38	<.001	-.46				
EIS Exploration	1.71	.09	.11				
Resentment and Cultural Dominance				97.91	2, 190	<.001	.50
CoBRAS	13.92	<.001	.71				
Emphasis on MCC Factors	-2.98	.003	-.15				
Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy				15.70	2, 193	<.001	.13
CoBRAS	3.79	<.001	.25				
EIS Exploration	-3.75	<.001	-.25				
Empathic Perspective-Taking				25.31	1, 188	<.001	.12
Racial Identity	5.74	<.001	.38				
Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege				169.24	2, 196	<.001	.63
CoBRAS	-18.40	<.001	-.80				
EIS Resolution	-1.44	<.001	-.06				
Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally				13.98	3, 189	<.001	.17
CoBRAS	-5.70	<.001	-.38				
EIS Resolution	2.15	.03	.14				
Teaching Strategies	2.45	.02	.16				
California Brief Multicultural Competence Scale				16.83	2, 190	<.001*	.14
CoBRAS	-5.06	<.001	-.34				
EIS Resolution	2.36	.02	.16				

*Note: *$p \leq .007$*, two-tailed*

Overall, the model including all of the predictor variables was a significant predictor of multicultural competence at Time 2, $F(7, 176) = 4.69$, $p < .001$. R^2 for this model was .16, indicating that the model accounted for 16% of the variance in multicultural competence. However, many of the steps in the model did not contribute significantly to the predictive value of the model. Participants' racial identity (White or student of color) did not contribute significantly to the prediction of multicultural competence, $F(1,182) = .19$, $p = .66$. The next

step, including the levels of ethnic identity at Time 2, did contribute significantly to the prediction of multicultural competence, $F(3, 179) = 2.06$, $p = .05$. However, when these three subscales were viewed individually, only level of Resolution was a significant predictor, $t = 1.9$, $p = .05$. The next step of adding in the Color Blind Racial Attitudes overall score from Time 2 was also a significant predictor of multicultural competence in addition to the effect of racial identity and ethnic identity variables, $F(1, 178) = 23.00$, $p < .001$. Course variables did not add significantly to the model, $F(2, 176) = .40$, $p = .67$.

Based on the high number of variables that did not contribute significantly to the model, the analysis was completed again with only the CoBRAS overall Time 2 score and the EIS Resolution Time 2 score. This model was a significant predictor of overall multicultural competence, $F(2, 190) = 16.83$, $p < .001$. The R^2 for this model was .15, indicating that these two variables alone accounted for 15% of the variance in multicultural competence. This simplified model appears to be the most judicious way of representing the relationship between ethnic identity and multicultural competence.

These analyses were repeated for each of the subscales on the EMC. For Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn, the full model was again significant, $F(7, 183) = 7.54$, $p < .001$. Overall, R^2 was .22, indicating that it accounted for 22% of the variance of the outcome. Again, however, the only two variables that contributed significantly to the model: CoBRAS overall score and EIS Exploration. The model was run again with only these two variables, and was found to be a better predictor than the more complicated model, $F(2, 196) = 30.15$, $p < .001$, with $R^2 = .24$. This simpler model accounted for 24% of the variance in Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn. Participants with lower levels of color blind racial attitudes and higher levels of

exploration of their ethnic identity would be expected to have higher levels of Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn.

For Resentment and Cultural Dominance, the full model was a significant predictor of the Time 2 score, $F(7, 180) = 27.70$, $p < .001$. The overall model had an R^2 of .52, indicating that the full model accounted for 52% of the variance in Resentment and Cultural Dominance. Upon examination of the factors, only the CoBRAS overall score and the level of emphasis on the four areas of multicultural competence in the course were significant predictors. When the model was fit with only these two variables as predictors, it was still a significant predictor of Resentment and Cultural Dominance, $F(2, 190) = 97.91$, $p < .001$. The R^2 for the simpler model was .51, indicating that it accounted for 51% of the variance. This is roughly equivalent to the amount of variance accounted for by the more complex model; therefore, the simpler model is more appropriate. Participants who reported higher levels of color blind racial attitudes and lower levels of attention paid to the 4 aspects of multicultural competence in their course would be expected to have higher levels of Resentment and Cultural Dominance.

For Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy, the full model was again a significant predictor, $F(7, 180) = 5.25$, $p < .001$, and accounted for 17% of the variance ($R^2 = .17$). However, only the CoBRAS score and level of Exploration on the EIS were significant predictors. When the model was run again with only these two variables, it was a significant predictor of Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy, $F(2, 193) = 15.70$, $p < .001$. This simpler model accounted for 14% of the variance. Participants with higher levels of color-blind racial attitudes and lower levels of exploration of their ethnic identity would be expected to have higher levels of Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy.

For Empathic Perspective-Taking, the only variable that was a significant predictor of variance was racial identity (i.e., White students, students of color). When this was the only factor, the model was significant, $F(1, 198) = 32.95$, $p < .001$, and accounted for 14% of the variance. None of the other variables contributed significantly after controlling for the impact of race. Students of color would be expected to have higher levels of Empathic Perspective-Taking than students who identify as White.

For Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege, the full model was a significant predictor, $F(7,182) = 47.67$, $p < .001$. This model accounted for 65% of the variance. However, only the CoBRAS score and Resolution on the EIS were significant predictors. When the model was fit again with only these two factors, the model was a significant predictor, $F(2, 196) = 169.24$, $p < .001$. This simpler model accounted for 63% of the variance. Participants who have lower levels of color blind racial attitudes and higher levels of resolution of what their ethnic identity means to them would be expected to have higher levels of Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege.

For Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally, the overall model was again a significant predictor, $F(7, 181) = 6.27$, $p < .001$, and accounted for 20% of the variance. Only 3 of the factors were significant predictors of the outcome- EIS Resolution, CoBRAS Time 2 score, and Teaching Strategies utilized in the course. When the model was fit again using only these three variables, it was again a significant predictor, $F(3, 189) = 13.98$, $p < .001$. It accounted for 18% of the variance. Participants who have lower levels of color blind racial attitudes, higher levels of resolution of what their ethnic identity means, and participated in courses that utilized more of the identified teaching strategies would be expected to have higher levels of Empathic Feelings and Acting as an Ally.

Chapter 5

Discussion

This chapter provides a discussion of the results presented in Chapter 4. An interpretation of what these results mean in the larger context will be provided, as well as a discussion of how these results converge with and diverge from previous research on the topic. This chapter will also include a discussion of limitations of the current study, and potential areas for continued future research.

Current Study

The current study examined the relationship between identity and worldview variables and multicultural competence for counseling students enrolled in a Master's level multicultural counseling course. There were some important differences in some of the scores based on racial identity (i.e., White students, students of color). For example, on the Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally subscale of the Everyday Multicultural Competencies Scale (EMC), students of color reported higher scores at Time 1 than students who identified as White. This may be due to different lived experiences, as students who identify as a member of a racial or ethnic minority group may be more likely to have experienced marginalization and feel empathy for other groups who are also experiencing marginalization. These same students may be more likely to take action against social injustice. White students generally had lower levels of ethnic identity development, higher levels of color-blind racial attitudes, and lower levels of competence on the EMC. These differences were fewer at Time 2, indicating that many of the gaps had closed between students of color and White students at the conclusion of a graduate level multicultural counseling course. These results are consistent with past research that students of color enter

multicultural counseling courses with higher levels of multicultural competence, but White students generally catch up over the course of the semester (Chao, Wei, Good, & Flores, 2010).

