

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Multicultural Assessment in Counseling and
Clinical Psychology

Buros-Nebraska Series on Measurement and
Testing

Spring 1996

Epilogue

Gargi Roysircar Sodowsky

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, sodowsky@unlinfo.unl.edu

James C. Impara

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, jimpara@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/burosbookmulticultural>

Sodowsky, Gargi Roysircar and Impara, James C., "Epilogue" (1996). *Multicultural Assessment in Counseling and Clinical Psychology*. 15.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/burosbookmulticultural/15>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Buros-Nebraska Series on Measurement and Testing at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Multicultural Assessment in Counseling and Clinical Psychology by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Epilogue

The book has shown the use of a combination of approaches to understand the nature of a problem: traditional diagnosis and standardized assessment, cultural and racial explanations as alternative hypotheses, clinical judgement based on a decision-tree involving cross-cultural and indigenous frameworks, quantitative-qualitative methods of data analyses, and the use of multicultural paper-and-pencil and projective tests. The attitudes and cognitive-affective tests presented or referenced in the book, in addition to being formally administered, could be used as springboards for collaborative discussions with clients and psychology trainees in order to gain a better understanding of their values and assumptions and, by inference, their modes of problem-solving in a multicultural society. We look forward to these new instruments' future refinements, psychometric enhancements, and diverse sampling of subjects.

The measurement of acculturation attitudes is important in counseling and clinical psychology. Its importance to applications has been affirmed by the 1994 *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-IV), and the 1993 *APA Guidelines for Service Providers to Ethnic, Linguistic, and Culturally Diverse Populations*, the latter stating that psychologists must document culturally relevant factors in client records, including number of generations in the

country, number of years in the country, fluency in English, community resources, level of education, and level of stress related to acculturation. Because a multicultural book is incomplete without addressing issues of acculturation, Appendices A and B provide measurement and research information on acculturation scales. Appendix A summarizes select psychometric properties of and predictions for frequently referenced acculturation scales developed for Hispanic/Latino and Asian groups in the U.S. Appendix B summarizes select counseling psychology studies showing the effects of acculturation on client reactions. At the end of each Appendix is a reference list of the authors of the instruments and related research studies.

We hope this work, *Multicultural Measurement in Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, will add to the long and colorful history of psychological assessment.

Gargi Roysircar Sodowsky
James C. Impara
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Spring 1996

Appendix A Acculturation Instrumentation

Edward Wai Ming Lai and Gargi Roysircar Sodowsky

Table 1

14 Acculturation Scales: Information about Respondents, Administration Procedures, Initial Scale Development, Reliability, and Validity

Authors	Ethnicity	Size	Respondents		Geograp. Location	Characteristics	Scale Development	Reliability (rel.)	Validity
			Age	Sampling					
Burnam et al. (1987) LAECA N of items =26	Mexican Americans	1245	18 or older	Random sampling	California	General population	Factor analysis Internal consistency test Subscales: 1) Language 2) Social Activities 3) Ethnic Background	Coefficient alpha=.97 Corrected item-total correlations ranged from .41 to .92	Criterion-related validity: 1) differentiation by generation 2) age and sex had complicated relations with acculturation Respective factor variances=62%, 6%, & 5% Factor loadings ranged from .43 to .93
Cuellar et al. (1980) ARMSA N of items =20	Mexican Americans, Mexicans, & Anglos	192 17 13 T=222	M=32	Recruitment	Mainly Texas	Psychiatric patients, hospital staff & students	A priori Factor analysis Internal consistency test Subscales: 1) Language 2) Ethnic Identity & Generation 3) Cultural Heritage & Exposure 4) Ethnic Interaction	Coefficient alphas=.88 & .81 Test-retest rel.=.72 & .80 Rater rel.=.89	Criterion-related validity: differentiation by staff ratings, language tests, and generation. Concurrent validity: 1) Correlation with Behavioral Acculturation Scale (rho=.76) 2) Correlation with Biculturalization Inventory (rho=.77) Respective factor variances= 64.6%, 18.9%, 11.4%, & 5.2% Factor loadings ranged from .50 to .91

Table 1 continues

Table 1 continued..

