2012

Multicultural competency, training, and outreach and setting : a quantitative study with college counselors

Eline Potoski
Smith College

Recommended Citation

Eline Potoski
Multicultural Competency, Training,
and Outreach and Setting: A
Quantitative Study with College
Counselors

ABSTRACT

This study looked at differences in multicultural competencies of college counselors by training, outreach, institutional setting, and demographic characteristics and their relationship to multicultural counseling competencies as measured by the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale.

Using a non-experimental cross-sectional design, this study gathered information from 77 college counselors responding to a web-based, self-report survey. The participants for this study were drawn from a non-probability sample of college counseling center staff currently employed at a college counseling center and currently providing counseling services to college or university students.

The study found that training, outreach and certain institutional setting characteristics, such as offering multicultural training, counseling staff diversity, and offering counselors more contact with students of color, were related to higher levels of multicultural knowledge and skills in the sampled college counselors. The results support the provision of in-house multicultural competency training, counselor outreach activities to minority student groups, as well as the importance of hiring and retaining counselors of color. Research implications include the need for further research on outreach activities, ethnic identity in college counselors, updated measurement instruments, and more objective measures of outcomes and counselor's multicultural competency.

MULTICULTURAL COMPETENCY, TRAINING, AND OUTREACH AND SETTING:

A QUANTITATIVE STUDY WITH COLLEGE COUNSELORS

A project based on an independent investigation
submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Social Work.

Eline Potoski

Smith College School for Social Work
Northampton, Massachusetts 01063

2012

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Dean and Meadows say that "College counseling can best be understood as the intersection of a professional activity and an environment" (1995, pg. 139). The phrase "college counseling" refers to the setting, a college, university or other institution of higher education, and to the professional identity of counselor. The professional identity of a "counselor" in the context of a college setting takes many forms, including vocational and career advising, mental health counseling and treatment, and campus outreach and consultation (mostly preventive work) (Stone & Archer, 1990). Although counseling centers vary in their conceptualization of service delivery, they all must adapt to both the changing nature of educational institutions as well as the changing needs and concerns of the students they work with. This study looked at this intersection from the lens of the increasing culture diversity of the student population and campuses around the country and the increased need for college counselors to be able to serve a culturally, racially and ethnically diverse population of students.

As the population of racial and ethnic minorities in the United States increases, colleges and universities have been seeing a corresponding increase in the number students of color enrolling. Following Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, many predominantly White colleges and universities have increased or worked to increase enrollments of students of color. The National Center for Education Statistics found that from 1998-99 to 2008-09, the number of degrees earned by Black and Hispanic students increased by a significantly larger degree than

those earned by White students at all degree levels. In 2008-09, Black students earned 10 percent and Hispanic students 8 percent of all bachelor degrees awarded, up from 9 and 6 percent in 1998-98 respectively (U.S. Department of Education, 2011). As population demographics are expected to continue to shift towards greater diversity (Passel & Cohn, 2008), colleges will continue to be increasingly called upon to serve a diverse body of students.

Despite increasing diversity in many colleges and universities, some studies indicate that students of color seem to be underutilizing counseling services (Kearney, Draper, & Barón, 2005). In his 2010 National Survey of Counseling Center Directors, Gallagher (2010) found that 83% of college counseling center directors participating believed that African American students underutilize their center's services. Kearney, Draper and Barón (2005) suggest that greater multicultural sensitivity and awareness in counseling centers might keep more minority students in counseling.

Within the last 20 years as student populations have become much more diverse, it has become incumbent upon college and university personnel to respond to student concerns in a more culturally responsive manner. For counselors working at colleges and universities with young and emerging adults who are often struggling with identity development, the awareness and application of multicultural counseling competencies are particularly important.

Professional associations have recognized the importance of multicultural counseling skills as a basis for sound ethical practice. In 2002, both the American Psychological Association and the National Association for Social Workers published codes of ethics calling upon their members to become aware of racial and ethnic bias and to strive to eliminate it from practice. In 2003 the APA issued guidelines for preparing and training counselors to be culturally sensitive

practitioners; the American Counseling Association developed multicultural counseling competencies in 1996.

Given the need for and emphasis on multicultural counseling competencies in college counseling staff, and the dearth of empirical research on the subject with this group, this study adds to the field by exploring multicultural competencies of college counseling center staff in a new way. Building on previous studies looking at relationships between multicultural counseling competency, training, and demographic characteristics, this study also looks at its relationship to institutional setting, outreach, and institutional diversity.

Using a web-based survey of college counseling professionals, this study examined relationships between multicultural competency, institutional setting, and counselors' training, outreach and counseling experiences with students of color. Differences in multicultural competency were compared with counselor training, outreach and counseling experiences with students of color as well as demographic characteristics and institutional settings of participants.

When I review particular studies in this document, I have used the terms for racial or ethnic categories interchangeably. In my survey questionnaire, for the sake of simplicity, I used categories of race used by the U.S. Census Bureau, while giving participants the option to check "other" and write in their own race or gender identity term. As an advanced clinical social work intern providing counseling in a college counseling center, this study has personal relevance to my current practice and education.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

This chapter provides a review of literature that is structured around the following research questions: What are the differences in multicultural competencies of college counselors by training, outreach, institutional setting, and demographic characteristics? Are training, outreach, institutional setting differences or demographics correlated to higher MCKAS scores? Section I of the literature review outlines the problem at the root of my research, which is the need for better counseling services for students of varied racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds. I begin with a brief history of the development of college counseling centers and some of the sociocultural factors that shaped their development. I then review literature related to the underutilization of counseling centers by students of color.

The second section of the literature review focuses on the theoretical literature underlying the development of multicultural counseling competency and the measurement scales used to measure it, one of which the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MCKAS) is used in this study. I also review research on the effectiveness of training emphasizing multicultural counseling competency, and other studies of college counselors' multicultural competency. My study builds on the previous research on multicultural competency by shedding light on the relationship between the counselors' frequency of training, contact with students of color, and institutional characteristics such as size and diversity. In the third section, theoretical literature on intergroup contact is presented to show theoretical support for the

question of whether counselors, particularly White counselors, who have more frequent contact with or discussion around racial and ethnic difference may have better multicultural competency or awareness. I conclude this chapter with a brief discussion of how the ideas and research presented here inform the current study.

The Need for Multicultural Counseling Competency in Colleges

   Historical development of college counseling. Higher educational institutions in the United States have sought to help students with their personal and social needs at least since the early part of the twentieth century following the First World War, and were influenced to a great extent by the mental hygiene movement (Prescott, 2008). By the 1930s, counseling services were being organized into offices and functions designed to assist student with obstacles that might interfere with their education (Dean & Meadows, 1995; Heppner & Neal, 1983). By the 1940's the terms *counseling*, *vocational guidance*, and *student personnel* were used interchangeably (Heppner & Neal, 1983). Most of these early counseling programs were primarily focused on developmental and academic counseling with students being referred off-campus for clinical or psychiatric services; a small minority of campuses offered clinically oriented mental health services through student health services on campus (Barreira & Snider, 2010).

   The period following the Second World War saw an increase in the number and services of college counseling centers as they expanded, guided by the Veterans Administration, to serve returning service men and women and help them adjust to college (Heppner & Neal, 1983). During the 1950s the professional role of counseling centers grew and became distinguished from other student personnel with the APA's establishment of Division 17 (Counseling Psychology) in 1953, and the *Journal of Counseling Psychology* in 1954 (Dean & Meadows, 1995). The professionalization of college counseling through the field of psychology

5

incorporated a continued developmental focus on mental hygiene and prevention that was distinct from the more clinical model being developed within the field of psychiatry with the publication of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual I (DSM-I)* in 1952 (Barreira & Snider, 2010).

In the 1960's college counseling staff began to view their role as providing personal counseling as well as vocational and educational counseling. However, studies from this period also showed that student perceptions as well as the services provided by counseling centers indicated that counselors were nonetheless providing more vocationally-oriented services (Heppner & Neal, 1995). Student surveys at the time indicated that although students reported personal problems, they most often turned to peers for support rather than counselors (Heppner & Neal, 1995).

Barriera and Snider (2010) suggest that the rise of the community mental health model in the early 1960s, with its focus on integrating services into the community, prevention and early treatment, had an impact on service delivery in many college and university settings. They note that mergers between counseling and mental health centers have been occurring since the 1970s (Barreira & Snider, 2010). The effect of this change is reflected in the current debate over how counseling centers should fit into the college setting via their reporting structure. Eells and Schwartz (2010) reported survey results indicating that while 94% of counseling centers report within a student affairs division, 45% report to a student affairs administrator (vice president or assistant/associate vice president), 34% to a dean or associate dean of students, and 9% to a health services director.

The 1970s also saw another shift in student enrollment towards more diversity, both in terms of race and age. Whereas the students seen in counseling centers in the first half of the

century were generally White, upper-middle-class, and Christian, the trend since the 1970s has been towards increasing diversity (Hodges, 2001). In the last 20 years, more of the literature about the state and direction of college counseling has focused on the issue of an increase in the number and severity of mental health concerns among college students (Stone & Archer, 1990; Hodges, 2001; Smith, Dean, Floyd, Silva, Yamashita, Durtschi, & Heaps, 2007). However, as student use of services increases, college administrators face increased concerns over liability, tight budgets, and college counseling centers continue to struggle with what services to offer and how to manage demand. Researchers and counseling center directors have directed more interest towards the needs, utilization, and effectiveness of services to diverse student populations and students of color in particular (Stone & Archer, 1990; Bishop, 1990; Hodges, 2001; Smith, Dean, Floyd, Silva, Yamashita, Durtschi, & Heaps, 2007). These issues combine to create the need for more outreach to underrepresented students at a time when students with serious mental health concerns are taking more of counselor resources while those resources are often also being cut.

Counseling center utilization by students of color. Despite the increase in students of color in colleges and universities and the commitment of professional associations and graduate training programs to provide college counseling staff with the skills needed to work with racially and ethnically diverse students, there has been little research conducted on the utilization rates of student counseling center services by race and ethnicity. One significant study on this issue by Kearney, Draper, and Barón (2005) surveyed 1,166 African American, Asian American, Caucasian and Hispanic students from 40 universities nationwide who had sought counseling services. Using sampling methods to ensure comparable sample sizes by race, they found that Caucasian students attended significantly more counseling sessions than other groups, while having the least distress at intake, though all groups appeared to benefit from counseling. Their

findings suggest that if minority students attended more counseling sessions, they might see improvement and that greater multicultural sensitivity and awareness in counseling centers might keep more students of color in counseling (Kearney, Draper, & Barón, 2005). The study results are compelling due to their large and diverse sample size and the naturalistic quality of the study. However, the study did not differentiate between centers that use long- versus short-term models of treatment which may affect counseling outcome data.

Counseling center directors seem to be aware of the underutilization of their services by students of color. In his 2010 National Survey of Counseling Center Directors, Gallagher (2010) found, for example, that 83% of college counseling center directors believed that African American students underutilize their center's services. Conducted annually since 1981, the National Survey of College Counseling Center Directors monitors trends in counseling centers and provides counseling center directors with their colleagues' opinions about the challenges and solutions facing counseling centers. The 2010 survey addressed a range of concerns including budgeting, programming and other administrative, ethical and clinical issues. Survey data were presented both aggregately and broken down by school size. Because the survey included only self-report data, it may contain reporter bias, and survey responders, who were limited to American College Counseling Association members, may not represent all college counseling center directors. Only one item on the survey asked directors about working with racial and ethnic differences.

Smith, Dean, Floyd, Silva, Yamashita, Durtschi, and Heaps (2007) also surveyed members of the American College Counseling Association on issues identified in the literature as pressing for counseling centers. These included the severity of client symptoms, counselor workload and job satisfaction, collaboration with other campus offices, multicultural

competence, and disaster and crisis management. The survey used qualitative and quantitative measures, including open-ended questions that allowed respondents to raise their own concerns. The survey targeted counselors engaged in service provision to capture the experiences of counselors without administrative roles. Smith, Dean, Floyd, Silva, Yamashita, Durtschi, and Heaps (2007) mailed 450 surveys to randomly selected members of the American College Counseling Association (ACCA) and received 133 responses. This survey did not evaluate differences in counseling center staff across institution size (large versus small) or type (community college versus university versus private college). Because it collected self-report data, it may reflect bias among respondents and may not accurately represent the experiences of all counselors at college counseling centers.

The counselors in the Smith, Dean, Floyd, Silva, Yamashita, Durtschi, and Heaps (2007) study reported regular contact with personnel from other college offices; more than half reported weekly contact with university administrators and faculty. There was an average of one contact per month with health and/or disability services reported. However the survey results indicated that 30-41% of counselors have no or minimal contact with personnel from multicultural and international student services, which was less frequent contact than with any of the other student support service areas included in the survey. Regarding multicultural competence, the survey results indicated that the most frequent strategy used at counseling centers was providing sensitivity training to staff. Only one participant mentioned policy or structural changes to support multicultural competency.

In 2007, Callicutt wrote a doctoral dissertation investigating the experiences and perceptions of college counseling directors regarding the current realities facing counseling centers. Using the Delphi Method, she analyzed the degree of consensus among the 24 sampled

directors and found that there was significant agreement that college counselors face unique and distinct challenges related to the college setting, that descriptive factors and the life experiences of college students are changing, and that these two factors combine to create learning environments in which students of diverse backgrounds, including culture, values and moral systems, social, physical and psychological descriptors are brought together. Calicutt's findings are limited by her small sample size and because the nature of her questions were specific to the centers surveyed and were not generalizable to other colleges.

