

The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

College of Education

**THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG
COUNSELING PROGRAM ACCREDITATION,
COMPLETION STATUS IN COUNSELING PROGRAMS,
AND THE RACIAL ATTITUDES OF COUNSELORS-IN-TRAINING**

A Thesis in

Counselor Education

by

Garbette A. M. Garraway

© 2006 Garbette A. M. Garraway

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

May 2006

The thesis of Garbette A. M. Garraway was reviewed and approved* by the following:

Spencer G. Niles
Professor, Counselor Education
Head of the Department of Counselor Education, Counseling Psychology, and
Rehabilitation Services
Thesis Advisor
Chair of Committee

Jerry Trusty
Professor, Counselor Education

Keith B. Wilson
Associate Professor, Rehabilitation Services

Edgar Yoder
Professor, Agricultural and Extension Education

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School.

ABSTRACT

The acknowledgement in the counseling profession that practitioners may be limited in their provision of services to client from ethnic and racial groups different from their own precipitated a multicultural perspective to counseling. Out of that perspective developed the operationalization of competencies that counselor should have for providing effective multicultural counseling to clients from diverse backgrounds.

Although empirical evidence indicates that the racial attitudes of counselors might also affect the services that they provide to clients, the focus of research has remained on counselors' multicultural counseling competencies and the multicultural courses through which they are intended to be acquired primarily. This study focuses instead on counselor training programs and racial attitudes. Specifically, the purpose is to investigate whether there is a relationship among the racial attitudes of counselors-in-training, the amount of credits they have taken in their counseling programs, and the status of those programs with regard to accreditation sponsored by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP).

Whereas amount of credits completed and the accreditation status of counseling programs are the two principal independent or predictor variables, the scores obtained by master's level counselor trainees on a racial attitude scale serve as the dependent or response variable. A cross-sectional research design will be used to investigate the relationship among the variables.

Inasmuch as racial attitudes are influenced by personal and social variables, the investigation accounts for the effect of the variables of age, gender, race/ethnicity,

exposure to multicultural/diversity courses or workshops, and amount of experience as a practitioner. A questionnaire specifically constructed for this study will collect data related to demographics and the coursework that participating counselor trainees have taken.

It is expected that results from the study will have implications for pedagogical goals, curricular content, and research in counselor education. Inasmuch as research indicates that counselors with multicultural counseling competencies provide more effective service than those without, the results of this study could also have implications with regard to the interaction of the racial attitudes and competencies of professional counselors in the field.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
CHAPTER 1 – PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION	1
Introduction to the Area of Study	1
Purpose of the Study	7
Statement of the Problem	8
Significance of the Study	13
Organization of the Study	14
Summary	15
CHAPTER 2 – REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	16
Introduction	16
State of Race Relations	16
Understanding Racial Attitude	19
Review of Research Literature	30
Summary	35
CHAPTER 3 – METHODOLOGY	36
Introduction	36
Research Design	36
Method	37
Participants	37
Data Collection Procedure	39
Instrumentation	40
Data Analysis Procedure	44
Summary	51
CHAPTER 4 – RESULTS	52
Introduction	52
Preliminary Analyses	52
Research Question 1	54

Research Question 2	55
Research Question 3	58
Summary	61
CHAPTER 5 – DISCUSSION	63
Review of the Study	63
Findings and Conclusions	65
Limitations	66
Implications	69
Recommendations for Future Research	72
APPENDIX A. Recruitment Notice to CESNET	76
APPENDIX B. Website Document Explaining the Study	77
APPENDIX C. Implied Informed Consent Form	78
APPENDIX D. Demographic and Coursework Questionnaire	80
APPENDIX E. Scoring Information and Sample Items from the Quick Discrimination Index	84
APPENDIX F. Recruitment Notice to COUNSELORGRAD	86
REFERENCES	87

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1		
Study Variables and Assigned Levels	47
Table 2		
Composition of Sample Used in Study	53
Table 3		
Descriptive Statistics of Scores on Cognitive and Affective Subscales	54
Table 4		
Interaction and Main Effects for Credits on Cognitive Subscale	56
Table 5		
Interaction and Main Effects for Credits on Affective Subscale	57
Table 6		
Interaction and Main Effects for Accreditation on Cognitive Subscale	59
Table 7		
Interaction and Main Effects for Accreditation on Affective Subscale	61

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For their support and guidance with this project, especially during the difficult periods that accompany such projects as this one, I thank my thesis committee – Spencer Niles, Jerry Trusty, Keith Wilson, and Edgar Yoder.

I acknowledge also the instruction, support, and camaraderie of many others in the Department of Counselor Education, Counseling Psychology, and Rehabilitation Services during the program of studies that led to the completion of this project. For his scholarship, warmth, and humor, special thanks to Spencer Niles, who was the chair of my thesis committee as well as my advisor from the beginning to the end of my doctoral studies.

Clarence, my brother and friend, helped to keep me balanced with long distance telephone discussions on topics that ranged beyond my academic work. My children, Asha and Shawn, were a special source of inspiration. They never doubted that I was able to do it.

CHAPTER 1 – PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION

Introduction to the Area of Study

Development of a Multicultural Perspective

About 40 years ago, Wrenn (1962) discussed the danger of “cultural encapsulation” in the counseling profession. He explained the concept as the potential for counselors in a rapidly changing society to become isolated within their own culture, which renders them uninformed and insensitive to other cultural viewpoints. Bound by their monocultural way of thinking, these counselors bring to the counseling activity stereotypical assumptions about clients who come from cultures that are different from their own. Through their lack of cultural competence, such counselors could engage in practices that are racist without being aware that they are doing so (Ridley, 1995).

Over the decades since Wrenn’s (1962) warning, professional organizations and educational institutions have responded to the need to address the issue of counselors’ cultural competence. With the Vail Conference of 1973 and its Follow-up Commission, the American Psychological Association (APA; Korman, 1974) adopted cultural competence as an ethical issue in counseling psychology. Current multicultural guidelines were approved as APA policy in 2002 and will remain in effect until 2009 (APA, 2003).

Almost simultaneously in the 1970s, the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES), a division of the American Counseling Association (ACA), introduced standards for the preparation of counselors that contained recommendations with specific reference to counselors practicing in a multicultural society (ACES, 1977).

In 1991, the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD), another division of ACA, approved a document that laid out the necessity and justification for a multicultural perspective in counseling (AMCD, 1992). A few years later, AMCD and ACES jointly developed the *Multicultural Counseling Competencies and Standards* (Arredondo et al., 1996). That document defined and operationalized the domains and competencies for counseling clients from diverse cultural backgrounds.

To promote the adoption of the competencies by all mental health professions, a national campaign was undertaken in 2002 (D'Andrea & Arredondo, 2002). The campaign provoked a heated debate over the necessity of the competencies in general, and for mental health professionals in particular (see Arredondo & Toporek, 2004; Patterson, 2004; Vontress & Jackson, 2004; Weinrach & Thomas, 2002). Arredondo and Toporek point out, however, that it seems the competencies are on the way to achieving widespread endorsement.

Results of the Development of the Competencies

Besides the debate, there were several outcomes from the formulation and dissemination of the competencies. First, there was the development of an inventory of instruments to measure the level of multicultural counseling competencies in counselors and other allied personnel. Second, a body of literature developed that investigated the acquisition and benefit to the counseling process of multicultural counseling competencies in various branches of the counseling profession. In this body of literature, several studies indicate that multicultural counseling competencies have an impact on the effectiveness of the service counselors provide to clients from cultures different from

their own (Constantine & Yeh, 2001; Fischer & Chambers, 2003; Ponterotto, Fuertes, & Chen, 2000). Third, efforts were made to ensure that the opportunity to acquire multicultural competence was integrated into existing counseling programs. The Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) specifies that of the eight core curricular areas that counseling programs must cover to receive accreditation, one of them must be Social and Cultural Diversity (CACREP, 2001).

With counseling programs that are CACREP-accredited, or seeking CACREP accreditation, fulfilling the requirement of having a curricular component that gives students an opportunity to develop cultural competence, many counseling programs offer courses aimed at promoting cultural competence in the counseling process. To name a few examples from different geographic regions around the country, such courses include Multicultural Counseling and Psychology at Western Michigan University, Cross-cultural Counseling at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Counseling Culturally Diverse Clients at the University of North Texas, and Social and Cultural Foundations in Counseling at San Francisco State University. Although the names of such courses can be used only to gauge the nature of their content, there is support for the claim that multicultural training can have an impact on the acquisition of multicultural counseling competencies (Constantine & Yeh, 2001; Fischer & Chambers, 2003; Ponterotto, Fuertes, & Chen, 2000).

Deficiency of the Competencies

The activities undertaken by professional organizations and educational institutions to address Wrenn's (1962) warning about cultural encapsulation indicate that progress has been made. Despite the progress and reported success of counseling programs to impart multicultural counseling competencies to trainees through multicultural courses, Patterson (2004) points out that the assumption that simply a knowledge of a client's culture will result in therapy that is more appropriate and effective has not been substantiated. He points out further that one of the flaws inherent in the competencies is the assumption that counseling is a matter of information, knowledge, practices, skills, or techniques. Patterson argues that the success of counseling depends on a list of characteristics and attitudes that range from the healing function of the counselor to the trust and confidence between the counselor and client. He does not include in the list, however, the racial attitude of the counselor. In fact, the racial attitude of the counselor as a factor in effective counseling did not become an issue in the debate (Arredondo & Toporek, 2004; Patterson, 2004; Vontress & Jackson, 2004; Weinrach & Thomas, 2002). Yet, the work of theorists and practitioners alike (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998; Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakame, & Hudson, 2002; Helms, 1984; 1990; 1995; Ridley, 1995) suggests that there is a significant need to also consider racial attitudes, as distinct from awareness, knowledge, and skills.