Authors	Ethnicity	Size	Respondents Age	Sampling	Geograp. Location	Characteristics	Scale Development	Reliability (rel.)	Validity
Deyo et al. (1985) <i>N</i> of items =4	Mexican Americans, & Anglos	1782 1103 T=2885	25-64	Random sampling & recruitment	Texas	Medical patients & general population	Scalogram analysis Scale: 1) Language	Guttman coefficient of reproductivity=.97, .97, & .96 Coefficient of scalability= .89, .90, & .81	Construct validity: Correlation between language scores and interviewers' rating is .79 Criterion-related validity: Differentiation by ethnic groups, country of birth, generation, and ethnic density of neighborhood
Garcia & Lega (1979) CBIQ <i>N</i> of items =8	Mainly Cubans & non- Cuban Hispanics	210 62 T=272	<i>M</i> =37.3 & 32.8	Recruit- ment	Florida, New Jersey	General population	Pilot study Expert rating Factor analysis Internal consist- ency test Scale: 1) Cuban Ethnic Identity	Coefficient alpha=.84	Criterion-related validity: Differentiation between Cuban and non-Cuban on the item of Cuban identity Factor variance=48.8% Factor loadings ranged from .24 to .81
Lang et al. (1982) GAS <i>N</i> of items =9	Latino	270	25-75	Random sampling	California	General population	A priori Subscales: 1) Generation 2) Years of Education 3) Percent of life in U.S. 4) Language	Not reported	Not reported
Marin et al. (1987) <i>N</i> of items =12	Hispanics Anglos	363 228 T=691	<i>M</i> =31.2 <i>M</i> =38.8	Recruit- ment	California	General population	Factor analysis Internal consist- ency test Subscales: 1) Language & Ethnic Loyalty 2) Media 3) Ethnic Social Relations	Coefficient alphas=.92, .90, .86, .78	Criterion-related validity: Differentiation by generation, length of residence in the USA, self-rating, ethnic groups, and age. Respective factor variances=54.5%, 7%, & 6.1%

Table 1 continues

Table 1 continued

Authors	Ethnicity	Size	Respondents Age	Sampling	Geograp. Location	Characteristics	Scale Development	Reliability (rel.)	Validity
Mendoza (1989) N of items =not reported	Mexican Americans, Anglos	Varied at different phases of the study		not reported	not reported	not reported	A priori Pilot study Expert ratings Factor analysis Cluster analysis Subscales: 1) Intra-Family Language 2) Extra-Family Language 3) Social Affiliation & Activities 4) Cultural Familiarity & Activities 5) Cultural Identification & Pride	Coefficient alphas=.87, .91 .89, .84, & .84 Test-retest rel=.91, .88, .95 Parallel form equivalence= .80 & .77	Criterion-related validity Differentiation by generation, exposure to the mainstream culture, temporary/permanent residence, and observer rating
Olmedo & Padilla (1978) N of items =20	Chicanos, Anglos	254 670 T=924	not reported	Recruit- ment	California	High school students	A priori Factor analysis Subscales: 1) Nationality-Language 2) Socioeconomic Status 3) Semantic	Test-retest rel=.84, .89, .66	Employed a double cross- validation regression procedure, yielding stability of .66 & .80 Respective factor variances=50.8%, 29%, & 20.2%
Padilla (1980) N of items =185	Mexican Americans	381	18-70	Recruit- ment	California	General population	A priori Factor analysis Cluster analysis Subscales: A) Cultural Awareness has 4 factors 1) Cultural Heritage 2) Spouse's Cultural Heritage 3) Parent's Cultural Heritage & Pride 4) Perceived Discrimination B) Ethnic Loyalty has 4 factors 1) Language 2) Cultural Pride & Affiliation 3) Cultural Identification & Preference 4) Social Behavior Orientation	Coefficient alpha=.90	Respective factor variances=89% & 11%