Calicutt's findings are relevant to the current study because they stressed the importance that the counseling center directors placed on multicultural and professional competence as a key issue they face. This relates to the question of whether and how counseling center directors can increase the multicultural competencies of college counselors to meet the diverse multicultural backgrounds found on campuses today.

Multicultural Competency Theory, Training and Research

Theoretical background. Much of the current efforts to train counselors to work with diverse populations reference the multicultural competencies initially outlined in the position paper by Sue, Bernier, Durran, Feinberg, Pederson, Smith and Vasquez-Nuttall (1982) including the APA, NASW and ACA guidelines. This important paper defined cross-cultural counseling as any counseling relationship in which two or more of the participants are from different cultural backgrounds, or have different values or lifestyles. Broadly speaking, the authors believed that almost every counseling relationship is at least slightly cross-cultural, and any cultural difference can prevent the counselor from understanding the clients' difficulties, empathizing with them, or providing an appropriate intervention. Sue, Arredondo and McDavis (1992) added that while all counseling is in some ways cross-cultural, multicultural competency should not be seen as so

10

broad as to dilute a focus on racial and ethnic concerns. The theory of multicultural competencies they present is meant therefore to be both universal and focused, placing culture as central to all counseling practice.

Sue, Bernier, Durran, Feinberg, Pederson, Smith and Vasquez-Nuttall's (1982) competencies fall into three broad areas: *beliefs/attitudes*, *knowledge*, and *skills*. *Belief/attitudes* relates to the counselor's awareness of her own cultural heritage, values and biases, and differences with her clients. *Knowledge* relates to the counselors understanding of sociopolitical systems, knowledge about the particular client or group she is working with, therapeutic knowledge and institutional knowledge. *Skills* relate to the counselor's ability to respond verbally and nonverbally to the client, such as active listening, and to her ability to apply institutional interventions where appropriate.

Sue and Sue (1990) expanded the model by adding three dimensional areas. These were skills specific to the multicultural domain (as opposed to general counseling skills), cultural self- and other-awareness related to the affective domain, and knowledge related to the cognitive domain. In summarizing these changes to the model, Sue and Sue (1990) stated:

> These three goals stress the fact that becoming culturally skilled is an active process, that it is ongoing, and that it is a process that never reaches an end point. Implicit is recognition of the complexity and diversity of the client and client populations, and acknowledgement of our own personal limitations and the need to always improve, (p. 146).

In response to the growing recognition of the need to challenge the mono-cultural nature of counselor training and the sociopolitical reality of dominant White cultural systems, Sue, Arredondo and McDavis (1992) emphasized the point that cultural "difference" does not mean

11

"inferior," as well as the ethical obligation that counselors have to not impose dominant cultural values on their clients through cross-cultural counseling. They also proposed that further expansion and revision of these constructs would be necessary.

Training. Since the 1970s when discussions about the needs of minority clients began (Pope-Davis and Ottavi, 1994), multicultural competency has become widely recognized as an important part of ethical counseling practice. The American Counseling Association developed multicultural counseling competencies in 1996. Both the American Psychological Association (APA) and the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) guidelines specifically call upon their members to become aware of biases based on race and ethnicity and to eliminate the effect of that bias on their work (APA, 2002; NASW, 2001; NASW 2002). In addition, the APA, Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) and the American Counseling Association required member and accredited programs to provide appropriate training in diversity awareness and multicultural practice.

How effective is multicultural training? This question was explored in meta-analytic reviews by Smith, Constantine, Dunn, Dinehart, and Montoya (2006) focusing specifically on the effectiveness of multicultural education in psychology. They conducted the meta-analysis in two studies. The first of these evaluated 45 studies that looked at individuals' level of education; the second evaluated 37 studies reporting on outcomes following an intervention. The result of the two meta- analyses indicated that multicultural education interventions resulted in positive outcomes.

The first study compared the average individual who had multicultural training with one who had not, and found an increase in self-reported competence. There were a number of

significant limitations in many of the studies analyzed, for example low survey response rates, and the researchers found the results of modest value.

The second meta-analysis looked at how much an individual changed as a result of multicultural training, and found substantial positive effects. The researchers listed eight significant limitations to their findings. For example, the analysis included single group pre- and post- test assessments that had problems with internal validity. In addition, the researchers reported that only six of the outcome studies had true experimental designs, and most of the intervention studies only reported aggregated data, potentially obscuring within-group differences, and most used only self-report measures (Smith, Constantine, Dunn, Dinehart, & Montoya, 2006). Other limitations they found included generic interventions, differences in the importance of the intervention, interventions measured only once and only one longitudinal study.

Despite the significant limitations, Smith, Constantine, Dunn, Dinehart, and Montoya (2006) felt that a significant finding of the meta-analyses were that the multicultural education interventions that were based on extant research and theory were nearly twice as effective as those that were not. This is an important finding for educators designing intervention studies and presents a foundation for this study's attention to training as a factor correlated to multicultural competency.

Measuring multicultural competency and its effectiveness. A number of instruments were developed between 1985 and 1995 to operationalize and measure multicultural competencies, including the Cross-Cultural Competency Inventory (1985) and the Cross-Cultural Competency Inventory-Revised (1991), the Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge-Skills Survey (1991), the Multicultural Counseling Awareness Scale (1993) and the Multicultural Counseling

13

Inventory (MCI) (1994) (Pope-Davis & Dings, 1994). The two most commonly used scales

today are the MCI, developed by Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin and Wise (1994) and the

Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MCKAS). The MCKAS is the 2003

revision of the Multicultural Counseling and Awareness Scale (MCAS) first presented in 1991

(Ponterotto & Potere, 2003).

Looking at studies that addressed the effectiveness of multicultural counseling concepts, I

reviewed a meta-analysis by D'Andrea and Heckman (2008). The authors set out to determine

the effectiveness of multicultural counseling through an analysis and review of 40 years of

published multicultural counseling outcomes studies conducted between 1967 and 2007.

Following up on earlier similar reviews by Atkinson (1983) and Atkinson and Lowe (1995),

D'Andrea and Heckman (2008) found that while there were 2,248 published studies on

counseling and psychotherapy outcomes, only 211 were related to multicultural counseling

outcome research. Of those, only 53 studies met their review criteria for empirically supported

data. Though they considered this number small, they noted that this represented a steady

increase over the previous reviews.

In the 53 studies they reviewed, D'Andrea and Heckman noted a growing shift in

research towards the psychological and behavioral changes found in clients engaged in

multicultural counseling. They also noted that their findings supported other research in the field

that suggested that multicultural research results suffer from threats to both internal and external

validity and the limitations of research strategies used in multicultural counseling research. They

found that small sample size and non-random sample selection were frequently a threat to the

studies' validity and generalizability, which are also limitations in this study. D'Andrea and

Heckman's (2008) results also pointed to the fact that empirical studies in multicultural

counseling are lagging behind the theoretical foundation and assertions of the field. The researchers present a series of recommendations to further research in the coming decade, including focusing on measures of racial/ethnic identity development, the use of qualitative and mixed methods research, and acknowledging the multidimensionality of multicultural counseling. More research is needed to determine the effectiveness of these theoretical constructs of multicultural counseling competency. Although D'Andrea and Heckman (2008) critiqued the state of past and current multicultural competency research, they do not discuss the findings from the studies they reviewed in their research.

Research in college and university settings. Several studies have been done that look at multicultural counseling competencies specifically in college counselors. Pope-Davis, Reynolds, Diggs and Ottavi (1994) studied the multicultural counseling competencies of 141 doctoral candidates interning in college counseling centers. The study used the MCAS, an earlier version of the MCKAS used in the study presented in this thesis. The study found that non-White counselors and women reported higher levels of multicultural knowledge and skills than White counselors and men. They also found that those who had received supervision on multicultural issues attended more multicultural workshops or attended more multicultural courses while in graduate school had higher multicultural knowledge and skills. Interestingly, multicultural awareness only correlated significantly to students who had received supervision in a multicultural setting, something that I did not look at in my study. This study was limited in its generalizability to other counselors because participants were all doctoral interns. There was little demographic diversity in the participants. However, the results were of interest in terms of counselor training and preparation.

Pope-Davis and Ottavi in another study (1994) examined the association between multicultural counseling competencies and demographic variables among college counselors. The study included 220 counselors from university counseling centers. Counselors in this study completed the Multicultural Counseling Inventory (MCI) and a demographic questionnaire. These authors found that Asian American and Hispanic counselors reported higher multicultural counseling knowledge than White counselors. African American, Asian American and Hispanic counselors all reported higher competencies in multicultural awareness and relationships than White counselors. They found no other differences by demographic variables in this study. Pope-David and Ottavi offered several hypotheses to explain these results, including the problems inherent in self-report measures, such as the possibility of over-reporting for various reasons, including social desirability. In addition, other differences in personal background, interests, socioeconomic status, or other factors not controlled for in the study could account for differences. However, the study results indicate further study and training experiences would be valuable particularly for White counselors. This study builds on prior research by looking at whether increased contact with persons of color, both students and other staff, and increased attention to diversity is associated with higher multicultural counseling competency.

In a more recent study, Chao and Nath (2011) built on ideas presented in the Smith, Constantine, Dunn, Dinehart, and Montoya (2006) study presented earlier in this chapter. Chao and Nath surveyed 313 college counselors using sampling methods similar to those used in this study, including ACCA email lists and personal contacts, and the sample was similar in race and gender to my sample. This study included a demographic questionnaire and three self-report measurement scales: the Sex Role Equalitarianism Scale (SRES), a measure of attitudes towards equality between men and women; the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR),

which measures impression management and self-deception; the Multi-group Ethic Identity Measure (MEIM), a measure of ethnic identity awareness; and the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness (MCKAS) scale, the scale used in this study to measure multicultural counseling competencies. They found that counselors with higher levels of ethnic identity and gender attitudes were more likely to report more multicultural training and corresponding multicultural competency as measured by the MCKAS. Their results indicated that relationships between ethnic identity, gender attitudes and multicultural competency are more complicated than earlier studies suggest, and that training seems to play a mediating role between gender roles/ethnic identity and multicultural counseling competency. Limitations of this study included the difference in group size between White counselors and counselors of other ethnic/racial groups and the limitations of the other studies reviewed here of relying on self-report measures. Although this study employed more than one measurement and took a somewhat different theoretical position, this research was used to structure the hypotheses and sampling methods for this study.

Intergroup Contact Theory and Research

Intergroup contact theory was first developed by George Allport (1954), who believed that under certain conditions, interpersonal contact between members of majority and minority groups was one of the most effective ways to reduce prejudice. Allport hypothesized that four conditions must be met: both groups must have equal status in the relationship; both groups must work together towards a common goal; groups must be able to meet under circumstances that enhance the possibility of friendship or familiar relationships rather than playing out a social role; and there must be some authority accepted by both groups to support the norms of the group interactions.

Pettigrew (1998), a current proponent of intergroup contact theory, has critiqued and expanded upon Allport's hypotheses. Reviewing studies based on Allport's theory, Pettigrew's critique focuses on four main points. The first was that the studies supporting Allport were limited by selection bias. He suggested that prejudiced people avoid intergroup contact, while the positive effects of cross-group friendship are greater than the bias. His second critique was that studies often include facilitating yet nonessential conditions. The final critiques were that the hypotheses do not address the processes by which intergroup contact facilitates change in prejudice or how the changes are generalized to other situations. Pettigrew offered a longitudinal intergroup contact theory that allows time for cross-group friendship to develop that includes a process of what he calls de-categorization (the initial contact), salient categorization (established contact), and re-categorization (unified group) (Pettigrew, 1998). Pettigrew also emphasizes that an individual's attitudes, experiences and values, as well as embedded social norms, influence whether they will seek or avoid contact, and what the effects of contact might be (Pettigrew, 1998).

To test these ideas, Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) conducted a meta-analytic study of intergroup contact theory, which included 713 independent samples from 515 studies based on Allport's theory. They note that intergroup contact theory has been most often applied in non-United States-based research related to international inter-ethnic conflicts. Almost all of the studies examined (94%) showed an inverse relationship between intergroup contact and prejudice. The analysis also found that the studies that structured contact to meet Allport's optimal conditions (19%) achieved a significantly higher mean effect size than the other studies. The results suggest that while Allport's optimal conditions are more effective, they are not essential to achieve positive results from intergroup contact. Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) note

that their study and most past research is limited because it is based on positive features of the contact situation and suggest that more research is needed to look at negative factors such as intergroup anxiety and normative restraints, to further define the mediators and conditions under which intergroup contact can reduce prejudice.

Utsey, Ponterotto and Porter (2008) examined research using Allport's intergroup contact theory and Pettigrew and Tropp's (2006) meta-analysis, as well as the meta-analysis of Smith, Constantine, Dunn, Dinehart, and Montoya (2006) of multicultural training efficacy reviewed in Chapter III. In comparing these two studies, they concluded that:

> In summary, the international research that has been conducted across diverse populations (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006), coupled with U.S.-based research that involved mental health professionals (Smith et. al., 2006), lead to the conclusion that the training of counseling professionals should include as much interpersonal contact across cultural groups as possible. (Utsey, Ponterotto and Porter, 2008, p. 343)

While acknowledging the empirical support of intergroup contact theory as shown in these two meta-analytical studies, Utsey, Penterotto and Porter (2008) also emphasize the need for new studies using non-self-report measures.