Racial Attitudes in the Counseling Context

It was Cross's (1971) model of the racial identity of African Americans that began drawing attention to the potential influence of racial attitudes in the counseling

context. Cross believed that White counselors could provide more effective service to their African American clients if the counselors had an idea of the racial identity development of African Americans. From a different but complementary perspective, Helms (1984) hypothesizes that for White counselors to provide effective service, they would benefit from becoming aware of their own racial identity. Helm contends that the racial attitudes of individuals result from the environment in which they grow up. With reference to European Americans, Helms claims that the environment in which they grow up has placed them in a position of privilege in comparison with other racial groups and, furthermore, has socialized them to protect their privileged position by adopting racist attitudes and behaviors towards people who are not members of their group.

Corroboration for Helms's point of view comes from research outside the counseling discipline. Dovidio and Gaertner (1998) and Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakame, and Hudson (2002) take Helms's assertions further with the argument that socialization into the world of the majority group provides many European Americans with strong egalitarian values, but from their experiences of power and privileges, and the learning of racial and other stereotypes, their socialization process bequeaths them also with (negative) prejudicial beliefs and feelings towards other groups.

Thus, the concept was gaining empirical credibility that in spite of their egalitarian values, many White counselors harbor unconscious, negative beliefs and feelings about their clients from other racial groups. The inference can be made from the preceding argument that, similarly, members of minority groups, from the "not-as-privileged" environments in which they grow up, develop certain attitudes relating to race

as well. Nonetheless, the implication of the point of view held by Helms (1984) and Dovidio and his colleagues (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998; Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakame, & Hudson, 2002) is that regardless of the racial and cultural backgrounds of counselors, they hold certain racial attitudes that may be counterproductive in their counseling practice, if not harmful to their clients (Remley & Herlihy, 2005; Ridley, 1995).

As in the case of the multicultural counseling competencies, instruments were developed to investigate racial identity development attitudes. Helms's (1984) White Racial Identity Development (WRID) model led to the development of Helms and Carter's (1990) White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS) for measuring the racial attitudes of Whites. Other instruments were developed to measure the racial attitudes of Whites, such as the New Racism Scale (NRS; Jacobsen, 1985), the White Racial Consciousness Development Scale (WRCDS; Clancy & Parker, 1989), and Choney & Behrens's Oklahoma Racial Attitude Scale-Preliminary Form (ORAS-P; as cited in Cumming-McCann & Accordino, 2005). Instruments were also developed to measure the racial attitudes of African Americans as well as the racial attitudes of people in groups that comprised members from different racial/ethnic backgrounds. These instruments included the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale (BRIAS; Parham & Helms, 1981), Helms's People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (POCRIAS; as cited in Vinson & Neimeyer, 2003), and the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI; Ponterotto, Burkard, Rieger, Grieger, et al., 1995).

Conclusion to Discussion of Area of Study

Whereas the development of the multicultural counseling competencies resulted in openly concerted efforts to facilitate the acquisition of the competences, the counseling literature reveals some reluctance in the profession to demonstrate similar efforts to address the racial attitudes of counselor trainees. Although it is arguable that this resistance exists because attitudes are more difficult to assess and alter than awareness, knowledge and skills, it is very likely that the reluctance exists also because addressing the racial attitudes of counselors in training is a much more sensitive issue than addressing their multicultural counseling competencies. As Vontress and Jackson (2004) point out, “it is unlikely that graduate students will be willing to pay money to have their racial attitudes changed, in spite of how noble that intention may be” (p. 79).

Nonetheless, the introduction of racial attitudes into the arena of counselor training brought the counseling profession to another stage in its advancement of theory, research, and training. As the discussion in this chapter has shown, efforts to address Wrenn’s (1962) concern about cultural encapsulation have taken the counseling profession through the acknowledgement of a multicultural perspective to counseling, the development of multicultural counseling competencies, and the requirement of multicultural courses in counseling programs, to the stage where attention is drawn to the racial attitudes of counselors that may be unconscious but harmful to clients.

Purpose of the Study

From the foregoing outline of the area of study under investigation, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Counselor trainees will enter counseling programs with certain racial attitudes, some of which may be negative and held unconsciously.
2. Addressing multicultural counseling competencies is given much more overt attention than racial attitudes in the training of counselors.
3. While multicultural courses or training may facilitate the acquisition of multicultural counseling competencies and positive racial attitudes, such courses comprise only one component of counseling programs.
4. Counseling programs may differ in the inclusion of multicultural courses as requisites and in the infusion of multicultural issues throughout their curricula.

Based on those conclusions about the current state of affairs in counselor training, the purpose of this study is to extend current research in this area by going beyond the investigation of multicultural courses and multicultural counseling competencies and investigate the relationship between counseling programs and the racial attitudes of counselor trainees.

Statement of the Problem

In specifying the investigation to be undertaken, certain concepts and assumptions need to be clarified. First, CACREP accredits counseling programs that are offered at the master's and doctoral levels. Whereas the master's program prepares counselors for first time entry into the profession, prior experience in the profession is required for admission to the doctoral program, which prepares candidates primarily for research and teaching. Although racial attitudes are certainly important at any level of practice in the profession, the study is concerned with the racial attitudes of that category of counselors whose

occupations require daily interact with clients in the provision of service. Those counselors are the current trainees in the master's program.

Second, because trainees have a choice of how many courses they take each semester and taking fewer courses may result in staying longer in the program but having less exposure to the program's curriculum, courses taken are more appropriate as a variable in this study than length of time in the program. Furthermore, the variability of the quarter and semester systems across educational institutions results in some courses being assigned varying amounts of credits, which are based on the number of hours the course meets each week. Seeing that credit hours is a more stable variable across programs than courses, exposure to counseling programs has been operationalized in this study as credits taken to fulfill graduation requirements.

The choice that counselor trainees have in the amount of credits they take each semester raises the third issue to be clarified. Within and across the various counseling programs that may be surveyed in any particular semester, credits completed by trainees may vary from 0 to 48 (and in some cases more). In light of the difficulty in determining before data inspection the most appropriate intervals for grouping the amount of credits taken, in the research questions, *12 and fewer credits* is used to identify the group of counselor trainees with the fewest credits taken whereas *43 and more credits* is used for the group with the most credits taken.

A fourth consideration in defining the research question concerns the parity of counseling programs. It has been stated above that CACREP accredits counseling programs. The assumption is made that those programs not accredited by CACREP have

not fulfilled the requirements or, regardless of the requirements, do not wish to be accredited by CACREP. However, since CACREP holds counseling departments and their programs to certain curricular standards, it will be assumed that those programs accredited by CACREP share a greater degree of homogeneity in their curricula than those that are not accredited by CACREP.

Fifth, CACREP accreditation could influence prospective applicants' perception of a program, in terms of the interrelationship they perceive among such factors as its tuition cost, its faculty, and the hiring potential of its graduates. Consequently, the status that various programs have with regard to CACREP accreditation could attract applicants differentially based on such factors as applicants' age, prior experience as a practicing counselor, and goals after graduation. For example, applicants who work in settings that allow them to practice as counselors and are continuing their practice, or plan to return to their practice after graduating from a master's program, might not be concerned with whether the counseling program they apply to is CACREP-accredited or not. On the other hand, applicants who intent to obtain licensure to begin practicing in the profession after graduation are likely to be concerned with the status that the program they apply to has with regard to CACREP accreditation. With the likelihood that applicants' backgrounds and other factors are influencing their choice of which counseling programs to apply to, it is likely as well that CACREP-accredited programs admit applicants with qualities, experiences, and qualifications that are different from those applicants who are admitted to programs that are not CACREP-accredited.

Sixth, although the study identifies and focuses on the curricula of counseling programs as the variable that can be a predictor of racial attitudes of counselor trainees, a systems approach to research argues that many other predictor variables work together to generate complex human phenomena such as racial attitudes. The literature and logical assumptions point to some likely variables. The literature has identified women as more comfortable with racial issues than men (Carter, 1990; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1992), people of color more than Whites (Vinson & Neimeyer, 2003), and younger students more than older students (Ottavi, Pope-Davis, & Dings, 1994). Furthermore, results from Ottavi, Pope-Davis, and Dings's (1994) study indicate that clinical experience and multicultural coursework have a positive effect on racial attitudes. Consequently, while this current study focuses primarily on the curriculum, it will also address the influence that gender, race/ethnicity, age, experience as a practicing counselor, and prior participation in multicultural courses or training may have on the racial attitudes of trainees.

Lastly, inasmuch as racial attitudes originate in cognitive as well as affective processes (Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 2005; Haddock & Huskinson, 2004; Kleg, 1993), and the racial attitudes of counselor trainees may exist and be affected differentially on these two dimensions, it is important to examine the scores of counselor trainees' racial attitudes on both dimensions separately. The instrument used in this study, the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI; Ponterotto, Burkard, Rieger, Grieger, et al., 1995) has three subscales, two of which can be used to measure those two dimensions independently. The two subscales used in this study are Factor 1, which assesses general (cognitive) attitudes

towards racial diversity/ multiculturalism and Factor 2, which assesses affective attitudes toward more personal contact (closeness) with racial diversity. They are referred to in the research questions as the cognitive and affective subscales respectively.