One interesting exception to the above-mentioned differences was the overall multicultural competence scale on the California Brief Multicultural Competence Scale (CBMCS). At both Time 1 and Time 2, there were no differences in scores between White students and students of color. This is inconsistent with previous research, which shows racial differences at the beginning of the semester (Chao, Wei, Good, & Flores, 2010; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994). The measures of multicultural competence were similar in this study and the previous study, as the CBMCS was partially based on the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MCKAS; Ponterotto et al., 2002), and these measures have not been shown to have a relationship with social desirability measures (Gamst, Liang, & Der-Karabetian, 2011; Roberts, 2006). Students who endorse high levels of multicultural competence on the CBMCS do not also endorse high levels of endorsing responses that would make them appear more adherent to social norms or what they believe others want them to respond.

However, these questions do have a high level of face validity. It is very obvious what they are assessing. They may be measuring confidence in abilities rather than actual competence. It would make sense that White students feel a similar level of confidence in their abilities to work with others who are different from themselves as students of color do, although they may lack the experience, knowledge, and awareness to support their confidence. This is consistent with the fact that White students reported significantly different scores on the subscales of the EMC, which measure attitudes underlying multicultural competence, at Time 1 than students of color. Although there were significant relationships between the subscales of the EMC and overall multicultural competence on the CBMCS, the correlations were not strong, ranging only

between .21 and .38. These measures likely measure different constructs or aspects of multicultural competence. The EMC subscales may be tapping into attitudes underlying multicultural competence in a way that participants are more willing and able to recognize in themselves.

An interesting aspect of the differences in scores on the Ethnic Identity Scale (EIS) was the Affirmation subscale. Students of color reported a moderate decrease in positive feelings about their identity, although White students' reported scores remained the same across the course of the semester. Again, this difference may reflect a change in overall identity development stage. However, it could also reflect that students of color genuinely felt less positively about their ethnic identity at the end of the semester than at the beginning. Much of the past research has looked at the identity development profile as a whole rather than each of the subscales individually (i.e. Neville et al, 1996; Ladany et al, 1997) , so it is difficult to ascertain whether this finding is consistent with past research or not. Students may have moved from a place of positive feelings about their identity without having investigated what that identity meant to them to a more nuanced state of understanding both the positive and negative aspects of their ethnic identity. Although looking at each of the subscales individually does not allow a comparison to past research, it may allow a better understanding of how each of these factors change individually. Due to the long-standing nature of identity development, a semester may not be long enough to see substantial change in identity development status; therefore, using subscale scores may be better able to reflect the subtle changes that occur across the course of the semester.

Students enrolled in a multicultural counseling course reported higher levels of exploration of what their ethnic identity means to them at the end of the semester as compared to

the beginning, as well as lower levels of resolution of what their identity means to them. Students explored more about their own ethnic identity, but reported less concrete resolution about what their identity means in the larger context of mainstream culture. These results may be consistent with previous research which demonstrates that students enrolled in a multicultural counseling course moved to more advanced stages of identity development at the end of the course than at the beginning of the course (Neville et al., 1996). As the current research used each of the subscales separately, rather than as a pattern of scores associated with a stage of identity development, it is difficult to know if the current participants' decline in resolution was due to an improved understanding of what their ethnic identity means for them. If so, that would represent a more advanced identity development stage, as people in earlier stages of identity development may have high levels of resolution of what their ethnic identity means although they have not engaged in any exploration. An increase in exploration coupled with an increase in resolution could signal that participants gained an understanding that they did not fully appreciate their ethnic identity the way they previously believed they did.

Participants reported higher levels of multicultural competence on nearly every measure at Time 2 as compared to Time 1. This is consistent with past research which shows improvements in multicultural competence across the course of a multicultural counseling course (Chao et al., 2010; Smith, Constantine, Dunn, Dinehart, & Montoya, 2006). The two exceptions to this pattern were the Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn and Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy subscales on the EMC. Although students reported similar levels of Cultural Openness and Desire to Learn at both times, this is not surprising as initial scores were quite high and there was very little room to increase from there. It is also not surprising that counseling students report high levels of openness to learning about others at both time points.

Students also reported similar levels of Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy between Time 1 and Time 2, although this difference was approaching significance. Scores on this measure were low overall, indicating that levels of anxiety were consistently low between timepoints.

Students who reported higher scores on the EIS subscales at Time 1 did not report higher levels of multicultural competence at Time 1. However, at Time 2, participants who reported higher levels of ethnic identity development, and in particular higher levels of understanding what their ethnic identity means to them, also reported higher levels of multicultural competence. Part of this difference between the two timepoints may be due to the properties of the CBMCS, as it is very dependent on a participant's level of confidence in their abilities. At the beginning of the semester, participants may report high levels of multicultural competence because they are not aware that they do not possess the skills required to engage in different types of work. By the end of the semester, they may be more aware of the work they have left to do in order to obtain the competencies. Those who better understand what their ethnic identity means to them at the end of the semester also reported higher levels of multicultural competence.

The overall change in reported ethnic identity development was also not related to the reported increase in multicultural competence across the course of the semester. Students who reported higher levels of change on the EIS subscales did not report higher levels of multicultural competence at the end of the semester.

In the models of predicting multicultural competence at the end of the semester, there were only five factors that were associated with any of the seven scales and subscales that measured multicultural competence in this study. The level of color-blind racial attitudes, as measured by the overall score of the CoBRAS, was associated with six out of the seven,

69

including the CBMCS overall score, and the Cultural Openness Desire to Learn, Resentment and Cultural Dominance, Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy, Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege, and Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally subscales of the EMC. Higher levels of color-blind racial attitudes were associated with higher levels of Resentment and Cultural Dominance and Anxiety and Lack of Multicultural Self-Efficacy. Participants who had lower levels of colorblind racial attitudes had lower levels of overall multicultural competence, Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege, and Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally. This pattern is consistent with what would be expected, as colorblind racial attitudes reflect the opposite sentiment of what would be conceptualized as multicultural competence. Those who hold high levels of colorblind racial attitudes generally believe that race is not an important factor in the lives of others, and fail to appreciate the systemic factors that are at play for many of their potential clients. A lack of understanding of these systemic barriers and structural influences has been shown to be associated with lower levels of multicultural competence (Toporek & Pope-Davis, 2005). There may also be significant differences in how multicultural competence training influences students who enter the course with different levels of colorblind racial attitudes, consistent with the research of Todd, Spanierman, and Poteat (2011) demonstrating that initial levels of colorblind racial attitudes influenced students interactions with future multicultural training opportunities. Although the fact that the CoBRAS scale would be the most consistent predictor of multicultural competence is not consistent with the hypotheses of this study, it is consistent with past research demonstrating a connection between color-blind racial attitudes and multicultural competence (Chao, et al., 2010).