Conclusion

This study, though based on a simple and straightforward design, incorporates theoretical foundations of multicultural competency theory and research as first outlined by Sue, Bernier, Durran, Feinberg, Pederson, Smith and Vasquez-Nuttall (1982) and expanded upon by Sue, Arredondo and McDavis (1992) and intergroup contact theory as initially outlined by Allport (1954) and refined by Pettigrew (1998).

Building on results discussed above in previous studies by Chao and Nath (2011) and Pope-Davis, Reynolds, Diggs and Ottavi (1994) with college counselors training experiences and demographic characteristics such as race and gender, the first three hypotheses (presented in Chapter III) examine the associations between these characteristics and multicultural competency, as well as additional data such as age and years of clinical experience. These demographic characteristics were added to the analysis because they could relate to contact theory, under the assumption that counselors with more age and clinical experience will have worked with more students from diverse backgrounds due to their increased exposure in the field. In this way the study is building on Pope-Davis, Reynolds, Diggs and Ottavi (1994), who focused on counselors-in-training, and Chao and Nath (2011) who did not look at experience or age when considering training to explore whether multicultural competency is something that is associated not just with training but with an increase in knowledge base that comes with age or clinical experience. In addition, this study also looks at how levels of multicultural competency are associated with specific measures of intergroup contact such as outreach activity with students of color, institutional demographic characteristics such as diversity and size, and certain counseling center practices such as the frequency with which racial differences are discussed in meetings or with students. Results of this study add to the body of knowledge about efforts to increase multicultural counseling competencies in college counselors and what institutional practices and settings might correspond with increased multicultural competencies in counselors.

The next chapter describes the research design chosen for this study, the specific questions being addressed. It also addresses the research methods used to recruit a sample of participants, and the methods used to collect and analyze the data.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

This chapter describes the research design and methods used in conducting this study. It starts with a description of the research questions and hypotheses posed in this study, outlines the sampling methods and the characteristics of the sample of study participants. It also describes the survey instrument and the means by which the data were collected and analyzed. Using a non-experimental cross-sectional design, this study gathered information from college counselors responding to a web-based, self-report survey. The study was designed to provide a description of participating college counselors' multicultural counseling competency, their training, outreach and counseling experiences with students of color. The study compares this data with specific institutional and demographic characteristics.

Research Question and Hypotheses

Two specific research questions were posed in this study. The questions were: What are the differences in multicultural competencies of college counselors by training, outreach, institutional setting, and demographic characteristics? Are training, outreach, institutional setting differences or demographics correlated with higher MCKAS scores? Based on these questions the following hypotheses were posed.

1. Older counselors, counselors with more clinical experience, and/or counselors with more multicultural training will have higher MCKAS scores

2. Ethnic and racial minority counselors have higher MCKAS scores

3. Female counselors will have higher MCKAS scores than male counselors

4. Counselors who participate in more outreach or whose institutions conduct more outreach with students of color will have higher MCKAS scores.

5. Counselors working in more diverse settings or with more diversity in their caseloads will have higher scores on the MCKAS

6. Counselors who participate in more discussions about race with students or colleagues will have higher MCKAS scores

Research Design

This study was based on a cross-sectional research design. Cross sectional designs provide a snapshot of the phenomena under study that is limited to a single point in time, unlike longitudinal studies which describe processes occurring over time. Because longitudinal studies can observe changes overtime, they are more suited to determining cause-effect relationships. However, they are more costly and time-consuming to conduct. As a cross-sectional study, this research looks at relationships and correlations between variables at single point in time, and does not indicate changes over time nor cause-effect relationships. Because no manipulation of the variables by the researcher is possible, its purpose was to provide a description of the study variables within the sample and possible correlations between them.

This study gathered information about the multicultural competence, training and outreach experiences of the college counselors responding to a web-based, self-report survey. Comparisons in the levels of multicultural knowledge and awareness were made according to training, outreach and counseling with minority students. Other comparisons in multicultural competency were made by race/ethnicity, gender, education and professional identity of college counselors, as well as by characteristics of the colleges and universities they work in, including

size, diversity of student body, geographic region, setting, and institution type. A correlational analysis of multicultural competency, college counselor demographic and institutional characteristics was conducted.

Sampling and Participants

The participants for this study were drawn from a non-probability sample of college counseling center staff currently employed at a college counseling center and currently providing counseling services to college or university students. Participants could be of any gender, race, sexual orientation or ethnicity and may provide counseling services in any type of college or university setting. Inclusion criteria for participation in the study were that the participant be currently employed or interning at a college counseling center in the United States and currently providing counseling services to college or university students. Exclusion criteria included not being employed by a college counseling center in the United States and currently not providing counseling services to college or university students. The target sample size for this study was 75-100 survey participants.

Broadly conceptualized, this target sample comprised a vast and diverse population of both counselors and the educational institutions they serve. Unfortunately, there was no viable way to reach a representative sample of this broad a group of college counselors in order to create a probability sample. Although lists of colleges were available, the lists didnot indicate whether colleges have counseling centers. College web sites do not always list counseling centers and those that do often do not list contact information. Membership organizations like the Association for University and College Counseling Center Directors (AUCCCD), because of the fees, do not necessarily represent the concerns of smaller centers or those with very tight budgets.

With these constraints in mind and in order to reach as large a number of college counselors as possible, convenience and snowball sampling methods were used to recruit participants via emails to professional listservs and individuals. Because previous surveys on multicultural counseling have been limited because of the small numbers of counselors of color participating, other ways to recruit specifically counselors of color were explored. Specific lists that would assist in reaching this population were not available, however the wording in the recruitment email (see Appendix C) asked for suggestions and input. The first sample source was the American College Counseling Association (ACCA) listserv. The ACCA is the primary professional association for college counselors and the listserv includes over 400 college counselors. As a student member of this listerv, I sent the recruitment and follow-up emails directly to the ACCA-L listserv, and sent a copy of the Human Subject Review Committee's approval letter (see Appendix) to the listserv manager.

The second sample source I chose was an email listserv called "Flying Solo" comprised of about 110 college counseling center staff who are a "one-man" show, i.e. single staff members who do all the counseling as well as administration themselves. This source was included in the population of potential contacts so as to ensure that small centers with small budgets and staff would be represented. This listserv's manager agreed to send the recruitment email out, however no confirmation that the email was sent to the listserv was received.

There were two additional sample sources to which emails were sent directly through SurveyMonkey. The third sample source was a list of 320 counseling center directors who participated in the Gallagher's (2010) National Survey of Counseling Center Directors, whose names and email addresses are included in the publication. The fourth sample source was the Counseling Center Village directory. The Counseling Center Village is an internet resource

center for counseling center research professionals around the world. The site's directory contained a list of 323 counseling center websites with contact names and email addresses from which the final email list for recruitment was collected.

Snowball sampling was employed in two ways. First, the recruitment email was sent to a small population of college counselors who were personal contacts. Second, the recruitment email asked recipients to forward the recruitment email to their colleagues.

Study participants were invited to participate in the study through an initial recruitment email and a second, follow-up email two weeks later. The emails asked recipients to share the study invitation with any colleagues or staff at their centers who counsel students. The recruitment emails contained a link to the survey on the SurveyMonkey site. A follow-up email was sent two weeks following the initial email reminding potential participants about the survey and inviting their participation.

The participants in this sample were counselors currently employed at a college counseling center and currently providing counseling services to students. The total number of participants who met the inclusion criteria and accessed the survey was 98, 77 (about 80%) completed nearly all the questions. The majority of the participants were White, females, working in the Northeast, and full-time college counselors. Close to half had a master's level degree and the other half a PhD with only a few participants in other degree categories. About half likewise identified as a counseling or clinical psychologist, the two second largest groups, together making up slightly more than half of the participants, were social workers and professional counselors. The participants ranged in age from 28-65 and were pretty evenly spread across this range, with the mean age being 46 years of age and the median 47. Nearly half (49.4%) of the participants had more than 20 years of clinical experience. The median was 19

and the mean was 18 years of clinical experience. Table 1 summarizes the demographic

characteristics of the sample showing race, gender, professional identity, highest degree attained

and age. Table 2 summarizes the characteristics of professional identity and clinical experience.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Sampled Group

Demographic Characteristics	*Frequency*	*Valid Percent*
Race		
Asian	2	2.6
Black or African American	6	7.8
Hispanic or Latino	1	1.3
White	63	81.8
More than one checked	4	5.2
Eastern European*	1	1.3
Total	77	100.0
Gender		
Female	60	77.9
Male	17	22.1
Total	77	100.0
Age		
20-29	3	3.9
30-39	19	24.7
40-49	21	27.3
50-59	19	24.7
60-69	15	19.5
Total	77	100.0
Geographic Region		
Northeast	31	40.3
Midwest	17	22.1
Southeast	17	22.1
West coast	3	3.9
Northwest	7	9.1
Southwest	2	2.6

Total	77	100.0
Highest Degree Attained		
PhD, MD or Equivalent	40	51.9
Master's Degree	36	46.8
BA or uncharacterized	1	1.3
Total	77	100.0

* Participants were given the opportunity to check "other" and to specify their own category.

Table 2. Frequency Distribution of Professional Identity and Years of Clinical Practice

Professional Identity and Years of Clinical Practice	*Frequency*	*Valid Percent*
Professional Identity		
Counseling or Clinical Psychologist	35	45.5
Professional Counselor	18	23.4
Social Worker	19	24.7
Nonspecified Mental Health Professional	2	2.6
Nurse Practitioner*	1	1.3
CADC, LMFT*	1	1.3
Clinical Social Worker*	1	1.3
Total	77	100.0
Years of Clinical Practice		
1 to 9	25	32.5
10 to 19	14	18.2
20 to 29	25	32.5
30 to 39	12	15.6
40 to 49	1	1.3
Total	77	100.0

* Participants were given the opportunity to check "other" and specify their own category.

Data Collection

Data were collected via an online survey using Survey Monkey. This data collection method was chosen because online surveys offer a quick and inexpensive way to reach large numbers of prospective respondents over a large geographic region (Van Selm & Jankowski, 2006; Albrecht & Jones, 2009). It is an effective tool to reach the target group of college counselors because colleges generally provide employees with computers and internet access, reducing barriers otherwise inherent to internet surveys. Because of the ease of receiving and responding to an internet-based survey for this target group, an internet survey may increase response rates thereby providing a more representative sample than a mailed survey.

Upon clicking the link to the survey provided in the invitation email, participants were directed to the SurveyMonkey website with questions related to the inclusion criteria. If potential participants did not meet the inclusion criteria, they were directed to a page informing them that they were not eligible to participate and thanking them for their time. If they did meet the criteria, participants were directed to the informed consent agreement (see Appendix B). The informed consent page outlined the risks and benefits of participating in the study. It included information about the researcher and a brief description of the project. It described the participants' involvement in the research, the conditions of confidentiality and anonymity, the approximate time it would take to complete the survey, and the risks and benefits of participation. It also explained that the survey was voluntary and that the participants had the option to withdraw from the survey at any time prior to the final submission at the end of the survey. They were provided with contact information for the researcher and the Smith College School for Social Work's Human Subjects Review Committee should they have any questions. Participants were asked to read the informed consent information and indicate their

understanding and to consent to the informed consent agreement by clicking a check-box agreeing to participate before continuing on to the survey itself.

This study presented no clear risk to participants as it asked mental health professionals non-sensitive questions related to their professional activities, training and demographics. Participants could exit the survey anonymously at any time. Benefits to participation in the study included the opportunity for participants to reflect on and increase their awareness of outreach and multicultural issues that affect students of color, the opportunity for participants to express their opinions, and to help increase the body of research and knowledge about what kinds of institutional and professional activities and training relate to increased multicultural competency. The study provided participants the opportunity to help counselors and counselor education specialists find ways of improving training for college counselors and improve counseling services to minority and multicultural students.

Study participation was voluntary; individuals who received the recruitment email self-selected. Participants could choose not to answer any question and could exit the survey at any time by clicking on an exit button that appeared on every page.

A number of steps were taken to ensure that participation in the study was anonymous. Survey responses were encrypted by SurveyMonkey to ensure that the data were private and confidential. The survey did not collect names, email addresses or other identifying data; I programed SurveyMonkey not to record IP addresses and SurveyMonkey assigned identification numbers to each participant's set of responses. There was no way for the researcher to determine who completed surveys. The data gathered was kept confidential, accessible only by the researcher, the research advisor, and the data analyst. Data storage was password protected on secured servers or computers. Data collected in this study were only shared in aggregate form

and will be kept in a secured location for five years after the completion of the study in a secure location as required by the MCKAS use agreement and Federal guidelines. After that the data will be destroyed.

The survey began with a brief series of questions about the participants' previous training experiences, the frequency with which they discuss racial difference with students of color in counseling, and the frequency of outreach activities to minority student groups.