Placed within these parameters, this study will attempt to answer this broad question: Is there a relationship between the amount of credits counselor trainees complete in accredited and non-accredited master's level counseling programs and their racial attitudes scores? To respond to this research question, the following hypotheses were examined:

1. After accounting for differences in age, gender, race/ethnicity, prior experience in multicultural/diversity coursework or workshops, and experience as a counselor, counselor trainees who have completed 12 or fewer credits in programs with CACREP accreditation will score significantly higher on the cognitive and affective subscales of the QDI than counselor trainees who have completed 12 or fewer credits in programs that do not have CACREP accreditation;
2. After accounting for differences in age, gender, race/ethnicity, prior experience in multicultural/diversity coursework or workshops, and experience as a counselor, counselor trainees who have completed 43 or more credits in programs with CACREP accreditation will score significantly higher on the cognitive and affective subscales of the QDI than counselor trainees who have completed 12 or fewer credits in programs with CACREP accreditation;
3. After accounting for differences in age, gender, race/ethnicity, prior experience in multicultural/diversity coursework or workshops, and experience as a counselor,

counselor trainees who have completed 43 or more credits in programs that do not have CACREP accreditation will score significantly higher on the cognitive and affective subscales of the QDI than counselor trainees who have completed 12 or fewer credits in programs that do not have CACREP accreditation.

Significance of the Study

Research investigation into the relationship between racial attitudes and counselor training is progressing slowly. Although Ponterotto, Fuertes, and Chen (2000) remind the profession that one of the purposes of counseling programs is to foster “nonracist attitudes” towards racial and ethnic minority clients, a gap remains in the literature with regard to research on that pedagogical goal. Furthermore, the acknowledgement is widespread that counseling practitioners might be harboring racial prejudices that are inherent in their communities (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998; Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakame, & Hudson, 2002; Helms, 1984; 1990; 1995; Locke, 1992; Remley & Herlihy, 2005; Ridley, 1995). As with the case of the pedagogical purpose articulated by Ponterotto et al., research investigating the development and recidivism of racial attitudes among practicing counselors is lacking. Results from this study may have implications not only for the goals and curricular content of counseling programs, but also for in-service training.

Results from the study may also have implications for future research in counseling practice. Inasmuch as this study is investigating whether counseling programs affect the racial attitudes of trainees, an associated question concerns the expectations of such programs. If the outcome of this study indicates that there is no relationship between

the curricula of counseling programs and the racial attitudes of counselors-in-training, then an extrapolation from that result would be not only to continue investigating with more rigorous studies whether such a relationship exists, but to consider whether it can exist while the curricula of counseling programs remain as currently structured.

As stated in an earlier section of this chapter, research evidence supports the claim that counselors with multicultural counseling competencies provide more effective multicultural counseling than counselor who do not have those competencies (Constantine & Yeh, 2001; Fischer & Chambers, 2003; Ponterotto, Fuertes, & Chen, 2000). Results from this study indicating that counselors enter the profession with prejudicial racial attitudes would suggest that it is fruitful to investigate the extent to which counselors can hold prejudicial racial attitudes and still provide effective multicultural counseling services. That line of research would have significant implications for the influence of racial attitudes in counseling practice.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 has been concerned with the background, purpose, and significance of the study. Chapter 2 will be concerned with a review of the relevant literature. Because the study focuses on the racial attitudes of trainees who will proceed to provide service to the public, chapter 2 will begin with a brief overview of the state of race relations in the United States of America. The overview will lead to a discussion of the types of racial attitudes and racism that still persist in society and that counselors are likely to take with them into their practice. The focus of chapter 2 will then narrow to a discussion of the research literature that is relevant to racial attitudes and counseling programs.

In the third chapter, the research design and the methodologies used in collecting and analyzing data will be identified and their selection rationalized. Chapter 4 will describe and explicate the results from the analyses of the data. The concluding chapter will consist of a discussion in which the results are placed in context of the relevant literature and point to implications for theory, research, education, and practice in the counseling profession.

Summary

This chapter has served as an introduction to the study. It outlined the area of study under investigation and purpose of the study and noted the need for research in the area of racial attitudes and counseling programs. Research in that area is viewed as particularly significant for the contribution it can add to theory, research, and practice in counselor education. Also, the research question that guides the study is defined within certain parameters and explicitly stated. Finally, the organizational structure of the study is described.

CHAPTER 2 – REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Inasmuch as this investigation is concerned with the racial attitudes of counselor trainees, it contains concepts that need to be clarified and substantiated. The purpose of this chapter is to provide such clarifications and substantiations and to review the research literature related to racial attitude. The literature review is intended to describe the current status of research and thinking in those areas related to the study and indicate how the study will contribute to research on the relationship between counselor training programs and the preparedness of counselors to provide effective service to clients from diverse cultural, ethnic, and racial backgrounds. Inasmuch as racial attitudes develop and are maintained within a social context, this chapter will begin with a description of the current state of race relations in the United States of America, as a backdrop of the social forces to which counselors are susceptible.

State of Race Relations

The foundation of the United States was built on the division of the races. It is a historical fact that white colonization, the subjugation of indigenous peoples, and the transatlantic relocation of Africans as slaves set the stage for racist acts of bias, injustice, and violence that lasted for centuries. Over the last forty years, legislative interventions, public policy initiatives, and the social stigmatization of racist behaviors have eliminated much of the blatant and intentional aspects of racism (Barnes & Lightsey, 2005; Katz, 2003; Neville, Worthington & Spanierman, 2001; Ponterotto & Pedersen, 1993). However, racial prejudice and racism have not entirely passed away.

There are numerous reports of people from racial minority groups experiencing racism in many aspect of life that are significant to their existence, with African Americans experiencing the most (Smith, 2000). However, studies on racial discrimination do not readily find their way into scholarly journals. Difficulty in measuring racism or analyzing how it works (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2003) presents a partial explanation for the scarcity in scholarly journals. Another problem may lie in the various definitions of racism that exists and the ethical concerns surrounding the manipulation of racism for experimental purposes (Barnes & Lightsey, 2005). Magazine and newspaper articles, however, are a prime source for stories about racism.

An example from the New York Times (Leonhardt, 2002) describes a study that revealed the racial disparities found in the cost of mortgages. More African American and Latino householders with above-average incomes held mortgages with higher interest rates than Whites with comparable incomes. Moreover, the study revealed that the racial disparities increased as homeowners' income increased when in reality it should be the other way. One reason given to explain the disparity was that the concentration of subprime lenders in minority neighborhoods automatically attracts minority borrowers, while another reason stated that the banks reject loan applications from minorities, forcing them to apply for loans from higher-interest subprime lenders. Substantiation for the second explanation lies in an earlier New York Times news story reported by Bradsher (as cited in Pincus, 2000). Bradsher reported that the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago reviewed almost 2000 mortgage applications in the Boston area in 1990 and

found that African Americans and Latinos with bad credit were twice as likely to be turned down as Whites with bad credit.

Another example is reported in an African American newsweekly magazine. A study conducted by a sociologist at the University of Pennsylvania (National report, 2001) discovered that voice mail was being used by housing rental agents to discriminate, based on various linguistic features of callers. The study showed that compared to Whites, African Americans were less likely to get an opportunity to speak to a rental agent and less likely to be told about a vacancy.

Pincus (2000) cites the story of a large restaurant chain that paid a \$132.5 million out-of-court settlement to end a lawsuit for denying employment to African Americans in positions that involved customer contact, except in African American communities. The founder of the chain felt such a policy was good business because Whites would not want to eat at a restaurant where they would have to interact with African Americans, either as waiters or managers (Pincus, 2000).

In their study of labor market discrimination, Bertrand and Mullainathan (2003) responded to help-wanted ads with resumes that were randomly assigned either a very African American sounding name or a very European American sounding name and found that there was significant discrimination against African American names uniformly across occupations and industries.

Findings of a national survey conducted by the National Conference for Community and Justice (NCCJ; Smith, 2000) substantiate that such instances of racial and other types of discrimination can be found in situations ranging from housing and

employment to sports and places of worship. “Such discrimination is often rooted in deep-seated prejudices,” the president and chief executive officer of NCCJ stated in a press release attached to the 2000 report. Inasmuch as racial prejudice is widespread in society, there is no reason to believe that counselors are any less susceptible to holding and manifesting them (Locke, 1992; Remley & Herlihy, 2005; Ridley, 1995).

Understanding Racial Attitude

Perhaps most crucial to any discussion dealing with such terms as racism and racial prejudice is an understanding of what the terms themselves mean. Seeing that many writers (e.g., Pincus, 2000; Ponterotto & Pedersen, 1993; Ridley, 1995) have drawn attention to the confusion that results from the interchangeable use of prejudice and racism, clarification is in order. Such a clarification is made even more necessary with the introduction of the not-so-familiar terms of racial attitude. Inasmuch as a succinct statement defining racial attitude is lacking in the literature, its close association conceptually to the more common concepts of prejudice and racism facilitates its comprehension. Therefore, the following discussion on prejudice and racism serves two purposes: clarify those terms and facilitate an understanding of racial attitude

Origin and Definition of Racism

Racism is a general term that covers various subtypes (Dovidio, & Gaertner, 1998; Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakame, & Hudson, 2002; Gullick & Chinn, 2002; Katz, 2003; Pincus, 2000; Ridley, 1995), and the features that distinguish them merit clarification. However, inasmuch as Kleg (1993) points out that any attempt to understand racism in its current connotation needs to be facilitated by an understanding

of its origin, and Ridley adds that discussing racism “with any sense of integrity requires a well-substantiated definition” (p. 16), a brief overview of the origin and definition of racism is undertaken first.