There were several factors for which aspects of ethnic identity development were significant predictors. Participants who reported higher levels of understanding of what their ethnic identity means to them were more likely to report higher levels of multicultural competence, as well as empathy and likelihood to engage in actions as an ally. This is consistent with what would be expected, as those who have resolved what their identity means to them would also be expected to have engaged in reflection about how that fits in with the larger society, as well as what that may mean for others. However, they were also more likely to report lower levels of Awareness of Contemporary Racism and Privilege, with is inconsistent with this expectation. Participants who reported higher levels of exploring what their ethnic identity means to them were more likely to report being open to learning about other cultures, and less likely to report anxiety about working with others from different cultures. This is consistent with expectations, as it would be expected that individuals who have engaged in learning about their own culture may also be interested in learning about other cultures, and would also be less anxious about different cultures if they understand how their culture relates to others.

Course variables, including teaching methods and topics covered in the course, were positively related to Empathic Feeling and Acting as an Ally, and negatively related to Resentment and Cultural Dominance. Participants who were enrolled in courses with a greater focus on the four aspects of multicultural competence and greater use of the common teaching strategies were more likely to report being comfortable engaging in activism as an ally, and were less likely to endorse feeling that their culture was the dominant one. This result is not consistent with past research showing that courses that had a theoretical foundation led to greater improvements in multicultural competence than those that did not (Smith et al., 2006; Mallott, 2010). However, this result may be due to a lack of variability in the teaching methods and topics

covered in the course rather than a lack of impact of a theoretical basis. Many of the courses used a similar approach to teaching and had similar emphases on factors of multicultural competence. There was not as much variability in overall course variables as was initially expected, which could contribute to the lack of impact that course variables had on the model.

Only race was a significant predictor of Empathic Perspective-Taking. Students of color were more likely to report higher levels of empathy than White students. This is particularly interesting because it suggests there is no one factor measured in this study that is consistently related to this scale outside of racial identity. Questions on this scale ask about comfort and ability to take the perspective of others who are from different cultures from themselves, as well as to understand frustrations that others may experience from discrimination. The fact that this scale was not related to anything other than race suggests that White students may have overall difficulty in understanding the experiences of students of color that are not related to their own levels of understanding their ethnic identity, nor their levels of color-blind racial attitudes.

Implications for Practice

Promoting overall multicultural competence is a goal of multicultural counseling courses at the Master's level. For many students enrolled in these courses, this is their first introduction to cultural differences and working closely with others who are from different cultures than themselves. Understanding how multicultural competence changes over the course of the semester, as well as how it is related to personal identity development factors, can help instructors of these courses select the most effective teaching methods to promote overall multicultural competence.

Results of this study demonstrate that color-blind racial attitudes, or the belief that race or color does not have an influence on whether someone is successful, are strongly related to

multicultural competence. Those who endorsed higher levels of adherence to color-blind racial attitudes, or endorsed feelings that opportunities are equal for everyone, generally had lower levels of multicultural competence. For instructors, it may be important to specifically target these types of beliefs in order to improve multicultural competence. However, students who endorse color-blind racial attitudes can also be the most difficult to connect with in classes that challenge those types of beliefs. This is consistent with past research which shows that students who endorsed greater levels of color-blind racial attitudes had lower levels of change in multicultural competence across the course of the semester (Chao et al., 2010).

One strategy many instructors have adopted in order to improve overall multicultural competence is self-awareness. This study examined how one aspect of self-awareness, ethnic identity, may be related to multicultural competence. Level of ethnic identity resolution was a positive predictor of overall multicultural competence and empathic feeling and acting as an ally, which indicates that teaching strategies that promote ethnic identity development and help students come to a better understanding of what that identity means to them may be effective in developing overall multicultural competence. Level of ethnic identity exploration was a positive predictor of cultural openness and desire to learn about others, indicating that engaging in practices that promoting self-understanding also predicted willingness to learn about others. It was a negative predictor of anxiety and lack of multicultural self-efficacy. Students who had engaged in exploration about their own ethnic identity were less anxious about working with others from different cultures.

An overall adherence to the teaching strategies included in this study, which includes a focus on personal awareness, knowledge of cultural groups, experiential learning, and application of skills, was predictive of greater empathic feeling and acting as an ally. Students

73

who were enrolled in courses with a higher emphasis on these four aspects were more likely to endorse empathic feelings towards others and a willingness to engage in activism. It is important to note that the majority of classes included aspects such as knowledge of cultural groups and an experiential learning assignment, while most classes did not include an aspect of application of skills. This is consistent with the findings of Collins and Arthur (2010) that the skills aspect can be difficult to operationalize to include in courses. Further evaluation of whether including a focus on skills contributed to the difference in acting as an ally as students may feel more comfortable engaging in skills that they have had experience using.

Students who were enrolled in courses that included a greater emphasis on each of the four areas of multicultural competence, awareness, knowledge, skills, and actions, were less likely to endorse feelings that their majority culture should be the dominant one, as well as resentment towards other cultures. Including an emphasis on each of these four areas may also be important for promoting this aspect of multicultural competence, consistent with the findings of Smith, et al (2006) that inclusion of a theoretical basis is important for promoting multicultural competence.

Limitations and Implications for Future Research

There are several aspects of the current research that should be noted as limitations. One is the lack of a control group in order to compare changes that may occur over the course of any semester enrolled in a counseling program. While this study hoped to evaluate changes that specifically occur during enrollment in a multicultural counseling course, it is highly likely that the majority of students who participated in this study were also enrolled in other courses at the same time. It is difficult to assess what changes in multicultural competence may occur just as a result of enrollment in courses that encourage students to reflect on themselves and the way they

interact with the world in general, which is common in counseling courses, as compared to the specific impact the multicultural counseling course has. Future research could benefit from having a control group included to control for this.

There was also significant difficulty in recruiting participants for this study. Due to the large sample size required, online data collection was necessary in addition to in-person recruitment when possible. While the participation rate was high for in-person recruitment, very few students responded to email invitations to participate in the study. This was likely partly due to the large amounts of emails that students receive at the beginning of the semester, and a lack of personal acquaintance with the principal investigators. Other factors that may have contributed include a lack of instructor promotion of the study, as well as the initial incentive of being entered into a lottery. When the incentive was changed to provide an incentive for all participants in the study rather than as a lottery format, the initial participation rate for online participation greatly improved. The rate of participants completing the second survey also greatly improved when incentives were provided to all participants. The end of the semester can be a very busy time, and the possibility of gaining a reward was likely not enough incentive to add another task to their plate at the end of a semester. On the other hand, offering extra credit was a very effective recruitment method. Courses in which extra credit was offered, whether it was in-person or online recruiting, had very high rates of participation and completion of the study.

This study looked at the Ethnic Identity Scale subscales as three separate variables rather than conducting a cluster analysis to determine an overall identity development stage. While this method had several advantages, such as being able to see how each of the three subscales change individually rather than as a part of an identity development stage, it also made it more difficult

to put the results in the context of the other research that has been completed. Future research that includes an overall ethnic identity development stage could help to better contextualize the results.