Participants were then asked to complete the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MCKAS). The MCKAS is the 2003 revision of the Multicultural Counseling and Awareness Scale (MCAS) first presented in 1991 (Ponterotto & Potere, 2003). The MCKAS was developed to measure self-reported multicultural counseling competencies as outlined in Sue et al in 1982 and expanded by Sue et al in 1992 and Sue et al in 1998. It is a 32-item questionnaire organized around two factors: knowledge/skills (20 items) and awareness (12 items). Items are measured using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from "not at all true" to "totally true." Ponterotto and Potere (2003) reported ten-month test-retest reliability to be .70 for the Knowledge/Skills subscale and .73 for the Awareness subscale. They reported internal consistency reliability data across a range of studies. For the Knowledge/Skills subscale coefficient alphas ranged from .78 to .93 and for the Awareness subscale they ranged from .67 to .89. An example of a question on the Knowledge/Skills subscale is: I am aware that some minorities see the counseling process as contrary to their own life experiences and inappropriate or insufficient to their needs. An example of a question from the Awareness subscale is: I believe that it is important to emphasize objective and rational thinking in minority clients (see Appendix B for the full MCKAS instrument).

The final section of the survey was a demographic questionnaire focusing both on demographic characteristics of the individual counselor as well as characteristics of the college or university setting the counselor is practicing in. Individual demographic characteristics included race/ethnicity, gender, years of clinical practice, highest degree obtained, and professional identity. Institutional characteristics included size of student body, diversity of student body, diversity of counseling staff, geographic region and institution type.

MCKAS ethical use guidelines require that participants have the opportunity to review a concise written summary of study's purpose, method, results, and implications. To that end I included an invitation in the informed consent page and recruitment email to contact me by email if a person invited to participate wished to receive a brief summary of the survey with results and implications. Four people requested this document.

Data Analysis

Survey data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the study participant responses in terms of frequencies, and the mean and median responses. Cronbach's alpha was used to test the internal reliability of the two MCKAS subscales. T-tests were used to determine whether mean scores on the MCKAS subscales were different when comparing two groups of participants. One-way ANOVA tests were used to determine wither the mean scores of the MCKAS subscales were different when there were more than two groups to compare. When differences were found, Bronferroni and LSD post-hoc tests were used to determine statistically significant differences between specific groups. Spearman's rho was used to determine if there was a relationship between the MCKAS subscales and the ordinal (rank-level) data. Pearson's r was used to determine if there was a relationship between the MCKAS subscales and interval data.

Significance of the Study

Building on ideas presented in these earlier studies with college counselors about previous training experiences and demographic characteristics (Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994), this study examined how levels of multicultural competency differ by institutional factors such as outreach activity, institutional and participant demographic characteristics, provision of training, and some counseling center practices such as the frequency that racial differences are discussed in meetings or with students. This study adds to the body of knowledge about efforts to increase multicultural counseling competencies in college counselors and what institutional practices and settings might be associated with an increase in multicultural competencies in counselors.

This study expands upon studies that have compared the relationship between college counselors and individual demographic characteristics by looking at institutional characteristics, training experiences, as well as counselors outreach activities to minority student populations.

Study Design Limitations

Because this study used a non-probability sample, the results may not have an acceptable level of external validity and caution must be used when generalizing results to the larger population of college counselors. The study's small sample size may also present a threat to study's validity and generalizability. The study may be limited by a response bias; because the study participants self-select, this may systematically affect results as the study sample may over-represent participants with particular characteristics. Because the study is using only self-reported data, there may also be a social desirability bias in reporting personal knowledge or skills about multicultural competency in the responses that might skew the results.

The next chapter describes and summarizes the data that were collected. It also describes the statistical tests used to analyze the data, and the outcomes of those tests.

CHAPTER IV

Findings

This chapter reviews the research question and hypotheses and provides background information about the kinds of variables looked at in the study and reports some of the descriptive statistics about the responses. Participant's comments for the two open-ended questions are summarized. The chapter then presents the statistical analyses used to determine differences between comparison groups, correlations of the variables with the MCKAS scores, and the results of these analyses. The major research questions were:

What are the differences in multicultural competencies of college counselors by training, outreach, institutional setting, and demographic characteristics? Are training, outreach, institutional setting differences or demographics correlated to higher MCKAS scores?

Background

Participants were asked a series of questions about the number of their own and their institutions' outreach efforts, i.e. meeting with groups of students on their campuses around counseling center issues. The responses to these questions are summarized in Table 3. Three of the participants reported that their centers did no outreach at all, and 50% reported that their centers engaged in 6 or more outreach activities per year. One quarter of the participants reported that their centers did not conduct outreach to minority student groups, though about three quarters did. Most of the counselors (90.5%) engaged personally in outreach efforts to students, but 24.5% of them did not engage in outreach to minority student groups. About 30% of the

counselors participated in 3-5 outreach activities per year (the most frequently chosen response) and about 38% reported 1-2 of those activities were with minority student groups. Six participants noted that there were no minority student groups active on their campuses.

Table 3. Frequency Distribution of Outreach Activities Reported

Question	Response Categories		Frequency	Valid Percent
How many outreach activities per year to student groups does your counseling center engage in?	Valid	0	3	3.1
		1-2	8	8.3
		3-5	20	20.8
		6-10	17	17.7
		11-15	11	11.5
		16+	37	38.5
		Total	96	100.0
How many of your counseling center's outreach activities per year are targeted to minority (ethnic, racial or international) student groups?	Valid	0	25	26.3
		1-2	20	21.1
		3-5	21	22.1
		6-10	9	9.5
		11-15	8	8.4
		16+	12	12.6
		Total	95	100.0
	Missing	System	1	
	Total		96	
How many outreach activities per year do you personally engage in with student groups?	Valid	0	9	9.5
		1-2	22	23.2
		3-5	28	29.5
		6-10	26	27.4
		11-15	5	5.3
		16+	5	5.3
		Total	95	100.0
	Missing	System	1	
	Total		96	
How many	Valid	0	23	24.5

outreach activities per year do you engage in personally with minority student groups?		1-2	36	38.3
		3-5	23	24.5
		6-10	9	9.6
		11-15	1	1.1
		16+	2	2.1
		Total	94	100.0
	Missing	System	2	
	Total		96	
Approximately how many minority student groups are active on your campus?	Valid	0	6	6.4
		1-2	13	13.8
		3-5	27	28.7
		6-10	30	31.9
		11-15	7	7.4
		16+	11	11.7
		Total	94	100.0
	Missing	System	2	
	Total		96	

Another set of questions focused on the frequency the participants engaged in discussion about race in their graduate programs, in their counseling center meetings, and in their meetings with students when there was a racial difference in the therapy dyad. The response frequencies are listed in Table 4.The most frequent participant responses to whether race was discussed in graduate school or in staff meetings was "Sometimes" (43% and 47.3% respectively) followed by "Often" (37.6% and 34.3% respectively). Slightly over half (56.7 %) of the participants indicated that when there is a racial difference in the counseling dyad, it sometimes came up for discussion; 77.8% of the participants expressed that they were either often or always the person who brought up race in the counseling dyad, rather than the student. Participants reported that students brought up race far less than counselors: only 2.2% reported that students often initiated discussion about race, and none reported that they did so all the time, with 74.2% responded with

"Sometimes," and 23.6% reporting that the students never were the ones to bring up race in the counseling dyad.

Table 4. Frequency Distribution of Discussions about Racial Differences in Counseling

Question	Response Categories		Frequency	Valid Percent
During your graduate studies, how often did issues of working with cross-racial or cross-ethnic clients come up for discussion?	Valid	Never	3	3.2
		Sometimes	40	43.0
		Often	35	37.6
		All the time	15	16.1
		Total	93	100.0
	Missing	System	3	
	Total		96	
In general, how often is race and/or ethnicity discussed in case presentations or discussions of students of concern in your team or clinical staff meetings?	Valid	Never	2	2.2
		Sometimes	44	47.3
		Often	32	34.4
		All the time	12	12.9
		N/A	3	3.2
		Total	93	100.0
	Missing	System	3	
	Total		96	
When there is a racial or ethnic difference in the counseling dyad, do you discuss the difference in the counseling?	Valid	Never	1	1.1
		Sometimes	51	56.7
		Often	31	34.4
		All the time	7	7.8
		Total	90	100.0
	Missing	System	6	
	Total		96	
When racial or ethnic difference in the counseling dyad is discussed, how often are you the person	Valid	Never	1	1.1
		Sometimes	19	21.1
		Often	54	60.0
		All the time	16	17.8
		Total	90	100.0

Question	Response Categories			Frequency	Valid Percent
initiating the discussion?		Missing	System	6	
		Total		96	
When racial or ethnic difference in the counseling dyad is discussed, how often is the student the person initiating the discussion?	Valid	Never		21	23.6
		Sometimes		66	74.2
		Often		2	2.2
		All the time		0	0
		Total		89	100.0
	Missing	System		7	
	Total			96	

Several questions asked participants about the size of their caseloads, the number of minority students in their caseload, and the race or ethnicity most represented in their caseload (see Table 5). The caseload sizes reported ranged from 3 to 200, with a mean of 27.07 and a median of 20.0. The number of minority students in participants' caseloads ranged from 1 to 35, with a mean of 6.75 and a median of 5.00. The most represented group in participants' caseload was Black/African American.

Table 5. Frequency Distribution of Size of Caseloads

Question	Response Categories		Frequency	Valid Percent
How many students are in your current counseling caseload?	Valid	1 to 10	11	12.9
		11 to 20	33	38.8
		21 to 30	19	22.4
		31 to 40	4	4.8
		41 to 50	7	8.2
		51-60	1	1.2
		71-80	1	1.2
		100-200	3	3.6
		Total	85	100.0
	Missing	System	11	
	Total		96	
How many	Valid	1 to 5	49	57.6

students of color are in your current counseling caseload?		6 to 10	19	22.4
		11 to 15	10	11.8
		16 to 20	6	7.1
		35	1	1.2
		Total	85	100.0
	Missing	System	11	
	Total		96	
Which minority ethnic/ racial group is most represented in your current caseload?	Valid	American Indian/Alaskan Native	4	4.7
		Asian	15	17.4
		Bi- or Multi-racial	18	20.9
		Black or African American	33	38.4
		Hispanic or Latino	10	11.6
		Ethiopian*	1	1.2
		Indian	1	1.2
		One each*	2	2.3
		One Hispanic, One Bi-racial*	1	1.2
		2 Black, 2 Asian*	1	1.2
		Total	86	100.0
	Missing	System	10	
	Total		96	

* Participants were given the opportunity to check "other" and specify their own category.

Several questions asked participants about their training experiences. Response frequencies are summarized in Table 6. Most of the counselors took at least one required multicultural training course in graduate school, although 17.6% did not take any in graduate school. Only 8.2% have not taken any multicultural competency trainings since graduate school. Nearly half (47.1%) of the participants have attended more than six trainings since graduate school; 61.4% attended one or more multicultural training provided by their center in the past year, and 55.4 % attended one or more multicultural training outside of their center.

Table 6. Frequency Distribution of Training Experiences

Question	Response Categories		Frequency	Valid Percent
How many courses on racism or multicultural competency did you take while in graduate school?	Valid	0	15	17.6
		1	38	44.7
		2	20	23.5
		3	7	8.2
		4	2	2.4
		5	1	1.2
		6	2	2.4
		Total	85	100.0
	Missing	System	11	
	Total		96	
How many of the courses on racism or multicultural competency you took in graduate school were required courses?	Valid	0	23	28.0
		1	39	47.6
		2	16	19.5
		3	3	3.7
		6	1	1.2
		Total	82	100.0
	Missing	System	14	
	Total		96	
Approximately how many trainings related to multicultural competency have you attended since graduate school?	Valid	0	7	8.2
		1	6	7.1
		2	12	14.1
		3-5	20	23.5
		6-10	18	21.2
		11+	22	25.9
		Total	85	100.0
	Missing	System	11	
	Total		96	
How many in-service trainings related to multicultural competency has your center or	Valid	0	31	36.9
		1	15	17.9
		2	16	19.0
		3-5	15	17.9
		6+	7	8.3

institution offered in the past year?		Total	84	100.0
	Missing	System	12	
	Total		96	
How many in-service trainings provided by your center or institution related to multicultural competency have you attended in the past year?	Valid	0	32	38.6
		1	17	20.5
		2	16	19.3
		3-5	12	14.5
		6+	6	7.2
		Total	83	100.0
	Missing	System	13	
	Total		96	
How many trainings related to multicultural competency have you attended outside of your center or institution in the past year?	Valid	0	37	44.6
		1	18	21.7
		2	17	20.5
		3-5	8	9.6
		6+	3	3.6
		Total	83	100.0
	Missing	System	13	
	Total		96	

Several questions in the survey asked about characteristics of the institutional setting. These questions and the response frequencies are listed in Table 7. Private/liberal arts colleges were the most frequently represented (44.2%), followed by state universities (36.4%). Institution size was spread across the ranges. More than half had more than 500 students of color enrolled. In terms of staff size, 66% had five or fewer full-time counselors in their centers; the mean was 3 and the median was 5.29. Part-time counselors were employed at 62.3% of the participant's institutions. Just over 40% of the participants reported that there were counselors of color employed at their institutions; the mean reported was 1.51 and the median was 1.