The concept of race originated more than a century ago with the attempt by European anthropologists to classify human beings into racial groups according to their physical characteristics (Gullick & Chinn, 2002; Hays, 2001; Kleg, 1993; Ponterotto & Pederson, 1993). Various classification systems failed to account adequately for the numerous variations in physical features among human beings. In spite of the failure, the notion took hold that human beings were organized hierarchically with the light-skinned European at the top (Hays, 2001; Katz, 2003). Consequently, for many decades in North America in particular, beliefs, laws, and national practices converged into a complex of discrimination that gave cultural, socioeconomic, and political dominance to the descendents of Europeans at the expense of other racial groups. Broadly speaking, according to Wellman (as cited in Tatum, 2000, p. 80) that is racism: “a system of advantage based on race.”

Gollnick and Chinn (2002) expand that definition of racism by emphasizing the role of power: “the most crucial fact in understanding racism is that the dominant group has power over an oppressed group” (p. 93), while Pincus underlines the aspect of intentionality when he defines racism as “a system of beliefs, policies, and practices designed to maintain White superiority” (p. 33). Perhaps the most comprehensive definition of racism was put forward by Jones (as cited in Barnes & Lightsey, 2005) as “the transformation of race prejudice and/or ethnocentrism through the exercise of power

against a racial group defined as inferior, by individuals and institutions with the intentional or unintentional support of the entire culture” (p. 117). Power and the intentional and unintentional dimensions of racism are three properties that occupy a significant role in understanding the various types of racism that are discussed in the literature.

Types of Racism

Three types of racism are widely discussed in the literature: (a) *individual*, (b) *institutional*, and (c) *structural*. The most fundamental is structural in that although it does not intent to create victims of racism, because of the systemic structure of society, racism occurs nonetheless. Pincus (2000) gives an example of a bank establishing its “creditworthiness” for extending loans in a race-neutral manner with no intent to victimize any individual or group. However, because of their lower incomes, certain racial minority groups will still be more likely to be turned down than Whites (Pincus, 2000).

Ridley’s (1995) classification of racism does not have a category designated as structural, but it is clear that his unintentional-institutional category is congruent with Pincus’s (2000) structural category. Ridley’s example involves the routine utilization of standardized assessments by mental health agencies with no intention to victimize any individual or group. The implication of this example is that, as well-intentioned as the assessment exercise may be, biases in the construction and interpretation of such assessments might result in their use leading to harmful consequences for members of minority groups.

Following Ridley (1995), Gollnick and Chinn (2002) identify only individual and institutional racism but omit the distinction between intentional and unintentional institutional racism that Ridley makes. By remarking that institutional racism “cannot be attributed to prejudicial attitudes” but “refers to the effects of inequalities that have been integrated into the system-wide operation of a society” (p. 92), Gollnick and Chinn’s explanation is lacking the crucial distinction between institutional and structural racism that intention creates. The issue of intention, according to Pincus (2000), is the main difference between institutional and structural racism. Ridley supports Pincus’s conclusion that whereas structural racism is unintentional, institutional racism is intentional.

The story given above of the restaurant chain that had the policy of not hiring African Americans for positions that brought them into contact with Whites is an example of institutional racism (Pincus, 2000). Ridley’s example of (intentional as opposed to unintentional) institutional racism involves mental health agencies that deliberately set their fees at an amount that most racial minority clients cannot afford, thus excluding them from treatment. Ridley refers to such practices more narrowly as covert intentional institutional racism and distinguishes them from overt institutional racism. In overt institutional racism, an agency might openly deny treatment to clients from racial minority groups. Ridley notes that under federal civil rights legislation such instances of overt institutional racism, as well as overt individual racism, are now illegal.

The covert and overt dimensions in Ridley’s (1995) model of racism allow a significant distinction to be made in the discussion of individual racism. Although it is

widely accepted that individual racism has subsided significantly, examples that Ridley gives make it clear that it can be still a potent force in race relations. For example, while it is illegal for counselors to openly refuse to accept racial minority clients on the basis that they are inferior, some senior counselors might get away with practicing racism intentionally but covertly if they assign a minority client to an intern because of racial prejudice but claim to have an overloaded schedule.

Ridley's (1995) model also includes a dimension that represents unintentional individual racism, in which an individual's well-intentioned act may inadvertently result in the victimization of a member of a racial minority group. For example, in a counseling treatment for a client from a racial minority group, with the best of intentions counselors may use and interpret standardized assessments that are inappropriate for the client. Dovidio and his colleagues (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998; Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakame, & Hudson, 2002) broaden the concept of racism even further with the introduction of *aversive racism*. That concept relies heavily on the phenomenon of *racial prejudice*, however; thus, an explication on prejudice will be undertaken first.

Prejudice

Underlying racism in general is the phenomenon of racial prejudice. To begin with, there is no definitive definition of the term prejudice (Kleg, 1993). However, when used in the context of race relations, there is widespread agreement on the dynamics with which it is associated: It implies a negative evaluation; it is aimed at outgroups; and it has a psychological basis. In the context of race relations, Blumenfeld and Raymond (2000, p. 22) define prejudice as "an adverse opinion or belief without just ground or before

acquiring sufficient knowledge.” Gollnick and Chinn (2002, p. 91) introduce the term attitude in their definition of prejudice, describing it as “a set of negative attitudes about a group of people.” Along similar lines, Ridley (1995, p. 18) cites Schaefer’s definition as “negative attitudes, thoughts, and beliefs about an entire category of people.” Eagly and Chaiken (as cited in Vargas, 2004, p. 276) provide the psychological underpinnings of racial prejudice with their observation that an attitude is “a psychological tendency.”

Not only does prejudice have a psychological basis, but also it has an explicit and an implicit dimension. Prejudice results from an evaluation that is based on information from three sources: cognitive, affective, and behavioral (Aronson, Wilson, & Akert, 2005; Haddock & Huskinson, 2004; Kleg, 1993). The cognitive, affective, and behavioral processes that individuals are able to access and manage comprise explicit prejudice. However, some attitudinal processes are not consciously accessible and managed. Such processes, according to Greenwald and Banaji (1995), may lie in “introspectively unidentified (or inaccurately identified) traces of past experiences ...” (p. 473). The attitudinal processes that operate beyond the awareness of individuals comprise implicit prejudice. Aronson, Wilson, and Akert (2005) identify awareness of one’s prejudicial attitudes as the critical difference between explicit and implicit prejudice: “We consciously endorse and can easily report explicit attitudes” whereas “implicit attitudes are involuntary, uncontrollable, and at times unconscious” (p. 201).

In addition, opposing attitudes can be held towards the same person or group. Support for the theory that an individual can hold such opposing beliefs or attitudes comes from the social psychology discipline. Armitage and Conner (2004) explain that

the bidimensional model of attitudes purports that individuals can simultaneously hold positive and negative attitudes. Furthermore, the model contains the principle that the positive and negative attitudes may not be perfectly correlated with each other. That is, a strongly held positive attitude does not necessarily reflect a corresponding weakly held negative attitude. Therefore, individuals who hold strong positive attitudes may also hold strong negative attitudes towards the same object. It is the co-existence of equally strong opposing attitudes as well as implicit and explicit prejudice that give rise to such unacknowledged and pervasive behavior as aversive racism.

Aversive Racism

In the concept of racism that Dovidio and his colleagues (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998; Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakame, & Hudson, 2002) refer to as aversive racism, the term aversive signifies having feelings, not as strong as hatred and animosity, but rather at the levels of discomfort, uneasiness, and fear in the presence of African-Americans. It signifies also the sense of aversion that Whites feel towards themselves when they are called racists but strongly believe that they are egalitarian. According to Dovidio and his associates, these two conflicting forces arise from the socialization process that many European Americans experience. Socialization into the world of the majority group provides many European Americans with strong egalitarian values. However, it bequeaths them also with (negative) prejudicial beliefs and attitudes towards other racial groups that develop from lifelong experiences of the power and privileges enjoyed, the learning of stereotypes about outgroups, and other socialization factors (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998; Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakame, & Hudson, 2002; Helms, 1984; Katz,

2003). Thus, many European Americans hold egalitarian values yet carry around unconscious, negative beliefs and feelings about other racial groups.

Inasmuch as their negative attitudes may be implicit and their positive attitudes explicit, individuals who commit aversive racist acts would not consciously do anything that could be labeled as racist and would refute any accusation that they are prejudiced. However, under certain circumstances, their negative beliefs lead to racist behavior. Research by Dovidio and his colleagues (Dovidio, Gaertner, Kawakame, & Hudson, 2002) has shown, for example, that Whites will be fair to African Americans in employment situations where African Americans are definitely qualified or definitely not qualified. However, when the qualifications for the candidates were not as obvious and the decision to be made was more ambiguous, Whites were recommended for the position 76 % of the times and African Americans 45% of the times. Thus, the research indicates that while aversive racists maintain an egalitarian, nonprejudiced image, when the opportunity presents itself, they will practice racism to the detriment of those groups against whom they hold unconscious prejudices.

The concept of aversive racism demonstrates how closely racial prejudice, the attitude, is linked conceptually to racism, the behavior. Racial attitude as conceptualized in this study has all the potential of the racial prejudice and various types of racism that have been described above. It is that potential that alarms counselor educators such as Ridley (1995). However, this perspective of racial attitude is only one aspect of the concept intended here. The theory of racial identity development broadens the concept of racial attitude.