There were several aspects of course variables that were associated with overall multicultural competence. However, many of the course variables had a low level of variability between the courses; i.e., the majority of courses either did or did not include a particular element. There were several elements that were only included in a few courses, such as a focus on the aspect of action. Taking a closer look at how these aspects influence multicultural competence individually, rather than as a combined score, may give a better perspective of how course variables relate to multicultural competence.

Future research should also include an emphasis on evaluating multicultural competence as opposed to confidence. There were significant differences between scores on the CBMCS, which has been used in more research to assess multicultural competence, and the EMC, which focuses more broadly on attitudes that may underlie multicultural competence. The CBMCS may evaluate feelings of multicultural confidence, which may not be an accurate reflection of someone's competence. Those who lack the knowledge that there are differences in working with different populations may rate themselves highly on ability to work with others from different cultural groups, although they may lack the skills to do so effectively. On the other hand, individuals who are more aware of the skills needed to work with others who are different from themselves may rate themselves lower, as they recognize their limitations, although they may be more competent than those who are unaware. Future research would benefit from including multiple aspects of measuring multicultural competence, such as was done in the

current study. A more thorough examination of the relationships between the aspects of multicultural competence is necessary.

Overall, this study demonstrates the importance of continued research into how multicultural competence and ethnic identity development interact, and particularly how they interact in the context of enrollment in a multicultural counseling course. As an understanding of their own individual identities is an important part of developing overall multicultural competence (Ratts, et al, 2016), better understanding this relationship will help to promote better practices in increasing overall multicultural competence. One of the most consistent results of this study is the importance of addressing colorblind racial attitudes in early training. Colorblind racial attitudes were associated with many aspects of overall multicultural competence, and addressing beliefs such as these may be the most effective way to improve overall multicultural competence. Connecting this with improved understanding of what one's own identity means in the larger context of society may be an effective strategy for improving competence for students who are in an introductory multicultural counseling course.

References

Abreu, J. M., Gim Chung, R. H., & Atkinson, D. R. (2000). Multicultural counseling training: Past, present, and future directions. *The Counseling Psychologist, 28(5),* 641-656.

American Psychological Association. (1994). *Guidelines and principles for accreditation of programs in professional psychology.* Washington, DC.

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

Arredondo, P., Toporek, R., Brown, S. P., Jones, J., Locke, D. C., Sanchez, J., & Stadler, H. (1996). Operationalization of the multicultural counseling competencies. AMCD: Alexandria, VA.

Association of Black Psychologists. (2015). *Our History*. Retrieved from
http://www.abpsi.org/about_history.html

Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development. (2015). *An Historical Sketch (1972-2002)*. Retrieved from
http://www.multiculturalcounseling.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=93&Itemid=88.

Brown, S. P., Yonker, R., & Parham, T. A. (1996). Influence of a cross-cultural training course on racial identity attitudes of White women and men: Preliminary perspectives. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 74,* 510-516.

Council for Accreditation for Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2009). 2009
    standard for accreditation standards. Alexandria, VA: CACREP.

Cass, V. C. (1979). Homosexual identity formation: A theoretical model. *Journal of
    Homosexuality, 4*(3), 219-235.

Cates, J. T., Schaefle, S. E., Smaby, M. H., Maddux, C. D., & LeBeauf, I. (2007). Comparing
    multicultural with general counseling knowledge and skill competency for students who
    completed counselor training. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 35,*
    26-39.

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

Chao, R. C., Wei, M, Good, G. E., & Flores, L. Y (2010). Race/ethnicity, color-blind racial
    attitudes, and multicultural competence: The moderating effects of multicultural
    counseling training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58(1),* 72-82.

Cokley, K. O. (2007). Critical issues in the measurement of ethnic and racial identity: A
    referendum on the state of the field. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54,* 224-239.

Collins, A. & Arthur, N. (2010). Culture-infused counseling: A fresh look at a classic framework
    on multicultural counselling competencies. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 23*, 203 -
    216.

Constantine, M. G. (2001). Predictors of observer ratings of multicultural counseling competence in Black, Latino, and White American trainees. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48(4),* 456-462.

Constantine, M. G. (2002a). Predictors of satisfaction with counseling: Racial and ethnic minority clients' attitudes toward counseling and ratings of their counselors' general and multicultural counseling competence. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 49,* 255-263.

Constantine, M. G. (2002b). Racism attitudes, White racial identity attitudes, and multicultural counseling competence in school counselor trainees. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41,* 162-174.

Constantine, M. G., & Ladany, N. (2000). Self-report multicultural counseling scales: Their relation to social desirability attitudes and multicultural case conceptualization ability. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47,* 155-164.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (1994). *Accreditation and procedures manual and application.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2016). *CACREP vital statistics 2015: Results from a national survey of accredited programs.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

Cross, T., Bazron, B, Dennis, K., & Isaacs, M. (1989). *Towards a Culturally Competent System of Care, Volume I.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Child Development Center, CASSP Technical Assistance Center.

Cross, W. E., Jr. (1971). The Negro-to-Black conversion experience. Black World, *20*, 13-27.

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

Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.

Fischer, A. R., & Moradi, B. (2001). Racial and ethnic identity: Recent developments and needed directions. In J.G. Ponterotto, J.M. Casas, L.A. Suzuki, and C.M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of Multicultural Counseling* (pp. 341-370). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fuertes, J., & Brobst, K. (2002). Clients' ratings of counselor multicultural competency. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 8(3),* 214-223.

Gamst, G., Dana, R. H., Der-Karabetian, A., Aragon, M., Arellano, L., Morrow, G., & Martenson, L. (2004). Cultural competency revised: The California Brief Multicultural Competence Scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 37,* 163-183.

Gamst, G. C., Liang, D. T. H., & Der-Karabetian, A. (2011). *Handbook of multicultural measures.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Helms, J. E. (1996). Toward a methodology for measuring and assessing racial identity as distinguished from ethnic identity. In G. Sodowsky & J. Impara (Eds.), *Multicultural Assessment in Counseling and Clinical Psychology* (pp. 143-192). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurement.

Helms, J. E. (1997). How multiculturalism obscures race and culture as differential aspects of counseling competency. In D. B. Pope-Davis & H. Coleman (Eds.), *Multicultural Counseling Competencies: Assessment, education, and training, and supervision* (pp. 60-79). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Helms, J. E. (1997). Implication of Behrens (1997) for the validity of the White Racial Identity

    Attitude Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44,* 13-16.

Hunley, P. H., Lidderdale, M. A., Thiagarajan, M., & Null, U. (2004). Identity development and

    multicultural competency. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32,*

    283- 295.

Jackson, M. J. (1995). Multicultural counseling: Historical perspectives. In J. G. Ponterotto, J.

    M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling*

    (pp. 3-16). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ladany, N., Inman, A. G., Constantine, M. G., & Hofheinz, E. W. (1997). Supervisee

    multicultural case conceptualization ability and self-reported multicultural competence as

    functions of supervisee racial identity and supervisor focus. *Journal of Counseling*

    Psychology, 44(3), 284-293.

LaFramboise, T.D., Coleman, H. L. K., & Hernandez, A. (1991). Development and factor

    structure of the Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised. *Professional Psychology:*

    Research and Practice, 22, 380-388.