Table 7. Frequency Distribution of Characteristics of Participants' Institutions

Question	Response Categories		Frequency	Valid Percent
What is the size of the student body at your college or university?	Valid	less than 1,000	11	14.3
		1,000-5,000	24	31.2
		5001-10,000	17	22.1
		10,001+	25	32.5
		Total	77	100.0
	Missing	System	19	
	Total		96	
Approximately how many students of color are enrolled at your college or university?	Valid	less than 100	10	13.0
		101-200	8	10.4
		201-300	4	5.2
		301-500	12	15.6
		501+	43	55.8
		Total	77	100.0
	Missing	System	19	
	Total		96	
How many full time counselors work in your counseling center?	Valid	0 to 2	27	35.1
		3 to 5	24	31.2
		6 to 10	16	20.8
		11 to 20	9	11.7
		21 to 30	0	.0
		31 to 40	1	1.3
		Total	77	100.0
	Missing	System	19	
	Total		96	
How many part-time counselors work in your counseling center?	Valid	0 to 2	48	62.3
		3 to 5	24	31.2
		6 to 10	4	5.2
		11 to 20	0	.0
		21 to 30	1	1.3
		Total	77	100.0
	Missing	System	19	
	Total		96	

How many counselors of color work in your counseling center?	Valid	0	31	40.3
		1	22	28.6
		2	11	14.3
		3	5	6.5
		4	4	5.2
		5	1	1.3
		7	1	1.3
		8	1	1.3
		21	1	1.3
		Total	77	100.0
	Missing	System	19	
	Total		96	
Which type below best describes your institutional setting?	Valid	State University	28	36.4
		Liberal Arts or Private College	34	44.2
		Community College	9	11.7
		Research One Institution	3	3.9
		For Profit College	3	3.9
		Total	77	100.0
	Missing	System	19	
	Total		96	
In what geographic region of the country is your institution located?	Valid	Northeast	31	40.3
		Midwest	17	22.1
		Southeast	17	22.1
		West Coast	3	3.9
		Northwest	7	9.1
		Southwest	2	2.6
		Total	77	100.0
	Missing	System	19	
	Total		96	

There were two open ended questions on the survey. The first was: "Please feel free to express in writing below any thoughts, concerns, or comments you have regarding the MCKAS instrument." Thirteen participants responded to this invitation. Eight of the comments were

directly related to the MCKAS instrument. Five were related in particular to the wording of the instrument responses (ranging from "not at all true" to "totally true") as not fitting with the question statements. For example, on participant wrote "the rating scales for many questions did not fit the statement provided." Two participants commented about the instrument's validity given the wording; one of them also mentioned social desirability bias. One comment suggested that the field has progressed beyond what the MCKAS measures. For example, one participant suggested that "Face validity and awareness of 'preferred' responses will skew results." Another participant commented "As the field has progressed, this instrument seems to focus on problems that are less widespread now than in the past." The remaining five comments to this question were about the relevance of MCKAS and initial survey questions to the particular issues faced in that college's setting, such as size, rural location, and staffing issues.

The second open-ended question was "Please use this final page to provide any comments you would like to make on your or your counseling center's approach to working with ethnic or racial minority students at your institution, and/or any thoughts, concerns, or comments you have regarding this study." Nineteen participants provided comments. None of the participants commented on their center's approach to working with students of color. Six of the comments related specifically to the racial composition of the institutional setting: two reported working at an Historically Black College or University (HCBU), one at a predominantly Hispanic college, one at a campus that was 50% White and 50% students of color, and two from predominantly White campuses. Three participants commented on the diversity of their counseling center clients: one indicated that their clients were in proportion to the number of students of color enrolled at the institution, another reported a high number of students of color are seen compared to other campus resources for students of color, one reported few African

American men in their clientele. The remaining comments focused on issues personal to the participant or setting, such as being new, appreciating the focus on the study, and a comment about the number of students enrolled in on-line courses.

Internal Validity of the MCKAS

As reported in Chapter III, the MCKAS is a 32-item questionnaire organized around two factors: Knowledge/Skills (20 items) and Awareness (12 items). Items are measured using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from "not at all true" to "totally true." Ponterotto and Potere (2003) reported internal consistency reliability data across a range of studies. For the Knowledge/Skills subscale coefficient alphas ranged from .78 to .93 and for the Awareness subscale they ranged from .67 to .89. The MCKAS subscales in this study were tested for internal reliability using Cronbach's alpha. The Knowledge/Skills subscale coefficient alpha was .88 (N=74); the Awareness subscale coefficient alpha was .70 (N=75).

Hypothesis Testing

The first hypothesis was that older counselors, counselors with more clinical experience, and/or counselors with more multicultural training will have higher MCKAS scores. Spearman's rho test was run to test for correlations between MCKAS scores and number of years of clinical experiences, age, and courses taken in graduate school. Spearman's rho was used because the responses were ordinal values. No statistically significant correlations were found between age and years of clinical experience and the MCKAS scores. No statistically significant correlations were found between MCKAS scores and the number of courses taken in graduate school. Because the nature of the response categories made both Spearman's rho test for correlation and one-way ANOVA test for difference possible, both sets of tests were run for the other variables related to training.

A one-way ANOVA was run to determine if there was a difference in Knowledge/Skills scores by the number of courses taken since graduate school. A significant difference was found ($f(5,77)=2.834$, $p=.021$). A Bonferroni post-hoc test showed the statistically significant difference was between those who attended 2 trainings (m=4.8374) and those that attended more than 10 trainings (m=5.668). A one-way ANOVA was also run to determine if there was a difference in Awareness by the number of courses taken since graduate school and no statistically significant difference was found. Spearman's rho test found no correlation between the number of multicultural training courses taken since graduate school and Awareness or Knowledge/Skills MCKAS scores.

A one-way ANOVA was run to determine if there was a difference in Knowledge/Skills scores by the number of multicultural trainings offered at the participant's college, and a statistically significant difference was found ($f(4,75)=3.296$, $p=.015$). However, a Bonferroni post-hoc test did not show any statistically significant differences between specific groups. A different post-hoc test, the LSD, showed the statistically significant differences were between those who were offered 0 trainings (m=5.08) and those who were offered 1 training (m=5.61); between those who were offered 0 (m=5.08) trainings and those who were offered 3-5 trainings (m=5.59); between those who were offered 0 training (m=5.08) and those who were offered more than 5 trainings (m=5.78); between those who were offered 1 training (m=5.61) and those who were offered 2 trainings (m=5.08); between those who were offered 2 trainings (m=5.08) and those who were offered 3-5 trainings, (m=5.59); and between those who were offered 2 trainings (m=5.08) and those who were offered more than 5 trainings (m=5.78). A one-way ANOVA was also run to determine if there was a difference in Awareness scores by college-offered trainings and no statistically significant difference was found. Spearman's rho

correlations were run to determine if there was a relationship between the number of multicultural trainings offered by the participant's college and Awareness or Knowledge/Skills scores. There was a significant, weak, positive correlation between the number of trainings offered at the college and Knowledge/Skills scores (rho=.271, p=.013). There was no statistically significant correlation with Awareness scores.

A one-way ANOVA test was run to determine if there was a difference in Knowledge/Skills scores by the number of college-offered trainings the participant attended and a statistically significant difference was found (f(4,77)=4.047, p=.005). A Bonferroni post hoc test showed the significant difference was between those who attended 0 trainings (m=5.058) and those that attended 1 training (m=5.735). A one-way ANOVA was also run to determine if there was a difference in Awareness scores by the same variable, and no statistically significant difference was found. Spearman's rho correlation tests were run to determine if there was a relationship between the number of trainings offered by the college that the participant attended and Awareness or Knowledge/Skills scores. There was a significant, weak, positive correlation between attended trainings and Knowledge/Skills (rho=.221, p=.046). There was no statistically significant correlation with Awareness scores.

One-way ANOVA tests were also run to test for differences in Knowledge/Skills and Awareness scores by the number of trainings attended outside the college setting, and no statistically significant differences were found. Spearman's rho correlation tests were run to determine if there was a relationship between the number of trainings the participant attended outside his/her college and Awareness or Knowledge/Skills MCKAS scores. There was a significant, weak, positive correlation between this variable and Knowledge/Skills scores (rho=.287, p=.009). There was no significant correlation with Awareness scores.

Table 8. Difference in Knowledge/Skills by Training

Question	Response Categories	N	Mean	F	df	p
Approximately how many trainings related to multicultural competency have you attended since graduate school?	0	7	5.1462	2.8345	5,77	.021
	1	5	5.6300			
	2	12	4.8375			
	3-5	20	5.4036			
	6-10	17	5.1310			
	More than 10	22	5.6677			
How many in-service trainings related to multicultural competency has your center or institution offered in the past year?	0	30	5.0812	3.296	4,74	.015
	1	15	5.6091			
	2	16	5.0844			
	3-5	15	5.5893			
	More than 5	7	5.7786			
How many in-service trainings provided by your center or institution related to multicultural competency have you attended in the past year?	0	31	5.0579	4.047	4,77	.005
	1	17	5.7353			
	2	16	5.1500			
	3-5	12	5.3741			
	More than 5	6	5.9167			

These findings suggest that while age and clinical experience do not affect multicultural knowledge/skills and awareness, attending trainings after graduate school can increase multicultural counseling knowledge and skills areas. They also suggest that counselors who work in agencies that offer more training to staff have higher levels of knowledge/skills.

Before testing the second hypothesis which examined differences in MCKAS scores by race and gender, the distribution of gender and racial groups in this sample were compared with

those in the Gallagher (2010) survey. Table 9 summarizes these data. These data show less
diversity in this sample by race and gender.

Table 9. Comparison of Race and Gender with Gallagher's (2010) Survey

Counselor Characteristic	Current Study		Gallagher, 2010	
	Frequency	Valid Percent	Frequency	Valid Percent
Female	60	77.9	1,284	68.66
Male	17	22.1	586	31.34
African American	6	7.8	165	8.12
Asian American	2	2.6	115	5.66
Hispanic American	1	1.3	90	4.43
Native American	0	0	6	0.3
Other	5	6.5	214	10.53
White/Caucasian	63	81.8	1,443	70.98

The second hypothesis was that ethnic and racial minority counselors will have higher

MCKAS scores than White counselors. Because of the small number of participants who

identified a race other than White, I combined all the respondents who identified with a race

other than White. A t-test was run to determine if there was a difference between the MCKAS

scores of White Counselors and Counselors of Color among the participants. This test was

chosen because data were being compared between two groups. A statistically significant

difference in groups in the Awareness subscale was found (t(75)=2.214, p=.030). The White

Counselors had a higher mean on the Awareness subscale (m=6.31) than Counselors of Color

(5.99). There was no statistically significant difference in knowledge. Contrary to the hypothesis,

this finding suggests that White Counselors have higher Awareness scores than Counselors of

Color.

Table 10. Difference in Awareness by Race Grouping

Group	N	Mean	SD	t	p
White Counselors	63	6.31	.48664	2.214	.030
Counselors of Color	14	5.99	.60127		

To determine whether the difference in Awareness scores by racial grouping could be accounted for by the number of trainings a counselor attended or by the number of minority students the counselor was working with, further t-tests were run. The first t-tests looked for differences in the number of trainings attended, either in graduate school, after graduate school, within the college or outside the college, by racial grouping. No statistically significant differences were found. A t-test was also run to determine whether there was a difference by race in the percentage of minority students in a counselor's caseload, and no statistically significant difference was found.

The third hypothesis was that female counselors will have higher MCKAS scores than male counselors. A t-test was run to determine if there was a difference between the MCKAS scores of women and men. This test was chosen because data were being compared between two groups. A difference that approached statistical significance was found for the Knowledge/Skills subscale (t (75)=1.950, p=.055). The mean for men was higher (m=5.68) than the mean for women (m=5.31). There was no statistically significant difference in Awareness scores by gender. This finding is contrary to the hypothesis, and could suggest that men on average have higher Knowledge/Skills scores than women. However, because the tests did not achieve statistical significance, these data should be interpreted with caution.

49

Table 11. Difference in Knowledge/Skills by Gender

Group	N	Mean	SD	t	P
Male Counselors	17	5.68	.70	1.950	.055
Female Counselors	60	5.31	.68		

To determine whether the difference that approached statistical significant in Knowledge/Skills scores by gender could be accounted for by the number of trainings a counselor attended or by the number of minority students the counselor was working with, further t-tests were run. The first t-tests looked for differences in the number of trainings attended, either in graduate school, after graduate school, within the college or outside the college by gender. No statistically significant differences were found. A t-test was also run to determine whether there was a difference by gender in the percentage of minority students in a counselor's caseload. There was a significant difference in the percentage of minority students in a counselor's caseload by gender ($t(73)=2.612$, $p=.011$). Female counselors had a lower mean percent minority caseload (m=.2652) than male counselors (m=.4280). This suggests that the male counselors' slightly higher average MCKAS scores in Knowledge/Skills in this study might be accounted for by a higher percentage of minority students in their caseloads, which is also associated with higher Knowledge/Skills scores.

The fourth hypothesis was that counselors who participate in more outreach or whose institutions conduct more outreach with students of color will have higher MCKAS scores. Spearman's rho test was run to test for correlations between MCKAS scores and questions related to outreach to students. Spearman's rho was used because the responses were ordinal values. No statistically significant correlations were found between MCKAS scores and the

number of outreach activities to all student groups engaged in by the institution or the participant. There was a statistically significant, positive, weak correlation between the Knowledge/Skills subscale (rho=.279, p=.011) and the number of outreach activities a participant's institution targeted towards minority student groups. There was no statistically significant correlation with the Awareness subscale. There was a statistically significant, positive, weak correlation between the Knowledge/Skills subscale (rho=.270, p=.014) and the number of outreach activities a participant personally engaged in with minority student groups. There was no statistically significant correlation with the Awareness subscale. These findings support the hypothesis, suggesting that participants who engage in outreach activities with minority student group as well as those working in an institution that engages in more outreach to minority student group have higher Knowledge/Skills scores.