Racial Identity Development

Racial identity development may be defined as the process through which individuals perceive the psychological, cultural, physical, and sociopolitical aspects of being members of their racial group (Chávez & Guido-DiBrito, 1999; Sanders-Thompson, 1992). LaFromboise (November/December, 1998) adds that “it is a learned aspect of an individual's overall personality development” which is associated with the “process of broadening, narrowing and crystallizing boundaries in the quest to remain distinct yet fit into an increasingly pluralistic society” The concept of a progression and a looking outwards to others, which is crucial to our discussion, is brought out clearly in Chávez and Guido-DiBrito’s definition:

Ethnic identity development consists of an individual’s movement toward a highly conscious identification with their own cultural values, behaviors, beliefs, and traditions. Ethnic and racial identity models provide a theoretical structure for understanding individuals’ negotiation of their own and other cultures. (p. 41)

It must be pointed out that racial identity development is an aspect of development in all racial and ethnic groups (Roberts & Phinney, 1999). For example, a model of racial identity development for African Americans was proposed by Cross (1971) to assist White counselors in providing effective service to their African American clients. However, placing the concept of identity development within the framework of racism as a derivative of White power and privilege, Tatum’s (1997) proposition is instructive here. Tatum proposes that the primary tasks in the racial identity development

of Whites are "the abandonment of individual racism and the recognition of and opposition to institutional and cultural racism" (Tatum, 1997, p. 94-95). Individuals accomplish these tasks as they move through different stages or phases in their development of an identity that integrates acceptance of themselves and others from different racial groups.

The basis for much of the thinking on White racial identity development derives from Helms's (1984) model, which laid out the stages that Whites theoretically pass through in their racial identity development. The model, one of the first White racial identity models, has been revised by Helms (1990; 1995) over the years. For example, Helms changed the term *stages* to *ego statuses* and introduced the notion of *cognitive schema* to describe the different attitudes represented by the statuses of the racial identity development model (Carter, Helms, & Juby, 2004). Basically, however, the model as widely known proposes the existence of five phases or statuses, each representing a different stage of white racial identity development. The first three statuses represent a less mature racial identity that is associated with more racist attitudes, whereas the last two statuses are associated with a more mature racial identity, characterized by a decrease in racist attitudes (Carter, 1996). The statuses may be characterized as follows:

1. Contact: unawareness of how they may benefit from institutional and cultural racism, and they may only superficially acknowledge their membership in the White racial group.

2. Disintegration: increasing awareness of their own racial group and their concurrent ambivalence about being White because they are treated differently (and better) than other racial groups.
3. Reintegration: idealization of their racial group by selectively perceiving and distorting information that allows for the maintenance of racism.
4. Pseudo-Independence: intellectual understanding of racism and how they may have perpetuated it, along with subtle feelings of superiority and intolerance toward other racial groups.
5. Autonomy: internalization of a positive racial identity by no longer imposing arbitrary racial definitions on others and by displaying an intellectual and emotional appreciation of racial differences and similarities.

A significant point made by Chavez and Guido-DiBrito (1999) about Helms's (1984; 1990; 1995) model, as well as Cross's (1971), is that it turned from the traditional perspective of conceptualizing racial identity as racial perception of self to racial perceptions of others. It is these representative attitudes towards others, as epitomized in the stages or statuses that individuals may be experiencing at a particular time in their development, that are referred to in the counseling literature variously as *racial identity attitude* (Ottavi, Pope-Davis, & Dings, 1994), *race-related attitude* and *racism attitude* (Constantine, 2002), and *racial attitude* (Cumming-McCann & Accordini, 2005). Racial attitude, then, has a broader connotation than racial prejudice. It is a continuum of attitudes that range from racial prejudice to an acceptance of racial differences and similarities, which allows one to abandon individual racism and resist institutional and structural racism. It is this

continuum that is crucial to an understanding of how racial attitude is conceptualized in the literature and for the purposes of this study.

Review of Research Literature

Racial attitude is a common variable in the relevant research literature. However, a search of the literature returned no studies that have investigated the effect of counseling programs on the racial attitudes of counselors-in-training. In introductory remarks to one of her research studies, Constantine (2002) comments that “school counseling has generally not attended to race-related attitudinal issues in the context of empirical investigations” (p. 162). That comment would serve well in its application to counseling programs in general. The closest researchers have come to such an investigation is examining the relationship between racial attitudes and multicultural counseling competencies and, to a lesser extent, between racial attitudes and multicultural training.

The research literature indicates that racial attitude is positively correlated to self-reported multicultural counseling competencies (Constantine, 2002; Cumming-McCann & Accordino, 2005; Neville, Heppner, Louie, Thompson, et al. 1996; Ottavi, Pope-Davis, & Dings, 1994; Vinson & Neimeyer, 2003) and to multicultural training (Neville, Heppner, Louie, Thompson, et al., 1996; Parker, Moore, & Neimeyer, 1998). Inasmuch as the focus of this study is on racial attitudes and research suggests that racial attitudes are related to multicultural training and multicultural counseling competencies, these are the three variables that will be of interest in this review of the research literature.

One of the outcomes of the convergence of attention on multicultural counseling competencies and racial identity attitudes was Sabnani, Ponterotto and Borodovsky's (1991) hypothesis that the racial identity development status of White counseling students strongly influences their acquisition of multicultural counseling competencies (Ottavi, Pope-Davis, & Dings, 1994). In their investigation, Ottavi, Pope-Davis and Dings tested Sabnani et al.'s hypothesis. They used the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS; Helms & Carter, 1990) as the independent, or predictor variable, and the Multicultural Counseling Inventory (MCI; Sadowsky, Taffe, Gutkin, & Wise, 1994) as the dependent, or criterion variable, with 128 White master's and doctoral counseling students and substantiated Sabnani et al.'s hypothesis. Other studies (e.g., Constantine, 2002; Neville, Heppner, Louie, Thompson, et al. 1996; Vinson & Neimeyer, 2003) produced findings that support the results from the study by Ottavi, Pope-Davis, and Dings; that is, the greater the levels of competencies were, the more positive the racial attitudes were.

All of these studies, however, reported inconsistencies in the WRIAS. Some of the subscales of the WRIAS showed poor correlation with the competencies. For example, in Ottavi, Pope-Davis, and Dings's (1994) study, the Contact subscale on the WRIAS did not show significant correlation with low levels of competencies on the MCI. The researchers point out that one possibility for the poor correlation of the Contact subscale is that it is a poor measure of its intended construct. Similarly, in their study, Neville, Heppner, Louie, Thompson, et al. (1996) used the Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey (MAKSS; D'Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991) instead of

the MCI and encountered correlational problems with the WRIAS. Although they found that higher levels of racial identity attitudes were associated with stronger endorsements of multicultural therapy competencies, the Reintegration status in the WRIAS failed to show a correlation with expected levels of multicultural therapy competencies.

This methodological problem very likely is a result of the failure of measures keeping abreast of theories and models. It was noted above that Helms's (1984) model has undergone some alterations, one of which includes the addition of a sixth status referred to as Immersion/Emersion (Carter, Helms, & Juby, 2004). This sixth status is even discussed in some sources as two separate statuses (Helms & Cook, 1999). In spite of those changes, the measure based on the original model continues to be used to assess only the original five statuses.

In her study of the contributions of racial attitudes to multicultural counseling competence, Constantine (2002) also investigated the influence of prior multicultural training on racial attitudes. Although Constantine found that multicultural training had an enhancing effect on racial attitudes, it must be pointed out that the multicultural training was not a treatment, before and after which the measure was administered. The variable consisted of self-reported participation in multicultural courses taken before the study was conducted. Any relationship detected between participation in prior multicultural training or courses and racial attitudes or identity need to be evaluated in light of other variables that could account for the relationship.

In addition to investigating the relationship between racial attitudes and counseling competencies in their study mentioned above, Neville, Heppner, Louie,

Thompson, et al. (1996) also investigated the impact of multicultural training on White racial identity attitudes. With 38 students enrolled in a graduate-level multicultural therapy course, the researchers found a significant increase in Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy subscales. However, no significant changes were detected in the Contact, Disintegration, and Reintegration subscales.

The researchers state that the multicultural therapy course appears to be related to the adoption by White individuals of more positive, nonracist White attitudes. While that might have been the case for the Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy subscales, it was not so for the subscales that correspond with attitudes of the Contact and Disintegration statuses, which are the less mature ones and, therefore, the ones that need to be impacted.

Although Neville, Heppner, Louie, Thompson, et al. (1996) gathered participants from three multicultural courses that shared many commonalities, none were used as a control class. Parker, Moore, and Neimeyer (1998) used a control and a treatment group with a total of 116 participants. Instead of the WRIAS, they used the White Racial Consciousness Development Scale (WRCDS; Clancy & Parker, 1989), a measure also based on Helms's (1984) model of White racial identity development. The study returned findings similar to those in the study done by Neville, Heppner, Louie, Thompson, et al. The multicultural training course caused no significant main effects or interactions for the Disintegration or Reintegration scores. In this case as well, the researchers mention that the study supported the efficacy of multicultural training in altering the perception of White individuals towards others and themselves. They neglect to discuss the implication of the failure of the course to alter attitudes in the less mature statuses of participants.

The failure of the courses in both studies to impact the less mature racial attitudes is important. As the discussion in a prior section of this paper implied, people who are classified as racists may be of two types: those whose blatant racist behaviors originate in negative, conscious racial beliefs and those whose subtle racist behaviors are driven by prejudicial beliefs that are negative but unconscious. The intuitive argument follows that different approaches are required to change the behaviors of these two types of racial attitudes. In other words, the likelihood exists that such multicultural courses as used in the studies and in counseling programs might fail to affect the racial attitudes that counselors-in-training might be least conscious of and that might most need attention.

That state of affairs raises the question surrounding the focus that is put on multicultural courses. Although the focus of researchers on multicultural courses, rather than the entire counseling program, suggests that such courses are given all the credit for success in the acquisition of multicultural counseling competencies and the promotion of more mature racial attitudes, this perception may not reflect reality or pedagogical goals for counseling programs. Arredondo and Arciniega (2001), CACREP (2001), Holcomb-McCoy (2004), and Lewis and Hayes (1991) have all stressed the importance of the pedagogical goal of integrating cultural components into all curricular areas in counseling programs.