Table 1 continues

Table 1 continued

Authors	Ethnicity	Size	Respondents Age	Sampling	Geograp. Location	Characteristics	Scale Development	Reliability (rel.)	Validity
Sodowsky & Plake (1991) AIRS N of items =34	International people	606 335 (pilot study) T=941	M=28 M=26	Recruitment	Nebraska Texas	College students, faculty, & staff	Factor analysis Internal consistency test Content analysis Subscales: 1) Perceived Prejudice 2) Social Customs 3) Language	For pilot study Coefficient alphas=.77 to .87 and Spearman-Brown split half rel=.75 to .82 For final study coefficient alpha=.89, .88, .79, & .82	Similar factor analysis results for both studies Respective factor variances= 20.6%, 8.1%, & 5.6% Factor loadings=.33 to .83 Criterion-related validity Differentiation by nationality group, residence status, years of residence, & religion.
Sodowsky et al. (1991) MMRS N of items =38	Hispanics, Asian Americans	133 149 T=282	M=24	Recruitment	Nebraska	College students, faculty, & staff	Confirmatory Factor analysis Test of generalizability Internal consistency test Subscales: 1) Perceived Prejudice 2) Social Customs 3) Language	Coefficient alphas=.95, .92, .89, & .94	For generalizability study, coefficients of factor congruence between MMRS and AIRS=.86, .54, & .80 Goodness of fit index of confirmatory factor analysis =.73 Criterion-related validity: Differentiation by ethnic group, Asian culture subgroups, immigration status, religion, & generation
Sodowsky & Lai (In press) MMRS N of items =38	Asian Americans	200 T=282	M=27	Recruitment	Nebraska	College students, faculty, & staff	Internal consistency test Same subscales as above	Coefficient alphas=.89, .88, .79, .82	Structural equation modeling: GFI=.87; Adj GFI=.85; nonsignificant chi square (as required); significant path coefficients and <i>t</i> scores for extent of ethnic friendships, years of U.S. residence, and age at immigration, with acculturation as dependent variable; significant path coefficient and <i>t</i> score for acculturation, with acculturative distress as dependent variable

Table 1 continues

Table 1 continued

Authors	Ethnicity	Size	Respondents		Geograp. Location	Characteristics	Scale Development	Reliability (rel.)	Validity
			Age	Sampling					
Osvold & Sodowsky (In press) MMRS N of items =38	Native Americans, African Americans	34 28 T=62	M=25	Recruitment	Nebraska	High School students, human service professionals, & home makers	Internal consistency test Same subscales as above	Coefficient alphas=.82, .77, & .70	Criterion-related validity: Differences between more and less acculturated women on problematic eating attitudes and behaviors
Suinn et al. (1987) SL-ASIA N of items =21	Asian Americans	82	M=19	Recruitment	Colorado, California	College students	Internal consistent test Subscales: 1) Language 2) Ethnic Identity & Generation 3) Cultural Heritage & Exposure 4) Ethnic Interaction	Coefficient alpha=.88	Criterion-related validity: Differentiation by generation, length of residence in the USA, and self-rating
Suinn et al. (1992) SL-ASIA N of items =21	Asian Americans	284	M=24.4	Recruitment	Colorado	College students	Internal consistency test Principal Components Factor analysis 1) Reading/Writing/Cultural Preference 2) Ethnic Interaction 3) Affinity for Ethnic Identity and Pride 4) Generational Identity 5) Food preference	Coefficient alpha=.91	Concurrent validity: Significant correlations with years in U.S. school, age of entering U.S. school, length of residence in the USA, years lived in non-Asian neighborhood; significant effect of English as first language Factorial validity: Factors 1, 2, and 4 similar to ARSMA factors 2, 3, and 4 Self-rated acculturation related to language preferences and ethnicity of friends