The fifth hypothesis was that counselors working in more diverse settings or with more diversity in their caseloads will have higher scores on the MCKAS. One-way ANOVA tests were run to determine if there were differences in awareness or knowledge by numbers of students of color. A one-way ANOVA test was chosen because there were more than two groups to compare. To even the group sizes for comparison, the 101-200 and 201-300 groups were combined so the resulting groups would be more even. No significant differences were found, either with the groups combined or without.

To determine whether there was a correlation by caseload, the percentage of each participant's caseload that comprised students of color was calculated. Pearson's r was run to test for correlations between MCKAS scores and questions related to caseload and staff diversity. Pearson's r was used because the level of measurement was not ordinal. There was a statistically significant, positive weak correlation between the minority caseload as percent of caseload and

the Knowledge/Skills subscale scores (r=.221, p=.048). This finding supports the hypothesis and suggests as the percent of counselors' caseload comprising students of color increases so does a counselor's Knowledge/Skills scores. There was no statistically significant association with Awareness subscale scores.

Similarly, to determine whether there was a correlation by number of counselors of color working in the center, the percentage of counselors of color working in each participants' center was calculated. Pearson's r test was run to test for correlations between MCKAS scores and staff diversity. Pearson's r was used because the level of measurement was not ordinal. There was a statistically significant, positive weak correlation between the staff diversity and the Knowledge/Skills subscale scores (r=.236, p=.039). This finding supports the hypothesis and suggests that as the percent of counselors of color in a center increases so does the counselor's Knowledge/Skills scores. There was no statistically significant association with the Awareness subscale scores.

The sixth hypothesis was that counselors who participate in more discussions about race with students or colleagues will have higher MCKAS scores. Spearman's rho was run to test for correlations between MCKAS scores and questions related to discussions about race with staff and students. Spearman's rho was used because the responses were ordinal values. No significant correlations were found between MCKAS scores and the questions relating to discussion about race with staff or students. This finding does not support the hypothesis, and suggests that participating in discussions about race is not associated with higher MCKAS scores.

The final chapter of this thesis discusses the results of this study in relation to the research question and the literature reviewed here. Implications for practice and further research are explored.

CHAPTER V

Discussion

This chapter summarizes the findings described at length in the previous chapter and considers how the findings support or do not support the hypotheses and the concepts and research presented in the literature reviewed in Chapter III. I also discuss the limitations of the study and the relevance of the findings for social work practice and future research.

This study posed the following two questions: What are the differences in multicultural competencies of college counselors by training, outreach, institutional setting, and demographic characteristics? Are training, outreach, institutional setting differences or demographics correlated to higher MCKAS scores? The findings suggested that training, outreach, and some characteristics of the institutional setting, such as staff diversity in the counseling center and caseload diversity of counselors, are associated with differences in MCKAS scores. Counselors who had attended more multicultural training since graduate school were more likely to have greater multicultural knowledge and skills. Counselors who participated in outreach with minority student groups or who had more students of color in their caseloads were also more likely to have greater multicultural knowledge and skills. In terms of setting, counselors who worked with a colleague who was a person of color, whose institution offered more multicultural trainings, and whose institutions engaged in more outreach to minority student groups were more likely to have greater multicultural knowledge and skills. Unlike previous research, the findings suggested that White counselors had higher Awareness subscale scores than counselors of color.

Interestingly, although there was a large and even spread in age and years of clinical experience, neither of these variables were associated with higher multicultural counseling competencies as measured by the MCKAS.

Not surprisingly the findings in this study supported the literature pointing to the need for multicultural training and the call by CSWE, the APA, and ACA to incorporate multicultural competency into new counselor training. The findings were congruent with those of the meta-analysis conducted by Smith, Constantine, Dunn, Dinehart, and Montoya (2006), supporting their conclusion that the average individual that had multicultural training showed an increase in self-reported competence over one who had none. Although, unlike the second study in the Smith, Constantine, Dunn, Dinehart, and Montoya (2006) meta-analysis, this research study did not distinguish between kinds of training or length of trainings, it does imply that any multicultural training is better than none. Because most of the participants in this study reported very similar responses about their graduate training, it is difficult to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of their training in graduate school.

One of the foundational theoretical constructs of this study was the relationship between multicultural counseling competencies emphasized by Sue, Bernier, Durran, Feinberg, Pederson, Smith and Vasquez-Nuttall (1982) and expanded upon by Sue, Arredondo and McDavis (1992) and interpersonal contact across cultural groups as outlined by Allport (1954) and refined by Pettigrew (1998). This connection was identified by Utsey, Ponterotto and Porter (2008) who suggested, when looking at meta-analyses of research based on these two theoretical perspectives, that counselor training should "include as much interpersonal contact across cultural groups as possible" (Utsey, Ponterotto and Porter, 2008, p. 343). The results in this study indicate that cross-cultural exposure in counselors via outreach activities to minority student

groups, working alongside counselors of color in counseling center settings, and having more students of color in their caseloads are correlated with higher knowledge/skills as measured by MCKAS scores. It was interesting to note relative to contact theory that reported frequency of discussions about race, which do not involve contact, in training or within the counseling center was not correlated with higher MCKAS scores.

The study results around the demographic characteristics of race and gender differed from the results Pope-Davis and Ottavi (1994) in terms of race and Pope-Davis, Reynolds, Diggs, and Ottavi (1994) in terms of race and gender. While this study found that White counselors had higher levels of multicultural awareness than counselors of color, Pope-Davis and Ottavi (1994) found that African American, Asian American, and Hispanic counselors all reported higher competencies in multicultural awareness and relationships than White counselors. Pope-Davis, Reynolds, Diggs, and Ottavi (1994), who used the MCAS measurement, an earlier version of the MCKAS used in this study, found that non-White counselors and women reported higher levels of multicultural knowledge and skills than White counselors and men, but no differences were found in multicultural awareness by race or gender. This study found that White counselors had higher Awareness scores than the counselors of color, and did not find statistically significant differences by gender.

The differences between the findings in this study and those mentioned above could be related to the conclusions of Chao and Nath (2011). They found that counselors with higher levels of ethnic identity and gender attitudes were more likely to report more multicultural training and corresponding multicultural competency as measured by the MCKAS. Their results indicated that relationships between ethnic identity, gender attitudes and multicultural competency are more complicated than the earlier studies suggest, and that training seems to

play a mediating role between gender roles/ethnic identity and multicultural counseling competency. When this is viewed in terms of potential cultural and institutional changes that have taken place in counseling practice and training between 1994 and 2012, it could be hypothesized that White counselors today are more aware of White privilege and cultural differences than they were in 1994. The increasing institutional emphasis on multicultural counseling competency as demonstrated in the surveys reviewed (Callicutt 2007; Smith, Dean, Floyd, Silva, Yamashita, Durtschi & Heaps, 2007; Gallagher, 2010) and increased emphasis in the field on multicultural competencies (APA, 2002; NASW, 2001; NASW 2002) could have added to the social desirability bias that may influence the responses of more privileged groups such as White counselors. Finally, sample size in this study was smaller (N=77 versus N=133 and N=220) and less diverse than the earlier studies, as there were only 14 counselors of color who participated and 17 male counselors.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited by the sampling methods, low response rate and the limited diversity of the sample that resulted from them. The participants for this study were drawn from a non-probability sample of college counselors. Given the resources I had available, I found no viable way to reach a representative sample of this broad a group of college counselors in order to create a probability sample. With these constraints in mind and in order to reach as large a number of college counselors as possible, I used convenience and snowball sampling methods to recruit participants via emails to professional listservs and individuals. Because of the imprecision of snowball sampling method in determining how many participants received the recruitment email, it is difficult to assess a response rate. Based on the lists I used, and bad and duplicate addresses, my best estimate is that about 800 counselors received my invitation. Of

them, 109 accessed the survey, a response rate around 13.6%, which yielded 96 participants, 77 of whom answered nearly all the survey questions. This low response rate was in part due to the length of my survey, survey fatigue of the listserv members (who received a number of requests for research participation at the time my survey went out), and the time of year my survey was sent, which was a particularly busy time for college counselors. In addition, due to time limitations I had to close my survey after three weeks and less than a week after my second request for participation, which limited the response rate. Because of the sampling methods employed and the self-select nature of participation, the demographic diversity of my sample was not representative of all college counselors.

In addition, some of the survey questions were, in retrospect, poorly designed. For example, while the response categories for size of student body (as are shown in Table 7) were adequate for comparison purposes given the even distribution of the responses, the response categories for the size of the student body were not adequate for comparison purposes. Over half of the participants (55.8%) chose the highest response categories (more than 500). This made statistical testing for difference or correlation between MCKAS and the diversity of the student body less useful. It would have been more useful to ask for exact numbers for responses to these questions. When designing the question, I chose not to ask the questions that way because I wasn't sure if counselors would have easy access to an exact figure, and it would not have been necessary if the response categories were adequately spread.

Although, as the literature presented in Chapter II suggests, the need for multicultural counseling competency is increasing, the qualitative comments from participants raise good points with regards to current relevancy of the MCKAS. As mentioned in Chapter III, the MCKAS is the 2003 revision of the Multicultural Counseling and Awareness Scale (MCAS) first

presented in 1991 (Ponterotto & Potere, 2003). The MCKAS was developed to measure self-reported multicultural counseling competencies as outlined in Sue et al in 1982 and expanded by Sue et al in 1992 and Sue et al in 1998. Shifting demographics in college campuses and an increased focus on multicultural competency training in graduate programs and college settings may have resulted in both an increased awareness of multicultural issues as important to counseling practice and may have increased the pressure on counselors to feel competent in multicultural counseling. This would result in the social desirability bias that the above participant noted could skew results. A social desirability bias is the tendency for people to say or do things that will make them look good. Social desirability bias is magnified by the fact that this instrument is self-report and that the counselors were self-selecting to participate. In addition, the MCKAS, though still used in research, is an older instrument that may need updating to be relevant to today's norms.

The issues of social desirability bias, participant self-selection, and self-report bias are important limitations to this study beyond the use of the MCKAS instrument. These are important concerns in this study and in the outcomes research for multicultural competency as a whole. Research studies utilizing other outcome measures such as student perceptions of the counselor, symptom improvement, direct observation where possible, and other more objective research methods are needed.

Implications for Practice

Although the study results do not show cause and effect relationships between the variables studied and the MCKAS scores, the results have some implications for clinical practice for counselors seeking to improve their multicultural competency, counselors supervising new-comers to the field, as well as for counseling center directors who have to make difficult choices

about hiring, staff development and outreach given tightening budgets. The study also has some

implications for supervising new counselors, as older and more experienced clinicians may not

have more multicultural competency than their supervisees based on those characteristics alone.

For individual counselors, the findings suggest that participants who engage in outreach

activities with minority student groups have higher Knowledge/Skills scores. They also suggest

that counselors who work with higher numbers of students of color in their caseloads have higher

levels of knowledge and skills. Results that showed that discussing racial differences, age and

clinical experience were not associated with higher levels of knowledge and skills. Therefore the

results emphasize direct contact and experience working with persons of color over intellectual

knowledge and general counseling experience. This has implications for counselors working in

settings where the staff and student body lack diversity who might want to find other ways of

increasing their cross-cultural contact as a means of increasing multicultural competency. The

results also suggest that more multicultural training experiences are related to higher levels of

knowledge and skills. It would be interesting to compare in future research whether this is

actually because training includes direct contact and if not, whether training or direct contact are

more highly correlated to higher levels of knowledge and skills.

This finding also has implications for counseling center directors and college

administrators who make resource allocation decisions that affect college counselors. The results

support the practice of many college counseling centers, and counselors themselves, of engaging

in outreach activities to minority student groups. It suggests that these activities, in addition to

the primary goal and benefit to the students, could also serve as an important means of

developing multicultural knowledge and skills in counselors. Several other factors related to

institutional setting and higher MCKAS scores in counselors are of relevance to counseling

center directors. These include offering multicultural trainings to their staff and the importance of hiring and retaining counselors of color on staff. The finding suggests that these practices might be more effective than talking about race and racial differences where there is no diversity in the staff. They suggest that counselors who do not have a lot of contact with people of color, either through their work or their colleagues, will on average have less multicultural knowledge and skills than staff who have more contact.

Implications for Research

Though the findings that point to training as an important factor in improving multicultural counseling competencies are not new (see Smith, Constantine, Dunn, Dinehart, & Montoya, 2006), this study also points to the need for further research into the specific factors in training programs that improve skills and those that don't. This study's findings imply that a non-diverse group of counselors discussing issues of race or ethnic difference may not result in improved multicultural counseling competency, while increased contact with diverse populations through a training program might. Further research is needed to determine whether experiential, contact-based training based on contact theory might be an effective training approach.