To recap, research has shown that in general multicultural counseling competencies correlate positively with mature racial attitudes and that multicultural training promotes mature racial attitudes. However, the literature indicates methodological problems with the WRIAS, the measure used extensively to assess

racial attitudes. More significantly, it seems that multicultural courses do not affect those attitudes associated with the less mature racial attitudes, which are the problematic ones in society and the counseling context. It is significant that although the literature indicates that multicultural training or courses promote mature racial attitudes, it does not reveal research that investigates the relationship between the entire counseling program and racial attitudes. The infusion of multicultural concepts throughout a counseling program that lasts for two years might produce different results. This study explores that likelihood.

Summary

In this chapter the current state of race relations in North America was established and then distinctions were made among racial prejudice and racism and different types of racism to which counselors and people in general are susceptible. The last part of the chapter was devoted to a review of the current research literature in order to support the need for this study and indicate how it will add to the current state of research.

CHAPTER 3 - METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the research design and the methodology used in this study. It includes a rationale for the selection of the research design, a description of the instruments used, and the procedures taken to collect the data and perform the statistical analyses.

Selection of Research Design

A cross-sectional design was utilized in the study. Because the cross-sectional approach allowed data to be collected at one point in time, the problems of cost, history, attrition, and continued representation of the original cohort into the second assessment was avoided. However, the use of the cross-sectional approach rests on the assumption that the sample is representative of a cohort at the beginning of the counseling program as well as at the completion of the program. The likelihood of more female trainees completing the program than male trainees would present a problem similar to the one in which attrition renders the sample in longitudinal approach unrepresentative. A similar concern would arise if trainees who were already involved in some form of help-giving occupation were more likely to complete the program than participants who were not.

A final point about the design of the study relates to other predictor variables beside credits completed and accreditation status. Although the focus of the study is on the influence of credits and accreditation, the study was designed to account also for the effect of other predictor variables on the response variables.

Method

Participants

One hundred and seventy master's level counselors-in-training participated in this study. One hundred and forty-eight (87%) of the participants were women, and 22 were men. Fifteen (68%) of the male participants self-identified as White, while 3 self-identified as African American, one Latino/White, one Asian American, one Native American, and one with no race/ethnicity reported. Among the 148 female participants, 132 (89%) self-identified as White, 5 as African American, 4 Latino/White, 2 Biracial/Multiracial, 1 Asian American, 1 Native American, 1 Pacific Islander, and 2 who self-reported as Other.

The ages of the participants were reported as intervals, with the majority of them less than 30 years old. Specifically, 56% of the participants were between the ages of 20 and 29 years, 24% between 30 and 39 years, and 20% represented the remaining participants from 40 to over 50 years. The majority of participants were also primarily from middle class backgrounds. Given *lower*, *middle*, and *upper* to choose from, 74% reported the socioeconomic level of their families during their childhood as middle. Nineteen percent reported lower and 8% reported upper.

From the list of programs that Clawson et al. (2004) used in their extension of the longitudinal study of counselor preparation programs, 10 categories were identified for use in this study. The school counseling program had the highest enrolment (39%), followed by community counseling (27%), mental health counseling (15%), and marital, couple, and family counseling/therapy (7%). Counselor education, student affairs, college

counseling, and gerontological counseling comprised the remaining 12% in that order, with no participants from career counseling or the category labelled Other.

With regard to enrolment status in the programs, 66% of the participants were full-time students, whereas 29% were attending part time, and 6% had completed their program in the semester or quarter that preceded the collection of data for this study. Almost half of the counseling programs in which participants were enrolled were located in one of four regions. Forty-eight percent of the participants were enrolled in counseling programs in the Midwest, 38% in the Southern region, 11% in the North Atlantic, and 4% in the Western region. These demographic areas of education follow the American Counseling Association's demarcation of mainland United States into regional areas.

Sixty-four percent of the 170 participants had no experience as practicing counselors, whereas the remaining 36% had experience that ranged from 6 months to over 5 years. However, the majority of participants (80%) had either completed a course or attended a workshop on diversity issues in the last five years. The remaining 34% either had no such extracurricular diversity experience or were in the process of getting that experience at the time of participating in this study.

In summary, the participants of this study can be described as predominantly White, female, young, middle class, and enrolled mainly full-time in CACREP-accredited school counseling and community counseling programs primarily in the Midwest and Southern regions. For the most part, they have diversity experience from extracurricular workshops and courses but, being trainees, no experience working as professional counselors.

Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected from counselor trainees enrolled in master's level counseling programs throughout mainland United States over a ten-day period. A letter was posted to CESNET, a listserv for counselor educators, that notified faculty members of counseling programs of the research, provided them with a URL (link) to a secure website, asked that they notify their students of the intended research, and make the link to the website available to them (see Appendix A). Interested students could then use the link to access the website provided by PsychData where they would find information about the research, an implied informed consent form, and the two instruments to be completed (see Appendices B, C, D, and E). Trainees were eligible as participants if, at the time of data collection, they were enrolled in a master's level counseling program, or if their latest date of completing such a program was in the semester or quarter that preceded the time of data collection. Participants were able to terminate their involvement in the study at any point and not transmit the completed instruments to PsychData. A week later, a similar notice of the research study, along with information on how to access the website, was posted to COUNSELORGRAD, a listserv for graduate students in counseling programs (see Appendix F).

No information was requested from the participants that could personally identify them. However, to ensure that the two instruments completed by each participant remain paired, IP addresses and the recorded times when the completed instruments were submitted to PsychData were used as a coding system. No remuneration or classroom incentives were offered to trainees for their participation, but a donation, based on the

number of participants who took part in the study, was made to ACA Foundation for its use in assisting those affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

Instrumentation

Two instruments were administered: the Demographic and Coursework Questionnaire, which was specifically designed by the researcher for this study, and the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI; Ponterotto, Burkard, Rieger, Grieger, et al., 1995; Ponterotto, Potere, & Johansen, 2002; Utsey & Ponterotto, 1999).

Demographic and Coursework Questionnaire. Seeing that the racial attitudes scores of counselor trainees could be influenced by other variables besides the amount of credits they have completed and the accreditation status of their programs, the Demographic and Coursework Questionnaire also collected data on trainee characteristics that relate to those other variables. Derived from a number of previous studies in the relevant literature, (for example, Carter, 1990; Ottavi, Pope-Davis, & Dings, 1994; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1992; Vinson & Neimeyer, 2003), the variables comprise age, gender, race/ethnicity, experience with diversity courses or workshops, and experience working as a counselor. To formulate a description of the sample of counselor trainees who participated in the study, other demographic and coursework data were collected, such as their socioeconomic backgrounds, the regional location of the universities or colleges where they were completing their programs, the program majors they were pursuing, and their enrollment statuses in the program.

The Quick Discrimination Index. The QDI was developed in 1995 (Ponterotto et al., 1995) and has undergone additional psychometric testing (Burkard, Jones, & Jhll, 2002; Green, Hamlin, Ogden, & Walters, 2004; Ponterotto et al., 2002; Utsey & Ponterotto, 1999), and evaluation (Burkard, Medler & Boticki, 2001). The instrument is a 30-item, Likert-type, self-report instrument designed to measure racial and gender attitudes across racial groups. With responses on the Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5), the score range is 30 to 150. Fifteen of the 30 items are worded and scored in a positive direction, with high scores indicating, high sensitivity to racial and gender issues. The other fifteen items are worded and scored in a negative direction. High scores indicate more positive racial and gender attitudes. To limit social desirability reaction to the instrument, it will be administered under its alternate title, Social Attitude Survey. Recommended for use with late adolescents and adults, the QDI was calculated to be at the ninth-grade level through the Lix (Readability) Index.

Three subscales comprise the QDI: general (cognitive) attitudes towards racial diversity/multiculturalism; affective attitudes toward more personal contact (closeness) with racial diversity; and attitudes toward women's equity. The combined score from the three subscales of the QDI is used to measure overall sensitivity, awareness, and openness to racial diversity and gender equality. Alternatively, the three subscales of the instrument may be scored separately. Ponterotto et al. (2002) advise that when the subscales are to be scored separately, the entire QDI should be administered, but only 23 of the total 30 items need to be scored: 9 from the cognitive subscale; 7 from the affective subscale; and 7 from the subscale addressing attitudes toward women's equity.

In developing the QDI, Ponterotto et al. (1995) argue that instruments being used to measure racial attitudes were susceptible to contamination by social desirability responses, were limited to measuring the racial attitudes of only one race/ethnicity toward another, measured racial attitudes only at the cognitive level, and were either too short or too long to be psychometrically sound. They developed the QDI to address those issues.

For the purpose of developing factor, criterion, convergent, and discriminant validity, the QDI has been administered to several samples. The three-factor structure of the instrument was developed through three developmental studies (Ponterotto et al., 1995). A later confirmatory factor analysis with three separate samples (Utsey & Ponterotto, 1999) indicated that the three-factor structure was stable across those samples. More recently, using a hierarchical factor analysis, Burkard et al. (2002) found a fourth factor, political/institutional attitudes towards racial diversity, and suggested that further hierarchical factor analyses be conducted on the QDI. However, at present, evaluation of the QDI in the literature is done on the basis of the three-factor structure.

Ponterotto et al. (1995) report that the criterion validity was examined by using the Group-Differences approach described by Walsh and Betz (1990) to compare correlational patterns of the QDI with demographic variables among a sample of adolescents and adults for a northeast metropolitan area. The analysis resulted in significant correlations for race, gender, urban/suburban residence, and political affiliation, but not for income level and childbearing status.