Table 1 continues

Table 1 continued

Authors	Ethnicity	Size	Respondents		Geograp. Location	Characteristics	Scale Development	Reliability (rel.)	Validity
			Age	Sampling					
Szapocznik et al. (1978) BAS N of items =24 VAS N of items =10	Cubans Anglos	265 201 T=466	14-85	Recruitment	Florida	General population	A priori Factor analysis Discriminant item validity Subscales: 1) Behavioral Acculturation Dimension 2) Relational Value Acculturation Dimension	Coefficient alpha=.97, .77 Parallel language forms (r=.88, .46) Test-retest rel=.96, .86	Criterion-related validity: Differentiation by years in the USA, age, and gender. Respective factor variances=48.1%, 13.5%, 13.4%, & 12.9% Items significantly discriminated between Cubans and non-Cubans and between high and low acculturated Cubans
Wong-Reiger & Quintana (1987) MAS N of items =21	South East Asians, Hispanics, & Anglos	170 174 90 T=434	Not reported	Recruitment	Oklahoma	General population	Pilot study Subscales: 1) Voluntary Behavior 2) Involuntary Behavior 3) Cognitions 4) Self-Identity	Not published	Criterion-related validity Differentiation between Canadian and foreign born students Concurrent validity Correlation with 2 acculturation scales (information unpublished)

REFERENCES

- Burnam, M. A., Hough, R. L., Telles, C. A., Karno, M., & Escobar, J. I. (1987). Measurement of acculturation in a community population of Mexican Americans. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 9*, 105-130.
- Cuellar, I., Harris, L. C., & Jasso, R. (1980). An acculturation scale for Mexican American normal and clinical populations. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 2*, 199-217.
- Deyo, R. A., Diehl, A. K., Hazuda, H., & Stern, M. P. (1985). A sample language-based acculturation scale for Mexican Americans: Validation and application to health care research. *American Journal of Public Health, 75*, 51-55.
- Garcia, M., & Lega, L. I. (1979). Development of a Cuban ethnic identity questionnaire. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 1*, 247-261.
- Lang, J. G., Munoz, R. F., Bernal, G., & Sorensen, J. L. (1982). Quality of life and psychological well-being in a bicultural Latino community. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 4*, 433-450.
- Marin, G., Sabogal, F., Marin, B. V., Otero-Sabogal, R., & Perez-Stable, E. (1987). Development of a short acculturation scale for Hispanics. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 9*, 183-205.
- Mendoza, R. H. (1989). An empirical scale to measure type and degree of acculturation in Mexican-American adolescents and adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 20*, 372-385.
- Olmedo, E. L., & Padilla, A. M. (1978). Empirical and construct validation of a measure of acculturation for Mexican Americans. *Journal of Social Psychology, 105*, 179-187.
- Osvold, L., & Sodowsky, G. R. (In press). Eating attitudes of Native American and African American women: Differences by race/ethnicity and acculturation. *Explorations in Ethnic Studies*.
- Padilla, A. M. (1980). The role of cultural awareness and ethnic loyalty in acculturation. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings* (pp. 47-84). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Sodowsky, G. R., Lai, E. W. M. (In press). Asian immigrant variables and structural models of cross-cultural distress. In A. Booth (Ed.), *International Migration and Family Change*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sodowsky, G. R., Lai, E. W. M., & Plake, B. S. (1991). Moderating effects of sociocultural variables on acculturation attitudes of Hispanics and Asian Americans. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70*, 194-204.

Sodowsky, G. R., & Plake, B. (1991). Psychometric properties of the American-International Relations Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 51*, 207-216.

Suinn, R. M., Ahuna, C., & Khoo, G. (1992). The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale: Concurrent and factorial validation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 52*, 1041-1046.

Suinn, R. M., Rickard-Figueroa, K., Lew, S., & Vigil, P. (1987). The Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Acculturation Scale: An initial report. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 47*, 401-407.

Szapocznik, J., Scopetta, M. A., Kurtines, W., & Aranalde, M. A. (1978). Theory and measurement of acculturation. *International Journal of Psychology, 12*, 113-130.

Wong-Rieger, D., & Quintana, D. (1987). Comparative acculturation of Southeast Asian and Hispanic immigrants and sojourners. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 18*, 345-362.