Mallinckrodt, B., Miles, J. R., Bhaskar, T., Chery, N, Choi, G, & Sung, M. (2014). Developing a

    comprehensive scale to assess college multicultural programming. *Journal of Counseling*

    Psychology, 61(1), 135-145.

Malott, K. M. (2010). Multicultural counselor training in a single course: Review of research.

    Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 38, 51- 63.

Marcia, J. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent*

    psychology (pp. 159-187). New York: Wiley.

Master's in Psychology and Counseling Accreditation Council (MPCAC). (2014). MPCAC
accreditation manual. Latham, NY: MPCAC.

Morrow, K. A., & Deidan, C. T. (1992). Bias in the counseling process: How to recognize and
avoid it. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*, 571-577.

Munley, P. H., Lidderdale, M. A., Thiagarajan, M., & Null, U. (2004). Identity development and
multicultural competency. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32,*
283-295.

Neville, H. A., Lilly, R. L., Duran, G., Lee, R. M., & Browne, L. (2000) Construction and initial
validation of the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS), *Journal of Counseling
Psychology, 47 (1),* 59-70.

Neville, H. A., Heppner, M.J., Louie, C. E., Thompson, C. E., Brooks, L., & Baker, C. E. (1996).
The impact of multicultural training on White racial identity attitudes and therapy
competencies. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 27(1),* 83-89.

Phinney, J. S., & Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity:
Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54,* 271-281.

Pole, N., Gone, J. P., & Kulkarni, M. (2008) Posttraumatic stress disorder among ethnoracial
minorities in the United States. *Clinical Psychology: Science & Practice, 15(1),* 35–61

Ponterotto, J. G., & Alexander, C. M. (1996). Assessing the multicultural competence of
counselors and clinicians. In L. A. Suzuki, P. J. Meller, & J. G. Ponterotto (Eds.),
*Handbook of multicultural assessment: Clinical, psychological, and educational
appllications* (2nd ed., pp. 651-672). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ponterotto, J. G. (1997). Multicultural counseling training: A competency model and national
survey. In D. B. Pope-Davis & H. L. K. Coleman (Vol. Eds.), *Multicultural aspects of*

counseling series: Vol. 7. Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education and training, and supervision (pp. 111-130). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ponterotto, J. G., Gretchen, D., Utsey, S. O., Rieger, B. P., & Austin, R. (2002). A revision of the Multicultural Counseling Awareness Scale. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 30,* 153-180.

Pope-Davis, D. B. & Dings, J. G. (1994). An empirical comparison of two self-report multicultural counseling competency inventories. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 27,* 93-102.

Pope-Davis, D. B., & Ottavi, T. M. (1994). Examining the association between self-expressed multicultural counseling competencies of graduate students in psychology. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 26,* 322-329.

Priester, P. E., Jones, J. E., Jackson-Bailey, C. M., Jana-Masri, A., Jordan, E. X., & Metz, A. J. (2008). An analysis of content in instructional strategies in multicultural counseling courses. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 36,* 29-39.

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,* 28-48.

Reynolds, A. (1997). Using the multicultural change intervention matrix (MCIM) as a multi-cultural training model. In D. B. Pope-Davis & H. L. Coleman (Eds.), *Multicultural Aspects of Counseling Series: Vol. 7. Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education, and training, and supervision* (pp. 209-226). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rogers-Sirin, L. (2008). Approaches to multicultural training for professionals: A guide for

    choosing an appropriate program. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice,*

    39(3), 313-319.

Sammons, C. C. & Speight, S. L. (2008). A qualitative investigation of graduate-student changes

    associated with multicultural counseling courses. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36(6),*

    814-838.

Schmidt, C. (2007). Racial/ethnic identity formation and ego development. *Dissertation*

    Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 68(1-A), 96.

Sevig, T. D., Highlen, P. S., & Adams, E. M. (2000). Development and validation of the Self-

    Identity Inventory (SII): A multicultural identity development instrument. *Cultural*

    Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 6, 168-182.

Smedley, A. (1999). *Race in North America: Origin and evolution of a worldview.* Boulder, CO:

    Westview Press.

Smedley, B. D., Smith, A. Y., & Nelson, A. R. (2003). *Unequal treatment: Confronting racial*

    and ethnic disparities in health care. Washington, DC: National Academic Press.

Smith, T. B., Constantine, M. G., Dunn, T. W., Dinehart, J. M., & Montoya, J. A. (2006).

    Multicultural education in the mental health professions: A meta-analytic review. *Journal*

    of Counseling Psychology, 53(1), 132-145.

Sodowsky, G. R., Kuo-Jackson, P. Y., Richardson, M. F., & Corey, A. T. (1998). Correlates of

    self-reported multicultural competencies: Counselor multicultural social desirability,

    race, social inadequacy, locus of control racial ideology, and multicultural training.

    Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45(3), 256-264.

Sodowsky, G. R., Taffe, R. C., Gutkin, T. B., & Wise, S. L. (1994). Development of the

    Multicultural Counseling Inventory: A self-report measure of multicultural competencies.

    Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41, 137-148.

Spanierman, L. B. & Heppner, M. J. (2004). Psychosocial Costs of Racism to Whites scale

    (PRCW): Construction and initial validation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51,*

    249-262.

Spanierman, L. B., Oh, E., Poteat, V. P., Hund, A. R., McClair V. L. Beer, A. M., & Clarke, A.

    M. (2008). White university students' responses to societal racism: A qualitative

    investigation. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36,* 839-870.

Spanierman, L. B., Poteat, V. P., Wang Y-F., & Oh, E. (2008). Psychosocial Costs of Racism to

    Whites: Exploring patterns through cluster analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology,*

    55, 75-88.

Spanierman, L. B., & Soble, J. R. (2010). Understanding whiteness: Previous approaches and

    possible directions in the study of White racial attitudes and identity. In J. G. Ponterotto,

    J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.) *Handbook of Multicultural*

    Counseling, (3rd Ed., pp. 283-299). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sue, D. W. (1996). Multicultural counseling: Models, methods, and actions. *The Counseling*

    Psychologist, 24, 279-284.

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, 64-88.

Sue, D. W., Bernier, Y., Durran, A., Feinberg, L., Pedersen, P. B., Smith, E. J., & Vasquez-Nuttal, E. (1982). Position paper: Cross-cultural counseling competencies. *The Counseling Psychologist, 10,* 45-52.

Sue, D.W., & Sue, D. (2013). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Wiley.

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Todd, N. R., Spanierman, L. B., & Poteat, V. P. (2011). Longitudinal examination of the psychosocial costs of racism to Whites across the college experience. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 58(4)*, 508-521.

Tomlinson-Clarke, S. M., & Clarke, D. (2010). Culturally focused community-centered service learning: An international cultural immersion experience. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 28,* 166-175.

Toporek, R. L., & Pope-Davis, D. B. (2005). Exploring the relationships between multicultural training, racial attitudes, and attributions of poverty among graduate counseling trainees. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 11(3),* 259-271.