The convergent validity of the QDI was evidenced (Ponterotto et al., 1995) by the correlational patterns of its scores with the scores of the New Racism Scale (NRS;

Jacobson, 1985), which purports to measure similar constructs. The three Factors of the QDI correlated with the NRS at the significant levels of $r = .44$, $.44$, and $.30$ for Factors 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

Discriminant validity was evidenced by the absence of significance correlational patterns with the Social Desirability Scale (SDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). The lack of significant correlation with the SDS indicates that the QDI scores are not affected by contamination from social desirability.

Burkard, Medler and Boticki (2001) make the observation that over 75% of the participants in the samples used for the studies were White participants, many of whom were college students. They suggest that further validity studies using more demographically diverse participants are necessary to improve the generalizability of the QDI. It must be pointed out here, however, that the overall profile of the samples used in the studies by Ponterotto et al. (1995) and Utsey and Ponterotto (1999) fits the expected sample for this present study.

Evidence that the coefficients of internal consistency of the QDI subscales are stable across samples has been provided by research studies that Ponterotto et al. (1995) and Utsey and Ponterotto (1999) conducted. Results from two samples in the Ponterotto et al. study report Cronbach's alpha for Factors 1 at $.80$ and $.85$, Factors 2 at $.83$ and $.83$, and Factors 3 at $.65$ and $.76$. Cronbach's alphas, comparable to those from the two studies by Ponterotto et al., come from three independent samples investigated by Utsey and Ponterotto. They report alphas ranging from $.85$ to $.90$ for Factors 1, $.70$ to $.79$ for Factor 2, and $.70$ to $.77$ for Factor 3. Furthermore, one of the studies conducted by

Ponterotto et al. included a test-retest investigation across three samples that consisted of undergraduates and a 15-week interval between tests. The investigation resulted in coefficients of stability of .90, .82, and .81 for Factors 1, 2, and 3 respectively.

In spite of the high Cronbach alpha reported for the studies cited above, a Cronbach alpha value of .55 was returned from a reliability analysis on Factors 1 and 2 for this study. In reporting this alpha, it must be noted that only Factors 1 and 2 were used in this study. Furthermore, because only Factors 1 and 2 were used, the scores for specific items on those two factors were not calculated in the scoring procedure, according to directions for using the QDI (Ponterotto et al., 2002). As a result, only 16 of a possible 30 items on the entire QDI scale was utilized. These procedural steps very likely could account for the Cronbach alpha of .55 reported in this study.

Data Analysis Procedure

Data were downloaded from the PsychData website (www.psychdata.com). The two instruments were examined visually to identify respondents who were not eligible to participate because they were not enrolled in a counseling program, did not know if their programs were accredited, did not respond to items on either of the instruments that related to one of the variables under consideration, only completed one of the two instruments, or made more than one submission.

Scores from the cognitive subscale and the affective subscale of the QDI represent the dependent or response variables in the study. Seeing that the QDI has distinct subscales for cognitive and affective attitudes towards racial diversity and that participants might score differentially on the two subscales, these two sets of scores were

treated in the data analysis as two distinct response variables. Inasmuch as the study addressed attitudes towards race and not gender, there was no need to use the third subscale, which addresses attitudes towards gender issues.

The Demographic and Coursework Questionnaire provided data for forming the primary predictor variables of program accreditation and amount of credits completed as well as the other predictor variables of age, gender, race/ethnicity, experience with diversity courses or workshops, and experience working as a counselor. The categories into which the data for the predictor variables were collected on the Questionnaire were arranged into levels to facilitate analysis. The number of levels into which these variables were divided was influenced by the small size of some subgroups within the sample (for example, ethnicities other than White, participants from non-CACREP accredited programs, and participants between ages 45 and 49). The rationale for the configuration of the levels for the variables is outlined next.

Age. There were no participants under 20 years old so that category, used in the survey, was discarded and the other categories were collapsed to form three levels that comprised participants in their 20s, 30s, and 40s with the small group of 50 years and over placed within the last level. The four levels resulted: 20-29, 30-39, and 40-50 and over.

Gender. This variable has 2 levels: Female and Male. There was another category for Other, but no one self-identified with that category.

Race/ethnicity. The Demographic and Coursework Questionnaire allowed participants to identify themselves in one of 9 categories; however, all of the categories

except White showed responses ranging from 0 to 8. Consequently, the variable of race/ethnicity was divided into the two levels of White and Other ethnicities.

Extracurricular diversity courses and workshops. To facilitate respondents' recollection of their participation in courses as well as workshop outside their programs, a distinction was made in the Questionnaire between those two experiences. In the data analysis process, however, the categories for diversity experience gained from such courses and workshops were collapsed to form one category then divided into the two levels of None and One or more. Therefore, a participant who completed a course but not a workshop, or vice versa, was credited with One or more experiences.

Experience as a counselor. As was the case with the variable of race/ethnicity, this variable had subgroups that were too small for analysis. Five of the categories had responses ranging from 0 to 7, whereas the largest category had 109. Consequently, two levels were created: None and 6 months or more.

Program credits completed. The two categories of credits originally identified for analysis (0-12 and 43-60+ as stated in Research Questions 2 and 3) remain in tact with the remaining credits that fall between those two categories divided into the two subgroups of 13-30 and 31-42. This procedure resulted in four levels: 0-12, 13-30, 31-42, and 43-60 and more.

Accreditation. This study is based on investigating scores among participants from programs with CACREP accreditation and scores among participants from programs that do not have CACREP accreditation. Thus, there are two levels: Accredited

and Not accredited. Table 1 provides a graphic representation of the variables and their assigned values and levels.

Table 1

Study Variables and Assigned Levels

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Values</u>	<u>Assigned Level Values for Statistical Analyses</u>
Age	20-29, 30-39, and 40-50 and over	20-29 = 1 30-39 = 2 40-50 and over = 3
Gender	Men, Women	Men = 1 Women = 2
Race/Ethnicity	White, Other ethnicities	White = 1 Other ethnicities = 2
Diversity (Experience)	None, One year or more	None = 1 One or more = 2
(Counseling) Experience	None, 6 months or more	None = 1 6 months or more = 2
Credits (Completed)	0-12, 13-30, 31-42, and 43-60 and more	0-12 = 1 13-30 = 2 31-42 = 3 43-60 and more = 4
Accreditation (by CACREP)	Yes, No	Yes = 1 No = 2

Treatment of Age, Gender, Race/Ethnicity, Diversity, and Experience in Analysis.

The literature indicates that the variables of age, gender, race/ethnicity, diversity experience (from extracurricular courses and workshops), and counseling experience correlate with racial attitudes for some populations. The primary interest of this study was

to investigate the assumption that program accreditation and the amount of credits completed have a correlation with racial attitudes. However, the variables of age, gender, race/ethnicity, diversity experience, and counseling experience could not be entered as covariates in the analytical model used in this study. They are categorical and dichotomous variables, and covariates have to be continuous variables for input into the model. Nonetheless, the research questions of this study necessitated an analytical consideration of the potential effect of those variables on the response variables.

Kirk (1999) and Sirkin (1995) discuss several approaches for addressing the presence of such variables, which are referred to by some researchers as *nuisance variables* (Kirk, 1999) and *control variables* (Kirk, 1999; Sirkin, 1995), depending on the nature of the study. One approach is to hold the variable constant for all subjects. For example, in this study, only white (race), female (gender) participants who are between the ages of 21 and 29 (age) and have no experience in diversity issues (diversity), and as practicing counselors (experience) would comprise the sample. This approach, however, would severely limit the size of the sample and the generalizability of the study.

A second approach discussed by Kirk (1999) and Sirkin (1995) is to assign all subjects randomly to the experimental situations. With this approach, nuisance variables are distributed throughout the various groups in the experiment and, therefore, are not likely to inequitably affect just one treatment or independent variable. Many research studies in the social science field do not have the liberty to randomly assign participants, seeing that they may be members of intact groups, or the variables under investigation

might be status variables, or variables that are unethical to manipulate, such as aggressive behavior.

Kirk (1999) and Sirkin (1995) also discussed the approach of including the variable as one of the factors in the design of the research. This is called a *randomized block design* on account of participants being assigned to groups or blocks in such a way that the group members are homogeneous with regard to the nuisance variable under consideration. For example, if age is the variable that needs to be controlled for, participants of the same or similar age will be assigned to the same block and randomly assigned to the treatments or conditions under investigation. It should be noted that this approach requires some randomization as well.

Those approaches could not be accommodated by the design of this study. Instead, the effects of the nuisance variables were address statistically. The variables of age, gender, race/ethnicity, diversity experience, and counseling experience were entered into a general linear model (GLM), along with the variables of accreditation status and amount of credits completed, as fixed predictor factors rather than random factors. After that, statistical analyses were conducted for *interaction* and *main effects*.

Model used in statistical analysis. According to Borg and Gall (1996) and Heppner, Kivlighan and Wampold (1999), an interaction effect occurs when a response variable is affected by the interaction of two or more predictor variables or their levels. The smaller the p-value is, the greater the degree of interaction. On the other hand, a main effect is the effect of a predictor variable on the response variable (Borg & Gall, 1996; Heppner, Kivlighan & Wampold, 1999). The smaller the p-value of the main effect

is, the greater the effect of the predictor variable on the response variable. Conceptually then, the equation for the model was response variable = main effect + interaction effect + error, with a p value of $< .05$ predetermined as an indication of statistically significant interaction and main effects.