This study's findings suggest that outreach to minority student groups has a positive impact on counselors' multicultural knowledge and skills. Further research to support this finding would be useful given the small size and scope of this study. Research that measures the impact of outreach programs on students, counselors, and the campus environment as a whole is needed, given how little this area has been studied. In light of Chao and Nath's (2011) finding that counselors with higher levels of ethnic identity and gender attitudes were more likely to report more multicultural training and multicultural competency, further research on the interactions between ethnic identity, training and outreach activities in college counselors could

60

yield interesting insight into multicultural competency in this population, particularly around how and whether outreach activities affect ethnic identity, something not looked at in this study.

This study used a research instrument to measure multicultural counseling competency that was originally designed in 1994. As noted above, shifting demographics and an increased focus on multicultural competency training in graduate programs and college settings may have increased the social desirability bias in this research. The MCKAS, though still used in research, may need updating to be relevant to today's social and cultural norms within the research context being studied.

The issues of social desirability bias and self-report bias are important concerns in this study and in the outcomes research for multicultural competency as a whole. New research methods that can utilize other more objective measures of outcomes and measures of multicultural competency, such as the student improvement rates by counselor, direct observation, or other methods are needed.

Conclusion

This study looked at differences in multicultural competencies of college counselors by training, outreach, institutional setting, and demographic characteristics and their relationship to multicultural counseling competencies as measured by the MCKAS. The study found that training, outreach and certain institutional setting characteristics, such as offering multicultural training, counseling staff diversity, and offering counselors more contact with students of color, are related to higher levels of multicultural knowledge and skills in the sampled college counselors. This has implications for the design of training programs, the importance of outreach in college settings, and the hiring and retention of counselors of color. Further research is needed that looks as the relative importance of contact theory in cross-cultural counseling training

design and practice, and in finding outcomes measures of multicultural competency that do not

rely on self-report data.

References

Albrecht, A. C. & Jones, D. G. (2009). Web-based research tools and techniques. In *Compelling counseling interventions: VISTAS 2009,* G. R. Walz, J. C. Bleuer, R. K. Yep (eds.). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association. Retrieved from http://counselingoutfitters.com/vistas/vistas09/Article_30_AlbrechtJones.pdf

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

American Counseling Association. (2005). ACA Code of ethics. Retrieved from http://www.counseling.org/Resources/CodeOfEthics/TP/Home/CT2.aspx

American Counseling Association. (1996). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards. Retrieved from http://www.counseling.org/Publications/

American Psychological Association, (2002). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/ethics/code/index

American Psychological Association. (2003). Guidelines on multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organizational change for psychologists. *American Psychologist, 58*, 377–402. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/pi/oema/resources/policy/multicultural-guidelines.aspx

Ancis, J. R., Sedlacek, W. E., & Mohr, J. J. (2000). Student perceptions of campus cultural climate by race. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 78* (2), 180-185. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.2000.tb02576.x

Barreira, P. & Snider, M. (2010). History of college counseling and mental health services and role of the community mental health model. In J. Kay & V. Schwartz (eds.), *Mental health care in the college community* (p. 21-31). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Bishop, J. B. (1990). The university counseling center: An agenda for the 1990s. *Journal of*

    Counseling & Development, *68*(4), 408-413. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1990.tb02519.x

Bishop, J. B. (2006). College and university counseling centers: Questions in search of answers.

    Journal of College Counseling, *9*(1), 6-19. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1882.2006.tb00088.x

Chao, R. (2012). Racial/ethnic identity, gender-role attitudes, and multicultural counseling

    competence: The role of multicultural counseling training. *Journal of Counseling &*

    Development, *90*(1), 35-44. doi:10.1111/j.1556-6676.2012.00006.x

Chao, R., & Nath, S. R. (2011). The role of ethnic identity, gender roles, and multicultural

    training in college counselors' multicultural counseling competence: A mediation model.

    Journal of College Counseling, *14*(1), 50-64. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1882.2011.tb00063.x

Chao, R., Wei, M., Good, G. E., & Flores, L. Y. (2010). Race/ethnicity, color-blind racial

    attitudes, and multicultural counseling competence: The moderating effects of

    multicultural counseling training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *58*(1), 72-82.

    doi:10.1037/a0022091

Constantine, M. G. & Sue, D. W. (2005). The American Psychological Association's guidelines

    on multicultural education, training, research, practice, and organizational psychology:

    Initial development and summary. In M. G. Constantine and D. W. Sue (eds.), *Strategies*

    for building multicultural competence in mental health and educational settings (p. 3-15).

    Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Council on Social Work Education. (2008). Educational policy and accreditation standards.

    Alexandria, VA: Author. Retrieved from http://www.cswe.org/File.aspx?id=13780

D'Andrea, M., & Heckman, E. (2008). A 40-year review of multicultural counseling outcome

    research: Outlining a future research agenda for the multicultural counseling movement.

Journal of Counseling & Development, 86(3), 356-363. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6678.2008.tb00520.x

Dean, L. A., & Meadows, M. E. (1995). College counseling: Union and intersection. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 74*(2), 139-142. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1995.tb01838.x

Eells, G. T. & Schwartz, V. (2010). The reporting structure and relationship of mental health services with health services. In J. Kay & V. Schwartz (eds.), *Mental health care in the college community* (p. 33-41). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Gallagher, R. P. (2010). National survey of counseling center directors 2010. Alexandria, VA: The International Association of Counseling Services, Inc. Retrieved from http://www.iacsinc.org/NSCCD%202010.pdf

Heppner, P., & Neal, G. W. (1983). Holding up the mirror: Research on the roles and functions of counseling centers in higher education. *The Counseling Psychologist, 11*(1), 81-98. doi:10.1177/0011000083111014

Hodges, S. (2001). University counseling centers at the twenty-first century: Looking forward, looking back. *Journal of College Counseling, 4*(2), 161-173. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1882.2001.tb00196.x

Kearney, L. K., Draper, M., & Barón, A. (2005). Counseling utilization by ethnic minority college students. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 11*(3), 272-285. doi:10.1037/1099-9809.11.3.272

National Association of Social Workers. (2001). NASW standards for cultural competence in social work practice. Washington, DC: NASW Press. Retrieved from http://www.naswdc.org/practice/standards/NAswculturalstandards.pdf

National Association of Social Workers. (2002). *Code of ethics*. Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Passel, J. S. & Cohn, D. (2008). *U.S. Population Projections: 2005–2050.*: Washington, D.C.:

    Pew Research Center. Retrieved from http://www.pewhispanic.org/2008/02/11/us-

    population-projections-2005-2050/

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *49*(1), 65-85.

    doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.65

Pettigrew, T. F.& Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal*

    of Personality and Social Psychology, 90(5), 751-783. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751

Pettigrew, T. F. & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-

    analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38*(6), 922-934.

    doi:10.1002/ejsp.504

Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup

    contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *35*(3), 271-280.

    doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.03.001

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

    applications (p. 651-672). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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(3), 153-180. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1912.2002.tb00489.x

Ponterotto, J. G., & Potere, J. C. (2003). The Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and

    Awareness Scale (MCKAS): Validity, reliability, and user guidelines. In D. P. Pope-

Davis, H. L. K. Coleman, W. M. Liu, & R. Toporek (eds.), *Handbook of multicultural competencies in counseling & psychology* (p. 137-153). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pope-Davis, D. B., & Ottavi, T. M. (1994). Examining the association between self-reported multicultural counseling competencies and demographic variables among counselors. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 72*(6), 651-654. doi:10.1002/j.1556-6676.1994.tb01697.x

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*(2), 93-102. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Pope-Davis, D. B., Reynolds, A. L., Dings, J. G., & Ottavi, T. M. (1994). Multicultural competencies of doctoral interns at university counseling centers: An exploratory investigation. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 25*(4), 466-470. doi:10.1037/0735-7028.25.4.466

Prescott, H. (2008). College mental health since the early twentieth century. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry, 16*(4), 258-266. doi:10.1080/10673220802277771

Roysircar, G. (2006). Research in multicultural counseling: Client needs and counselor competencies. In Courtland C. Lee (ed.), *Multicultural issues in counseling: New approaches to diversity* (p. 369-387). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

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. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.53.1.132

Smith, T. B., Dean, B., Floyd, S., Silva, C., Yamashita, M., Durtschi, J., & Heaps, R. A. (2007).
Pressing issues in college counseling: A survey of American college counseling
association members. *Journal of College Counseling*, *10*(1), 64-78. doi:10.1002/j.2161-
1882.2007.tb00007.x

Sodowsky, G., 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*(2), 137-148. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.41.2.137

Sodowsky, G., Kuo-Jackson, P. Y., Richardson, M., & Corey, A. (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. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.45.3.256

Sue, D. (2004). Whiteness and ethnocentric monoculturalism: Making the 'invisible' visible.
American Psychologist, 59(8), 761-769. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.59.8.761

Sue, D. W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. J. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and
standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*(4), 477-
486. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1912.1992.tb00563.x

Sue, D. W., Bernier, J. E., Durran, A., Feinberg, L., Pedersen, P. Smith, E. J., & Vasquez-
Nuttall, E. (1982). Position paper: Cross-cultural counseling competencies. *The
Counseling Psychologist, 10*(2), 45-52. doi:10.1177/0011000082102008

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (1990). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice*. New
York: Wiley.

Stone, G. L., & Archer, J. College and university counseling centers in the 1990s: Challenges

and limits. *The Counseling Psychologist, 18*, October 539-607.

doi:10.1177/0011000090184001

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2011). *The condition of

education 2011* (NCES 2011-033). Indicator 26. Retrieved from

http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011033.pdf

Utsey, S. O., Hammar, L., & Gernat, C. A. (2005). Examining the reactions of White, Black, and

Latino/a counseling psychologists to a study of racial issues in counseling and

supervision dyads. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *33*(4), 565-573.

doi:10.1177/0011000005276493

Utsey, S. O., Ponterotto, J. G., & Porter, J. S. (2008). Prejudice and racism, year 2008--still

going strong: Research on reducing prejudice with recommended methodological

advances. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *86*(3), 339-347. doi:10.1002/j.1556-

6678.2008.tb00518.x

Van Selm, M. & Jankowski, N. W. (2006). Conducting online surveys. *Quality & Quantity, 40*,

435–456

Vinson, T. S., & Neimeyer, G. J. (2003). The relationship between racial identity development

and multicultural counseling competency: A second look. *Journal of Multicultural

Counseling and Development, 31*(4), 262-277. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1912.2003.tb00354.x

SMITH COLLEGE

March 19, 2012

Eline Potoski

Dear Eline,

Thank you for letting us use your application as a model. Your revisions are terrific and your project is now approved by the Human Subjects Review Committee. I think it is very interesting.

Please note the following requirements:

Consent Forms: All subjects should be given a copy of the consent form.

Maintaining Data: You must retain all data and other documents for at least three (3) years past completion of the research activity.

In addition, these requirements may also be applicable:

Amendments: If you wish to change any aspect of the study (such as design, procedures, consent forms or subject population), please submit these changes to the Committee.

Renewal: You are required to apply for renewal of approval every year for as long as the study is active.

Completion: You are required to notify the Chair of the Human Subjects Review Committee when your study is completed (data collection finished). This requirement is met by completion of the thesis project during the Third Summer.

 I wish you the best of luck.

Sincerely,

David L. Burton, M.S.W., Ph.D.
Chair, Human Subjects Review Committee

CC: Joyce Everett, Research Advisor

Dear Counselor,

Thank you for your interest in participating in this research study on relationships between multicultural counseling competencies, training, outreach and counseling experiences with minority students, and demographic data for college counselors. The first couple of questions will determine your eligibility to participate in the study. If you are eligible, you will then be directed to an informed consent page after which the study will begin.

Thank you again for your time and participation.

Eline Potoski, M.P.A.
M.S.W. Candidate

*1. Are you currently working (as either an employee or intern counselor) at a college or university counseling center in the United States?

◯ Yes

◯ No

*2. Are you currently providing counseling services to students through a college or university counseling center?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Informed Consent Agreement

Dear Participant,

My name is Eline Potoski and I am an MSW candidate at Smith College School for Social Work (Northampton, MA) conducting research as part of my thesis. I am examining relationships between multicultural counseling competencies, training, outreach and counseling experiences with minority students, and demographic data for college counselors. This study has been approved by the Smith College Human Subjects Review Committee and will be presented as a thesis at Smith College. It may also be used in presentations or publications on this topic. You were invited to participate because you are a member of ACCA-L, the Flying Solo listserv, a counseling center director who participated in the 2010 national survey, a member of the Counseling Center Village website, or have received this from a colleague of one of these groups. I am trying to reach a broad and diverse group of college counselors.

This online survey questionnaire will take about 20-25 minutes to complete. The first section is a brief questionnaire about training, outreach and counseling experiences in multicultural contexts. The second section is the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MCKAS). The survey will end with number of demographic questions.

This study presents minimal risk to participants. Benefits to participation in the study include the opportunity to reflect on and increase your awareness of outreach and multicultural issues that affect students of color, express your opinions, and help increase the body of research and knowledge of how institutional and professional activities and training relate to multicultural competency. This could help counselors and counselor educators improve training for counselors and services to students.

Participation in this study is anonymous. I will not collect names, email addresses or other identifying data, and I have programed SurveyMonkey not to record IP addresses. Survey responses will be encrypted by SurveyMonkey to ensure that the data is private and confidential. The data gathered will be kept confidential, accessible only by me, my research advisor, and the data analyst. Data will only be shared in aggregate and will be kept in a secured location for five years after the completion of the study as required by the MCKAS use agreement and Federal guidelines. After that the data will be destroyed.