Umaña-Taylor, A.J., & Shin, N. (2007). An examination of ethnic identity and self-esteem with diverse populations: Exploring validation by ethnicity and geography. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 13,* 178-186.

Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Vargas-Chanes, D., Garcia, C. D., & Gonzales-Backen, M. (2008). A longitudinal examination of Latino adolescents' ethnic identity, coping with discrimination, and self-esteem. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 28,* 16-50.

Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Yazedjian, A., & Bamaca-Gomez, M. (2004). Developing the Ethnic

Identity Scale using Eriksonian and social identity perspectives. *Identity, 4,* 9-38.

U.S. Census Bureau (2015). *Projections of the size and composition of the U.S. population:*

2014-2060. Retrieved from

http://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2015/demo/p25-

1143.pdf

Weathersby, A. (2005). The effects of multicultural education on White racial consciousness.

Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 65(9-B),

4901.

Yoon, E. (2011). Measuring ethnic identity in the Ethnic Identity Scale and the Multigroups

Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology,*

17(2), 144-155.

Yoon, E., Langrehr, K., & Ong, L. (2011). Content analysis of acculturation research in

counseling and counseling psychology: A 22-year review. *Journal of Counseling*

Psychology, 58, 83-96.

Appendix A

Demographics

1. Age:_____
2. Gender:
    a. Female
    b. Male
    c. Transgender
    d. Other:_____
3. Race (select all that apply):
    a. White or Caucasian
    b. Black or African American
    c. Latino/a or Hispanic
    d. Asian or Pacific Islander
    e. Native American or Alaska Native
    f. Other:_____
4. Program currently enrolled in:_____
5. Program accreditation or certification (select all that apply):
    a. CACREP
    b. MCAC
    c. State licensure certification
    d. Unknown
6. Number of credits completed in program:_____
7. Total number of credits required for graduation:_____
8. Expected date of graduation:_____
9. Have you had Clinical experience in your program yet?
    a. No
    b. Yes
        i. Please Describe:_____

10. Outside of your current multicultural counseling course, what other formal multicultural training have you completed?_____

11. What informal multicultural training have you completed?_____

Ethnic Identity Scale

The U.S. is made up of people of various ethnicities. Ethnicity refers to cultural traditions, beliefs, and behaviors that are passed down through generations. Some examples of the ethnicities that people may identify with are Mexican, Cuban, Nicaraguan, Chinese, Taiwanese, Filipino, Jamaican, African American, Haitian, Italian, Irish, and German. In addition, some people may identify with more than one ethnicity. When you are answering the following questions, we'd like you to think about what YOU consider your ethnicity to be.

Please write what you consider to be your ethnicity here
_____ and refer to this ethnicity as you answer the questions below.

	Does not describe me at all 1	Does not describe me 2	Describes me somewhat 3	Describes me very well 4
1. I have participated in activities that have taught me about my ethnicity				
2. I have participated in activities that have exposed me to my ethnicity				
3. I have read books/magazines/newspapers or other materials that have taught me about my ethnicity				
4. I have attended events that have helped me learn more about my ethnicity				
5. I have learned about my ethnicity by doing things such as reading (books, magazines, newspapers), searching the Internet, or keeping up with current events				
6. I have experienced things that reflect my ethnicity, such as eating food, listening to music, and watching movies				
7. If I could choose, I would prefer to be of a different ethnicity				
8. I wish I were of a different ethnicity				

9. I feel negatively about my ethnicity				
10. I dislike my ethnicity				
11. I have not participated in any activities that would teach me about my ethnicity				
12. I am not happy with my ethnicity				
13. My feelings about my ethnicity are mostly negative				
14. I am clear about what my ethnicity means to me				
15. I understand how I feel about my ethnicity				
16. I have a clear sense of what my ethnicity means to me				
17. I know what my ethnicity means to me				

Appendix C

Color Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS)

1. White people in the US have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.
2. Race is very important in determining who is successful and who is not.
3. Race plays an important role in who gets sent to prison.
4. Race plays a major role in the type of social services (such as type of health care or day care) that people receive in the U.S.
5. Racial and ethnic minorities do not have the same opportunities as white people in the U.S.
6. Everyone who works hard, no matter what race they are, has an equal chance to become rich.
7. White people are more to blame for racial discrimination than racial and ethnic minorities.
8. Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against white people. White people in the U.S. are discriminated against because of the color of their skin.
9. English should be the only official language in the U.S.
10. Due to racial discrimination, programs such as affirmative action are necessary to help create equality.
11. Racial and ethnic minorities in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin.
12. It is important that people begin to think of themselves as American and not African American, Mexican American, or Italian American.
13. Immigrants should try to fit into the culture and values of the U.S.
14. Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations.
15. Talking about racial issues causes unnecessary tension.
16. Racism is a major problem in the U.S.
17. It is important for public schools to teach about the history and contributions of racial and ethnic minorities.
18. It is important for political leaders to talk about racism to help work through or solve society's problems.
19. Racism may have been a problem in the past, it is not an important problem today.

Appendix D

Everyday Multicultural Competencies Scale

1. I think it is important to be educated about cultures and countries other than my own.
2. I welcome the possibility that getting to know another culture might have a deep positive influence on me.
3. I admire the beauty in other cultures
4. I would like to work in an organization where I get to work with individuals from diverse backgrounds.
5. I would like to have dinner at someone's house who is from a different culture.
6. I am interested in participating in various cultural activities on campus.
7. Most Americans would be better off if they knew more about the cultures of other countries.
8. A truly good education requires knowing how to communicate with someone from another culture.
9. I welcome being strongly influenced by my contact with people from other cultures.
10. I believe the United States is enhanced by other cultures.
11. Members of minorities tend to overreact all the time.
12. When in America, minorities should make an effort to merge into American culture.
13. I do not understand why minority people need their own TV channels.
14. I fail to understand why members from minority groups complain about being alienated.
15. I feel irritated when people of different racial or ethnic backgrounds speak their language around me.
16. Minorities get in to school easier and some get away with minimal effort.
17. I am really worried about White people in the US soon becoming a minority due to so many immigrants.
18. I think American culture is the best culture.
19. I think members of the minority blame White people too much for their misfortunes.
20. People who talk with an accent should work harder to speak proper English.
21. I feel uncomfortable when interacting with people from different cultures.
22. I often find myself fearful of people of other races.
23. I doubt that I can have a deep or strong friendship with people who are culturally different.
24. I really don't know how to go about making friends with someone from a different culture.
25. I am afraid that new cultural experiences might risk losing my own identity.
26. I do not know how to find out what is going on in other countries.
27. I am not reluctant to work with others form different cultures in class activities or team projects.