Appendix B
Acculturation Effects on Client Reactions
Edward Wai Ming Lai and Gargi Roysircar Sodowsky

Table 2
 Summary of Select Acculturation Research Related to Counseling

Authors	Subjects Ethnicity	Subjects Size	Instruments	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Main Effects	Interaction Effects
Atkinson & Gim (1989)	Chinese A. Japanese A. Korean A.	263 185 109	1) Suinn-Lew Asian Self-Identity Accul- turation Scale (SL-ASIA) 2) Attitudes Toward Seeking Professional Help Scale (ATSPHS)	1) Respondent acculturation (low, medium, & high levels) 2) Respondent ethnicity 3) Respondent sex	Four ATSPHS subscales: Need, Stigma, Openness, & Confidence	1) Acculturation effect (H > M > L on Need, Stigma, & Openness) 2) Insignificant gender & ethnicity effects	1) no significant interaction effects
Atkinson et al. (1990)	Chinese A. Japanese A. Korean A. Filipino A. South East Asian A.	268 151 108 186 103	1) SL-ASIA 2) Help providers ranking list (11 helpers)	1) Respondent acculturation (low, medium, & high levels) 2) Respondent ethnicity 3) Respondent gender	1) Help provider rankings	1) Acculturation effect (H > L on ratings for mother & friend, L > H on oldest person, teacher, & coun- selor/psychologist) 2) Gender effect	1) Acculturation X Gender (on ratings for father) effect

Table 2 continues

Table 2 Continued

Authors	Subjects Ethnicity	Size	Instruments	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Main Effects	Interaction Effects
Gim et al. (1990)	Chinese A. Japanese A. Filipino A. Korean A. South East Asian A.	268 151 186 108 103	1) SL-ASIA 2) Personal Problems Inventory (PPI)	1) Respondent acculturation (low-medium & high levels) 2) Respondent ethnicity 3) Respondent gender 4) 8 personal concerns	1) 2 dimensions of PPI: ratings for severity of concern and willingness to see a counselor	For severity ratings, 1) acculturation effect (L-M > H on mean ratings across all concerns) 2) Ethnicity effect 3) Concerns effect For willingness to see a counselor, 1) acculturation effect (L-M > H on willingness to see a counselor) 2) Gender effect 3) Concerns effect	For severity ratings, 1) Acculturation X Concerns effect (L-M respondents rated financial problems first & academic problems second whereas the order was reversed for H respondents) 2) Ethnicity X Concerns effect For willingness to see a counselor, no significant effects
Gim et al. (1991)	Chinese A. Japanese A. Filipino A. Korean A. South East Asian A.	36 24 22 14 8	1) SL-ASIA 2) Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory (CCCI) 3) Counselor Effective- ness Rating Scale (CERS)	1) Respondent acculturation (low & high levels) 2) Counselor cultural sensitivity (sensitive vs blind) 3) Respondent ethnicity 4) Respondent gender	1) CCCI scores 2) 4 CERS sub- scales: Expert- ness, Trust- worthiness, Attractiveness, & Willingness to see a counselor	For CCCI, 1) nonsignificant acculturation effect 2) significant counselor cultural sensitivity effect 3) significant counselor ethni- city effect For CERS, same as 1), 2), 3)	For CCCI, 1) Cultural Sensi- tivity X Ethnicity effect 2) Cultural sensi- tivity X Ethnicity X Gender effect For CERS 1) Acculturation X Cultural Sensitivity X Gender effect

Table 2 continues

Table 2 Continued

Authors	Subjects Ethnicity	Size	Instruments	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Main Effects	Interaction Effects
Hess & Street (1991)	Mexican A.	48	1) Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans (AR SMA) 2) CERS	1) Respondent acculturation (high-bicultural & low-bicultural) 2) Counselor ethnicity (Anglo vs Mexican A.) 3) Respondent sex	1) Ratings of 4 subscales: Expertness, Trustworthiness, Attractiveness, & Willingness to see a counselor	1) no significant main effect	1) no significant interaction effect
Kunkel (1990)	Mexican A. Anglo A.	213 137	1) ARSMA 2) Expectations About Counseling-Brief Form (EAC-B)	1) Respondent acculturation (Mexican-oriented bi-cultural (M-O), true bicultural (B), Anglo-oriented bi-cultural (A-O) & very Anglicized (VA) levels) 2) Respondent ethnicity 3) Respondent gender 4) Respondent experience with counseling (yes vs. no)	1) EAC-B 17 subscale scores	1) Acculturation effect (M-O > B > VA > A-O on Directness & Empathy) 2) Gender effect 3) Counseling experience effect	1) Acculturation X Counseling Experience effect
Pomales & Williams (1989)	Puerto Ricans Mexican A.	85 9	1) ARSMA 2) Acculturation Rating Scale for Puerto Ricans (ARSPR) 3) Counselor Rating Form-Short Version (CRF-S) 4) Counselor Effectiveness Rating Scale (CERS)	1) Respondent acculturation (high, medium, & low levels) 2) Counseling styles (directive vs nondirective) 3) Respondent gender	1) 3 subscales of CRF-S: Expertness, Attractiveness & Trustworthiness 2) 5 items of CERS knowledge of psychology, ability to help, willingness to help, understanding problems & willingness to see a counselor	For CRF-S, 1) Acculturation effect on trustworthiness but not on attractiveness or expertness (H > M & L on trustworthiness) For CERS, 1) nonsignificant acculturation effect 2) Style effect	For CRF-S, 1) no interaction effect For CERS, 1) Acculturation X Counseling Style effect on counselor understanding 2) Gender X Counseling Style effect