Participation in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to answer any question and may withdraw from the study at any time before the end of the survey by clicking on the "Exit Survey" button that will appear on every page. If you exit before clicking the "Done" button at the end of the survey, any data you entered will be eliminated. Once you click "Done" however, I will not be able to remove your data because the anonymous nature of the survey will make it impossible to identify which responses are yours.

If you have any questions or concerns about the nature or purpose of this study or your rights as a research participant, or if you would like to receive a brief summary of the study with results and implications, please contact me at epotosk@smith.edu. You may also contact the Chair of the Human Subject Review Committee at Smith College School for Social Work, Northampton, MA, at (413) 585-7974. Please keep a copy of the informed consent.

*3. BY CHECKING "I AGREE" AND CLICKING "NEXT" YOU ARE INDICATING THAT YOU HAVE READ AND UNDERSTOOD THE ABOVE INFORMATION, THAT YOU HAVE HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO ASK QUESTIONS ABOUT THE STUDY, YOUR PARTICIPATION, AND YOUR RIGHTS, AND THAT YOU AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY.

○ I AGREE

○ I DO NOT AGREE

The first set of questions relate to your and your center's outreach and counseling practices.

4. How many outreach activities per year to student groups does your counseling center engage in?

◯ The center does not conduct outreach to student groups

◯ 1-2

◯ 3-5

◯ 6-10

◯ 11-15

◯ More than 15

5. How many of your counseling center's outreach activities per year are targeted to minority (ethnic, racial or international) student groups?

◯ The center does not conduct outreach to minority student groups

◯ 1-2

◯ 3-5

◯ 6-10

◯ 11-15

◯ More than 15

6. How many outreach activities per year do you personally engage in with student groups?

◯ 0 / Outreach is not part of my job responsibilities

◯ 1-2

◯ 3-5

◯ 6-10

◯ 11-15

◯ More than 15

7. How many outreach activities per year do you engage in personally with minority student groups?

◯ 0 / Outreach is not part of my job responsibilities

◯ 1-2

◯ 3-5

◯ 6-10

◯ 11-15

◯ More than 15

8. Approximately how many minority student groups are active on your campus?

◯ 0 / none that I know of

◯ 1-2

◯ 3-5

◯ 6-10

◯ 11-15

◯ More than 15

9. During your graduate studies, how often did issues of working with cross-racial or cross-ethnic clients come up for discussion?

◯ Never

◯ Sometimes

◯ Often

◯ All the time

10. In general, how often is race and/or ethnicity discussed in case presentations or discussions of students of concern in your team or clinical staff meetings?

◯ Never

◯ Sometimes

◯ Often

◯ All the time

◯ N/A

11. When there is a racial or ethnic difference in the counseling dyad, do you discuss the difference in the counseling?

◯ Never

◯ Sometimes

◯ Often

◯ All the time

12. When racial or ethnic difference in the counseling dyad is discussed, how often are you the person initiating the discussion?

◯ Never

◯ Sometimes

◯ Often

◯ All the time

◯ N/A

13. When racial or ethnic difference in the counseling dyad is discussed, how often is the student the person initiating the discussion?

◯ Never

◯ Sometimes

◯ Often

◯ All the time

◯ N/A

14. How many students are in your current counseling caseload?

(exact number) [   ]

15. How many students of color are in your current counseling caseload?

(exact number) [   ]

16. Which minority ethnic/ racial group is most represented in your current caseload?

◯ American Indian or Alaska Native

◯ Asian

◯ Bi-racial or Multi-racial

◯ Black or African American

◯ Hispanic or Latino

◯ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

◯ Other (please specify)

[   ]

The following questions relate to multicultural training you have had.

17. How many courses on racism or multicultural competency did you take while in graduate school?

(exact number) [   ]

18. How many of the courses on racism or multicultural competency you took in graduate school were required courses?

(exact number) [   ]

19. Approximately how many trainings related to multicultural competency have you attended since graduate school?

◯ 0

◯ 1

◯ 2

◯ 3-5

◯ 6-10

◯ More than 10

20. How many in-service trainings related to multicultural competency has your center or institution offered in the past year?

○ 0

○ 1

○ 2

○ 3-5

○ More than 5

21. How many in-service trainings provided by your center or institution related to multicultural competency have you attended in the past year?

○ 0

○ 1

○ 2

○ 3-5

○ More than 5

22. How many trainings related to multicultural competency have you attended outside of your center or institution in the past year?

○ 0

○ 1

○ 2

○ 3-5

○ More than 5

The following section is the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MCKAS), Copyrighted Ó by Joseph G. Ponterotto, 1997, which is a revision of the Multicultural Counseling Awareness Scale (MCKAS), Copyrighted Ó by Joseph G. Ponterotto, 1991.

On a scale of 1 to 7, rate the truth of each item as it applies to you.

23. I believe all clients should maintain direct eye contact during counseling.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

24. I check up on my minority/cultural counseling skills by monitoring my functioning – via consultation, supervision, and continuing education.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	4	5	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

25. I am aware some research indicates that minority clients receive "less preferred" forms of counseling treatment than majority clients.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

26. I think that clients who do not discuss intimate aspects of their lives are being resistant and defensive.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	4	5	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

27. I am aware of certain counseling skills, techniques, or approaches that are more likely to transcend culture and be effective with any clients.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

28. I am familiar with the "culturally deficient" and "culturally deprived" depictions of minority mental health and understand how these labels serve to foster and perpetuate discrimination.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

29. I feel all the recent attention directed toward multicultural issues in counseling is overdone and not really warranted.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	4	5	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

30. I am aware of individual differences that exist among members within a particular ethnic group based on values, beliefs, and level of acculturation.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	4	5	Totally true
Choose one	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

31. I am aware some research indicates that minority clients are more likely to be diagnosed with mental illnesses than are majority clients.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

32. I think that clients should perceive the nuclear family as the ideal social unit.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

33. I think that being highly competitive and achievement oriented are traits that all clients should work towards.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

34. I am aware of the differential interpretations of nonverbal communication (e.g., personal space, eye contact, handshakes) within various racial/ethnic groups.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

35. I understand the impact and operations of oppression and the racist concepts that have permeated the mental health professions.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

36. I realize that counselor-client incongruities in problem conceptualization and counseling goals may reduce counselor credibility.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

37. I am aware that some racial/ethnic minorities see the profession of psychology functioning to maintain and promote the status and power of the White Establishment.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

38. I am knowledgeable of acculturation models for various ethnic minority groups.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

39. I have an understanding of the role culture and racism play in the development of identity and worldviews among minority groups.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

40. I believe that it is important to emphasize objective and rational thinking in minority clients.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

41. I am aware of culture-specific, that is culturally indigenous, models of counseling for various racial/ethnic groups.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

42. I believe that my clients should view a patriarchal structure as the ideal.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

43. I am aware of both the initial barriers and benefits related to the cross-cultural counseling relationship.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

44. I am comfortable with differences that exist between me and my clients in terms of race and beliefs.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

45. I am aware of institutional barriers which may inhibit minorities from using mental health services.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

46. I think that my clients should exhibit some degree of psychological mindedness and sophistication.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

47. I believe that minority clients will benefit most from counseling with a majority who endorses White middle-class values and norms.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

48. I am aware that being born a White person in this society carries with it certain advantages.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

49. I am aware of the value assumptions inherent in major schools of counseling and understand how these assumptions may conflict with values of culturally diverse clients.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

50. I am aware that some minorities see the counseling process as contrary to their own life experiences and inappropriate or insufficient to their needs.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

51. I am aware that being born a minority in this society brings with it certain challenges that White people do not have to face.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

52. I believe that all clients must view themselves as their number one responsibility.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

53. I am sensitive to circumstances (personal biases, language dominance, stage of ethnic identity development) which may dictate referral of the minority client to a member of his/her own racial/ethnic group.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

54. I am aware that some minorities believe counselors lead minority students into non-academic programs regardless of student potential, preferences, or ambitions.

	Not at all true	2	3	Sometimes true	5	6	Totally true
Choose one	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯

55. Please click next to continue to the demographic section of this survey. Thank you for completing the MCKAS portion of the survey. Please feel free to express in writing below any thoughts, concerns, or comments you have regarding the MCKAS instrument:

This last section of questions are related to your and your institutions' demographic characteristics.

56. What is the size of the student body at your college or university?

◯ Less than 1,000

◯ 1,001-5,000

◯ 5,001-10,000

◯ More than 10,000

57. Approximately how many students of color are enrolled at your college or university?

◯ Less than 100

◯ 101-200

◯ 201-300

◯ 301-500

◯ More than 500

58. How many full time counselors work in your counseling center?

(exact number) ▭

59. How many part-time counselors work in your counseling center?

(exact number) ▭

60. How many counselors of color work in your counseling center?

(exact number) ▭

61. Are you employed full time or part time in your counseling center?

◯ Full-time

◯ Part-time

Please specify number of hours per week

▭

62. Which type below best describes your institutional setting?

◯ State university

◯ Liberal arts or private college

◯ Ivy League institution

◯ Community college

◯ Research one institution

◯ For-profit college

63. In what geographic region of the country is your institution located?

◯ Northeast

◯ Midwest

◯ Southeast

◯ West coast

◯ Northwest

◯ Southwest

◯ Alaska or Hawaii

64. What do you consider your professional role/identity?

◯ Counseling or clinical psychologist

◯ Professional counselor

◯ Social worker

◯ Psychiatrist

◯ Nonspecified mental health professional

◯ Other (please specify)

[ ]

65. What is your highest degree attained?

◯ PhD, MD, or equivalent

◯ Master's degree

◯ BA or uncategorized

66. Approximately how many years of clinical experience do you have?

(exact number) [ ]

67. Please indicate your race and ethnic identity (check all that apply)

☐ American Indian or Alaska Native

☐ Asian

☐ Black or African American

☐ Hispanic or Latino

☐ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

☐ White

☐ Other (please specify)

[_____]

68. Please indicate your gender

◯ Female

◯ Male

◯ Transgender

◯ Other (please specify)

[_____]

69. What is your age?

(exact number) [_____]

70. Please use this final page to provide any comments you would like to make on your or your counseling center's approach to working with ethnic or racial minority students at your institution, and/or any thoughts, concerns, or comments you have regarding this study.

Thank you for participating in this research. Please click "Done" to submit your response and exit the study.

[   ]

Dear College Counselor,

My name is Eline Potoski and I am an MSW candidate in clinical social work at Smith College School for Social Work. I am also an advanced clinical intern in a college counseling center hoping to continue professionally. I am currently conducting research on relationships between multicultural counseling competencies, training, outreach and counseling experiences with minority students, and demographic data for college counselors for my MSW thesis. This research has been approved by the Human Subjects Review Committee at Smith. You are receiving this email because you are a member of ACCA-L, the Flying Solo listserv, a counseling center director who participated in the 2010 national survey, a member of the Counseling Center Village website, or you have received this from a colleague in one of these groups. I am trying to reach a broad and diverse group of college counselors!

I write to ask if you would consider participating in my research by completing a web-based survey. It will take about 20-25 minutes to complete, and it includes the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MCKAS), a questionnaire about current experiences working cross-racially and cross-ethnically, with multicultural students and student groups on your campus, as well as a number of demographic questions. I believe the study will provide the opportunity to reflect on and increase your awareness of outreach and multicultural issues that affect students of color, express your opinions, help increase the body of research and knowledge of how institutional and professional activities and training relate to multicultural competency. This could help counselors and counselor educators improve training for counselors and services to students.

If you would like to receive a brief summary of the survey with results and implications, you may email me at any time at xxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxx.

All information you give will be both anonymous and confidential. To participate, please click on the following link: LINK

Because I am hoping to have as large a sample as possible for this survey, I would be so grateful if you would also consider forwarding this email to any colleagues you might have who would also be interested in participating. I am particularly interested in including the perspectives of counselors of color in this project and welcome your input or suggestions as well as your participation.

If you have any questions about the study or your participation, please email me at xxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxx. Thank you for your time and help!

Best wishes,

Eline Potoski, M.P.A.

M.S.W. Candidate, Smith College School for Social Work

Phone number

Dear College Counselor,

Two weeks ago I sent an email regarding my current research on how training and outreach experiences and demographic characteristics relate to multicultural counseling competencies in college counselors for my MSW thesis. If you responded to the survey, thank you so much! If you have not responded but would like to participate, you still can by clicking on the following link: LINK

I am hoping to recruit as many college counselors as I can for this study, which I believe will provide beneficial data for college counselors, counseling center directors and counselor educators. Please consider forwarding this email to your colleagues if there are any you know who might also be interested. I am particularly interested in including the perspectives of counselors of color in this project and welcome input or suggestions as well as your participation.

This web-based survey takes about 20-25 minutes to complete, and it includes the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MCKAS), a questionnaire about current experiences in working with minority clients and outreach to minority populations, and a number of demographic questions.

If you have any questions about the study or your participation, or would like a summary of the survey with results and implications, please email me at xxxxxxx@xxxxx.xxx.

Thanks again and best wishes,

Eline Potoski, M.P.A.

M.S.W. Candidate, Smith College School for Social Work

Phone number