28. It is easy for me to understand what it would feel like to be a person of another racial or ethnic background other than my own.
29. It is difficult for me to put myself in the shoes of someone who is racially and/or ethnically different from me.
30. It is difficult for me to relate to stories in which people talk about racial or ethnic discrimination they experience in their day to day lives.
31. I can relate to the frustration that some people feel about having fewer opportunities due to their racial or ethnic backgrounds.
32. I don't know a lot of information about important social and political events of racial and ethnic groups other than my own.
33. The US has a long way to go before everyone is truly treated equally.
34. For two babies born with the same potential, in the US today, in general it is still more difficult for a child of color to succeed than a White child.
35. I can see how other racial or ethnic groups are systematically oppressed in our society.
36. Today in the US White people still have many important advantages compared to other ethnic groups.
37. I am aware of how society differentially treats racial or ethnic groups other than my own.
38. I am aware of institutional barriers (e.g. restricted opportunities for job promotion) that discriminate against racial or ethnic groups other than my own.
39. Racism is mostly a thing of the past.
40. In American everyone has an equal opportunity for success.
41. I don't care if people make racist statements against other racial or ethnic groups.
42. I get disturbed when other people experience misfortunes due to their racial or ethnic background.
43. I am touched by movies or books about discrimination issues faced by racial or ethnic groups other than my own.
44. I share the anger of people who are victims of hate crimes (e.g. intentional violence because of race or ethnicity).
45. I rarely think about the impact of a racist or ethnic joke on the feelings of people who are targeted.
46. When I hear people make racist jokes, I tell them I am offended even though they are not referring to my racial or ethnic group.
47. When I see people who come from a different racial or ethnic background succeed in the public arena, I share their pride.
48. When I know my friends are treated unfairly because of their racial or ethnic backgrounds, I speak up for them.

Appendix E

California Brief Multicultural Competence Scale

Below is a list of statements dealing with multicultural issues within a mental health context. Please indicate the degree to which you agree with each statement by choosing the appropriate number.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I have an excellent ability to assess accurately the mental health needs of gay men.	1	2	3	4
2. I have an excellent ability to assess accurately the mental health needs of lesbians.	1	2	3	4
3. I have an excellent ability to assess accurately the mental health needs of persons with disabilities.	1	2	3	4
4. I have an excellent ability to assess accurately the mental health needs of older adults.	1	2	3	4
5. I have an excellent ability to assess accurately the mental health needs of men.	1	2	3	4
6. I have an excellent ability to assess accurately the mental health needs of persons who come from very poor socioeconomic backgrounds.	1	2	3	4
7. I have an excellent ability to assess accurately the mental health needs of women.	1	2	3	4
8. I am aware that counselors frequently impose their own cultural values on minority clients.	1	2	3	4
9. I am aware that being born a White person in this society carries with it certain advantages.	1	2	3	4
10. I am aware of institutional barriers which may inhibit minorities from using mental health services.	1	2	3	4
11. I am aware that being born a minority in this society brings with it certain challenges that White people do not have to face.	1	2	3	4
12. I am aware of how my cultural background and experiences have influenced my attitudes about psychological processes.	1	2	3	4
13. I can identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about different ethnic groups.	1	2	3	4
14. I have an excellent ability to critique multicultural research.	1	2	3	4
15. I have an excellent ability to identify the strengths and weaknesses of psychological tests in terms of their use with persons with	1	2	3	4

different cultural/racial/ethnic backgrounds.

16. I can discuss within group differences among ethnic groups (e.g., low socioeconomic status (SES) Puerto Rican client vs. high SES Puerto Rican client).	1	2	3	4
17. I can discuss research regarding mental health issues and culturally different populations.	1	2	3	4
18. I am knowledgeable of acculturation models for various minority groups.	1	2	3	4
19. My communication is appropriate for my clients.	1	2	3	4
20. I am aware of institutional barriers that affect the client.	1	2	3	4
21. I am aware of how my own values might affect my client.	1	2	3	4

Rachel Reinders-Saeman, MS, PC-IT

Education

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
> Pursuing PhD in Counseling Psychology, 2017 planned completion
>> Dissertation Title: Assessing the Relationships Between Multicultural Training, Cultural Identity, and Multicultural Counseling Competence Among Master's Level Counseling Students
>
> Master's degree in Counseling, May 2012
>> Community specialization

University of Wisconsin- Madison
> Bachelor of Arts in Psychology and Spanish, May 2009
> Comprehensive honors, Dean's List

Certifications and Skills

> Fluent in Spanish
> Professional Counselor-In Training (PC-IT)

Teaching Experience

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
> Instructor
>> Counseling 715: Multicultural Counseling   2014-2015
>> Counseling 765 & 970: Supervised Practicum in Community Counseling   2015
>> Counseling 600: Introduction to Community Counseling   2013
>>> Master's level counseling courses
>>
>> Educational Psychology 101: Pathways to Success   2013-2014
>>> Develop and implement curriculum to improve campus connection, retention, and academic success for first-year undergraduate students
>
> Co-Instructor
>> Counseling 600: Introduction to Community Counseling   2013
>> Counseling 800: Group Counseling Theory   2014

Marquette University
> Adjunct Instructor   2014-2016
>> Education 1220: Psychology of Human Development in a Diverse Society
>>> Undergraduate course designed to help future teachers develop an understanding and appreciation of how developmental models can assist them in their future careers
>>
>> Education 6340: Child and Adolescent Development   2016
>>> Graduate level course designed for teachers enrolled in the Teach For America program

Cardinal Stritch University
    Adjunct Instructor
        Psychology 547: Theories and Techniques of Individual Psychotherapy   2014
        Psychology 550: Substance Related Disorders   2015-2017
            Propose, design, and implement an online course that utilizes multimedia resources such as video, online lecture, and discussion boards

Carroll Univiersity   2014
    Adjunct Instructor
        Psychology 307: Experimental Psychology Lab

Research Experience

Research Assistant, (Re)Search for Change   2010- present
- University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
- Participate in all levels of research including design, analysis, and data collection
- Coordinate research assistant and participant schedules for qualitative interviews
- Focus on microaggression experience and identity development models

Member of Dr. Nadya Fouad's Research Team   2012- 2013
- University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
- Designed, implemented, and completed projects related to college retention efforts
- Designed and completed a study on family influence on Career Decision Making for Latino adults

Research Assistant, Milwaukee Young Parenthood Study   2010 - 2013
- University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
- Assisting with all aspects of research project, including designing data collection systems, recruitment, conducting semi-structured interviews, and data analysis
- Establish relationships and maintain contact with adolescent participants

Research Assistant, Adolescent Development Lab   2008
- University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Accurately gathered, coded and entered data
- Gained knowledge about adolescent development and research methods

Clinical Experience

Mendota Mental Health Institute   September 2016- Current
Pre-Doctoral Intern
- Work ethically and effectively with a forensic inpatient population
- Received specialized training in competency evaluation and working as a member of a diverse treatment team
- Complete rotations in inpatient risk assessment, competency evaluation, inpatient therapy, and outpatient therapy at a community clinic

St. Rose Youth and Family Center   May 2015 – December 2015
    Doctoral Practicum Student
- Conducted comprehensive evaluations with adolescents in the group home with ages 12-17
    - Gained experience in working with both the juvenile corrections systems and foster care system
- Effectively and accurately administer and interpret MMPI-A and WISC-IV

The Bridge Health Clinics
    Substance Abuse Counselor   February 2015 – July 2015
    Master's level Practicum Student   2011-2012
- Developed and conducted Spanish-speaking substance abuse treatment groups
- Managed initial evaluations for appropriateness for treatment
- Coordinated care with multiple community partners, including corrections systems