Table 2 continues

Table 2 continued

Authors	Ethnicity	Subjects Size	Instruments	Independent Variables	Dependent Variables	Main Effects	Interaction Effects
Ponce & Atkinson (1989)	Mexican A.	169	1) ARSMA 2) CERS 3) PPI	1) Respondent acculturation (high, medium, & low levels) 2) Counselor ethnicity (Anglo, Mexican A.) 3) Counseling style (directive vs nondirective)	1) 3 subscales of CERS: Expertness, Trustworthiness, & Attractiveness 2) 2 dimensions of PPI: ratings of severity of problems and willingness to see a counselor	For CERS, 1) nonsignificant acculturation effect 2) Ethnicity effect 3) Counseling style effect For PPI, same as 1), 2), & 3)	For CERS, 1) Ethnicity x Counseling Style effect For PPI, same as 1)
Sanchez & Atkinson (1983)	Mexican A.	109	1) Cultural Commitment item 2) Preference for seeing culturally similar counselor 3) ATSPHS	1) Respondent cultural commitment (com.) level (strong com. to Anglo culture (SA), strong com. to Mexican American culture (SM), strong com. to both cultures (SB), & weak com. to both cultures (WB) 2) Respondent sex	1) Counselor ethnicity 2) 4 ATSPHS subscales: Need, Stigma, Openness, & Confidence	For counselor ethnicity, 1) Cultural com. effect (SM > SB > WB > SA on choosing a Mexican A. counselor) For ATSPHS, 1) Cultural com. effect on Openness (WB > SM on using professional counseling services)	1) No interaction effects

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, D. R., & Gim, R. H. (1989). Asian-American cultural identity and attitudes toward mental health services. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36*, 209-212.
- Atkinson, D. R., Whiteley, S., & Gim, R. H. (1990). Asian-American acculturation and preferences for help providers. *Journal of College Student Development, 31*, 155-161.
- Gim, R. H., Atkinson, D. R., & Whiteley, S. (1990). Asian-American acculturation, severity of concerns, and willingness to see a counselor. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37*, 281-285.
- Gim, R. H., Atkinson, D. R., & Kim, S. J. (1991). Asian-American acculturation, counselor ethnicity and cultural sensitivity, and ratings of counselors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 57-62.
- Hess, R. S., & Street, E. M. (1991). The effect of acculturation on the relationship of counselor ethnicity and client ratings. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 71-75.
- Kunkel, M. A. (1990). Expectations about counseling in relation to acculturation in Mexican-American and Anglo-American student samples. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37*, 286-292.
- Pomales, J., & Williams, V. (1989). Effects of level of acculturation and counseling style on Hispanic students' perceptions of counselor. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36*, 79-83.
- Ponce, F. Q., & Atkinson, D. R. (1989). Mexican-American acculturation, counselor ethnicity, counseling style, and perceived counselor credibility. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36*, 203-208.
- Sanchez, A. R., & Atkinson, D. R. (1983). Mexican-American cultural commitment, preference for counselor ethnicity, and willingness to use counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30*, 215-220.