Children's Hospital of Wisconsin
    Doctoral Practicum Student   September 2014- May 2015
- Focused on:
    - Evaluation clinic, with particular focus on ADHD and anxiety assessments
    - Implemented Trauma Focused-CBT for anxiety and depression
    - Hospital Consultation Rotation

Jewish Family Services
    Doctoral Practicum Student   August 2013-May 2014
- Focused on:
    - Late Life Counseling- providing in-home counseling services to home-bound older adults
    - "Kids in the Middle" divorce support groups for kids ages 5-7
    - Individual mental health counseling with a variety of presenting concerns
    - Collaboration between service providers with different specializations

United Community Center
    Doctoral Practicum Student   June 2012-May 2013
- Focused on:
    - Substance abuse treatment with psycho-educational groups regarding relapse prevention and general mental health needs
    - Individual mental health counseling at Senior Center with Latino bilingual clients

Milwaukee Young Parenthood Study   2011
- Conducted treatment with pregnant adolescents and their partners according to study protocol
- Emphasized relationship and communication skills while assisting couples to process how this change in their life will affect them

Walker's Point Youth and Family Resource Center   2011
- Supervised the evening shift for adolescent residents
- Effectively handled interpersonal issues in the house
- Co-facilitated support group for the residents

National Service

Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development

Co-Chair, Program Evaluation Committee   2016
- Investigate and develop criteria for a potential AMCD endorsement of graduate programs
- Utilize current Multicultural Counseling Competencies to develop program criteria
- Integrate knowledge and information in order to operationalize process

Student Representative   2014-2016
- Develop graduate student programming for conference
- Cultivate student participation by holding town-hall meetings

National Latina/o Psychological Association

Elections Committee Member   2016

Mentoring Program Committee Member   2015-current
- Develop a program pairing mentors with graduate and undergraduate students
- Create a survey to facilitate effective pairing of mentors and mentees
- Support and education to pairs about what mentoring can look like

Interim Student Representative   2013
Student Representative   2014-2015
- Serve as liaison between student members and Leadership Council
- Work with Student Committee to plan student activities during conference
- Develop student programming in off-conference times

Reviewer, National Latino Psychological Association National Conference   2012

Professional Presentations

United Community Center

Psychoeducational Sessions- Senior Center   2013
"Navigating the Healthcare System" and "Stress Management"

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee College of Health Sciences

Guest Lecturer   2011
"How to Work with a Medical Interpreter"

Other Work Experience

Medical Interpreter: Un Idioma, LLC   2009-2010
Children's Hospital of Wisconsin   2010-2011
Wheaton Franciscan Healthcare   2011-2012
- Accurately and completely interpret patient interactions with medical staff
- Promote cultural understanding and patient care

Local Service

Forum on Latina/o Affairs, Planning Committee   2014-2016
      University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
- Assist with planning an event to bring together Latina/o community leaders to discuss issues currently facing the community
- Coordinate sponsorships for event

Counseling Psychology Student Association, Treasurer   June 2013 – May 2014
                       Vice President   June 2014- May 2015

Counseling Student Organization, Student Representative   2011-2012
- Liaison between students and faculty
- Bring student concerns to faculty and maintain communication

United Cerebral Palsy, Inclusion Facilitator   2008
- Aided teens with disabilities in the community
- Reinforced planned behavioral modifications

Badgerland Water Ski Show Team, Board Member   2004-2006, 2013-2015
                       Show Director   2015
- Manage team members and conflict situations effectively
- Create, write, produce and direct a theme show
- Promoted public relations events in the community

Additional Training

Dialectical Behavioral Therapy, Mendota Mental Health Institute   2017
Universidad del Valle, Guatemala   2011
- Attended Master's level supervision course in order to acquire more specialized training in conducting therapy in Spanish
- Familiarized self with mental health service provision in other countries and cultures

National Network for Eliminating Disparities LEARN participant   2012
- Attended multi-day training session focused on a specific under-served population
- Received training and education on Culturally Adapted CBT for Depression in order to provide better care for Latino clients
- Gained experience with and resources for using the Spanish language in the counseling relationship

Professional Conference Presentations

Reinders-Saeman, R. & Hipolito-Delgado, C. (2015) *Understanding the Practices of Counselors who are Allies to Communities of Color: Implications for Counselor Education*. Poster presented at American Counseling Association Conference, Orlando, FL.

Reinders, R. (2014, October) *Linguistic Competence with Latin@ LGBT clients*. Symposium session presented at the National Latino/Latina Psychological Association conference, Albuquerque, NM.

Reinders, R., Kern, L., & Altamirano, L. (2014, October) *The Power of Narratives: Qualitative Analyses of Campus Climate, Risks, and Resilience as Experienced by College Students of Color.* Symposium session presented at the National Latino/Latina Psychological Association conference, Albuquerque, NM.

Reinders, R., Florsheim, P., Navarro, P., Hajdini, N., & Ruenzel, W. (2014, March) *Conflict and Connection Among Expectant Adolescent Couples: Gender and Ethnic Differences*. Poster presented at Society for Research on Adolescence, Austin, TX

Ramos, E., Young, G., Lambrou, K., Reinders-Saeman, R., Wilson, C., Figuereido, C., Chang, W., & Kim, S. (2014, March) *When Supervisors Lack Diversity Competence*. Roundtable presented at Counseling Psychology in Action, Atlanta, GA

Reinders, R., Chavez-Korell, S., Lopez, M., & Aloma, A. (2014, March). *Latino Health Beliefs*. Poster presented at Counseling Psychology in Action, Atlanta, GA

Reinders, R. & Wilson, C. (2014, March). *Family Influence on Latino Career Decision Making.* Poster Presented at Counseling Psychology in Action, Atlanta, GA

Fouad, N., Wilson, C., & Reinders, R. (2013, May). *Family Influence of Latino Career Decision Making Outcomes*. Poster presented at School of Education Doctoral Poster Session, Milwaukee, WI

Lo, P., Florsheim, P., & Reinders, R. (2012, April). *Intimate Partner Violence among Pregnant Couples.* Poster presented at Undergraduate Research Symposium, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Reinders, R., Lira, E., Chavez-Korell, S., & Delgado, A. (2011, October). *Un Nuevo Amanecer (A New Dawn: A Collaborative Approach to Treating Depression Among Latino Elders in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.* Poster presented at 11th Annual Diversity Challenge, Boston, MA

Honors and Awards
- Awarded funding to attend Diversity Challenge Conference, 2010 and 2011
- Awarded funding to attend American Counseling Association Conference, 2011-2014
- Achieved Wisconsin Higher Educational Aids Board Scholarship Award
- Earned Rosevear-Research Award for outstanding Senior Honors Thesis in Psychology
- Recipient of the NLPA Student Scholarship award, 2014
- Honorary Volunteer of the Year award- United Community Center, 2012

Professional Affiliations
- Student member of American Psychological Association: Divisions 17 and 45
- Student member of American Counseling Association
- Student member of ACA Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development
- Student member of National Latino/a Psychological Association
- Psi Chi National Honor Society in Psychology
- Phi Beta Kappa National Honor Society