Although the terms main effect and interaction effect suggest an empirical paradigm, the research design utilized for this study does not support causality, as noted earlier in this chapter. With regard to this study, therefore, the strength or weakness of effects suggests strength or weakness of relationships. If the interaction effect between one of the primary predictor variables and one of the nuisance variables was not statistically significant, it was an indication that the relationship between the predictor variable and the response variable was not influenced by the nuisance variable, a condition required by the research questions of the study. Such a result then justified an examination of the main effect of the primary variable.

When there were statistically significant p values of main effects, one-way ANOVA analyses were conducted to determine which level or levels of the variable were responsible for the statistical significance. The procedure required that if the main effect of the variable was not statistically significant, indicating that there were no statistically significant differences among the means of the levels, there was no justification in performing the ANOVA procedure.

Analyses of the data for interaction and main effects were conducted only on the variables of accreditation status and credits completed, seeing that they were the variables of primary interest in the study. Two MANOVA procedures were used to analyze data

for effects, the first one dealing with the predictor variable of amount of credits completed and the second one with the variable of accreditation status. The cognitive and affective subscales were put into the model when the two MANOVA procedures were run. Each MANOVA procedure produced separate data for both subscales, which reduced time and cost.

MiniTab Statistical Software, Release 14, was used to perform all analyses in the study. It must be noted that even when only a univariate analysis is desired, the GLM procedure uses the multivariate method of specifying the model. Furthermore, the GLM formation was limited to the main factors and 2-way interactions. All higherorder interactions were excluded from the model for two reasons. First, higher-order interactions in complicated models often have little or no logical interpretations. Second, their inclusion in the model only leads to increasing complexity in terms of calculations for the model. The level of significance was set at $p = .05$ for all analyses, unless otherwise noted.

Summary

In this chapter the research design and the methodological procedures have been explained. Beginning with a rationale for the selection of a cross-sectional research design, the chapter also included a description of the instruments and method used to collect the data and the sample used in the investigation. The chapter ended with information on the procedures used in the statistical analysis.

CHAPTER 4 – RESULTS

Introduction

Data from 154 (91%) of the initial 170 participants were used in the statistical analyses for the study. Sixteen participants were eliminated for the following reasons: 7 did not know if their programs were accredited or not, 5 completed the Demographic and Coursework Questionnaire but not the QDI, 3 did not respond to all of the items on the QDI and 1 did not identify race/ethnicity. Table 2 shows the composition of this sample in terms of the n's, means, and standard deviation at each level of the predictor variables entered into the model.

Preliminary Analyses

The Pearson correlation procedure that was conducted on the cognitive and affective subscales of the QDI justified using them as separate response variables. Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) suggest that correlations between variables ranging from .7 to .9 are too high for them to be treated as separate factors. The correlation between the subscales was .41 (p value = 0.00), which supports the original intent to treat both subscales as separate response variables in the statistical analyses of the study.

To assess the fit between the response variables and the assumptions of normality, several tests were conducted. The variables were examined for skewness and kurtosis. Table 3 shows that the skewness and kurtosis (-.72 and .66 for the cognitive subscale and -.10 and -.37 for the affective subscale) were within the parameters traditionally suggested for proceeding with preliminary analyses.

Table 2

Composition of Sample Used in Study – Levels, N's, Means, and Standard Deviations
(Total N = 154 for all Variables)

<u>Cognitive Subscale</u>				<u>Affective Subscale</u>			
Variables	N	Mean	SD	Variables	N	Mean	SD
Age				Age			
1	85	33.52	6.00	1	85	26.11	3.58
2	38	34.03	5.33	2	38	26.63	3.73
3	31	32.19	6.06	3	31	24.00	3.86
Gender				Gender			
1	136	33.63	5.77	1	136	25.83	3.84
2	18	31.50	6.29	2	18	25.67	3.29
Race				Race			
1	133	33.26	5.91	1	133	25.54	3.72
2	21	34.14	5.54	2	21	27.52	3.67
Diversity				Diversity			
1	28	32.71	5.65	1	28	26.00	3.55
2	126	33.52	5.91	2	126	25.77	3.83
Experience				Experience			
1	102	32.99	5.88	1	102	25.48	3.61
2	52	34.13	5.77	2	52	26.46	4.02
Credits				Credits			
1	38	32.58	5.66	1	38	26.08	3.11
2	47	33.94	5.26	2	47	25.72	3.76
3	36	33.42	7.00	3	36	25.56	3.98
4	33	33.45	5.66	4	33	25.91	4.34
Accreditation				Accreditation			
1	140	33.48	5.92	1	140	25.89	3.77
2	14	32.36	5.20	2	14	25.00	3.80

Note. Age: 1 = 20-29, 2 = 30-39, and 3 = 40-50 and over; Gender: 1 = Women and 2 = Men; Race/ethnicity: 1 = White and 2 = Other ethnicities; Diversity experience: 1 = None and 2 = One or more; Counseling experience: 1 = None and 2 = 6 months or more; Credits completed: 1 = 0-12, 2 = 13-30, 3 = 31-42, and 4 = 43-60 and more; Accreditation: 1 = Yes and 2 = No.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of Scores on Cognitive and Affective Subscales

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Median	Range	Skew-ness	Kur-tosis
Cognitive Subscale	154	33.38	5.85	34.00	28.00	-.72	.66
Affective Subscale	154	25.81	3.77	26.00	17.00	-.10	-.37

The minimum and maximum scores attainable for the cognitive subscale are 9 and 45 whereas the minimum and maximum scores attainable for the affective subscale are 7 and 35.

The variables were also analyzed for their proximity to normal distribution through histograms and normality tests. The histograms of the two subscales were symmetric and bell-shaped, which implied normal distribution. That assumption was verified by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Normality Test (MiniTab Statistical Software, Release 14), which had the points on the probability plots falling on a line that was relatively straight, and the p value of .15 was greater than .10, the level of significance for this test. The Anderson-Darling Normality Test (MiniTab Statistical Software, Release 14) revealed 2 outliers on the cognitive subscale, but the removal of these outliers did not have an impact on the statistical differences among the levels of the variables, so they were reintroduced for the final analysis. Thus, a review of normality tests did not show a need to transform the response variables for conducting preliminary analyses.

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 sought to examine if the scores of counselors-in-training with 12 or fewer credits in programs with CACREP accreditation will score significantly

higher than counselors-in-training with 12 or fewer credits in programs that do not have CACREP accreditation. The purpose of this research question was to investigate whether programs with CACREP accreditation were attracting or accepting counselors-in-training with higher scores on the QDI than programs that do not have CACREP accreditations. Seeing that there were no participants who had completed 12 or fewer credits in programs that do not have CACREP accreditation, this research question was not investigated.

Research Question 2

This research question sought to examine if the scores on the cognitive and affective subscales of the QDI for counselors-in-training with 12 and fewer credits from CACREP-accredited programs were significantly lower than the scores for counselors-in-training with 43 and more credits from CACREP-accredited programs. The results of the analyses for interaction and main effects in Tables 4 and 5 show the first step in the process of answering this question. In examining these results, it is worthwhile remembering that in using the general linear model (GLM) in the multivariate procedure, Minitab produces separate analyses for the cognitive and affective subscales.

The results in Table 4 are for the cognitive subscale when credits completed is the predictor variable under consideration. The last five *p* values in the Table represent the interaction effects between the main variable of credits (completed) and the variables of age, gender, race/ethnicity, and experience with diversity and with counseling. Seeing that they are all greater than .05, they indicate that there are no statistically significant interaction effects from the main variable of credits and the other variables on the response variable (cognitive subscale). That situation permits an examination of the main

effect of the variable credits on the cognitive subscale. At a p value of .98, the main effect is well above the level of statistical significance. This indicates that amount of credits completed have no statistically significant relationship with the scores on the cognitive subscale of the QDI. There is no statistical justification in proceeding further to examine the levels of the credits predictor variable.

Table 4

Interaction and Main Effects for Credits on Cognitive Subscale

Variables	DF	Seq SS	Adj SS	Adj MS	F	p
Age	2	61.12	3.15	1.58	0.05	0.96
Gender	1	65.86	98.61	98.61	2.84	0.10
Race/Ethnic	1	17.98	43.63	43.63	1.26	0.27
Diversity	1	19.90	1.78	1.78	0.05	0.82
Experience	1	55.95	30.26	30.26	0.87	0.35
Credits	3	41.89	6.62	2.21	0.06	0.98
Accreditation	1	17.19	19.56	19.56	0.56	0.45
Age*Credits	6	298.38	251.12	41.85	1.20	0.31
Gender*Credits	3	101.03	83.25	27.75	0.80	0.50
Race/Ethnic*Credits	3	74.21	91.68	30.56	0.88	0.45
Diversity*Credits	3	123.59	104.16	34.72	1.00	0.40
Experience*Credits	3	19.23	19.23	6.41	0.18	0.91
Error	125	4341.81	4341.81	34.73		
Total	153	5238.16				

R-squared = .17 for all variables.

Partial eta-squared = .002 for the credits variable.

An examination of the results for the variable of credits with regard to the affective subscale (Table 5) shows likewise that the interaction effects on that subscale from the variable credits and the other predictor variables are not statistically significant (p values range from .32 to .99). Those results permit an examination of the main effect

of credits on the affective subscale. As Table 5 shows, at $p = .77$, that effect is not statistically significant. This indicates that the amount of credits completed have no statistically significant relationship with the scores on the affective subscale of the QDI at the predetermined p value. There is no statistical justification in proceeding further to examine the levels of the credits predictor variable.

It is important to note that when taking into account the effect of the variable credit on the cognitive and affective subscales, the Wilks' lambda value produced by the MANOVA procedure was .98, which supports the main effects results that there was no difference among the mean scores of the 4 levels of credits.

Table 5

Interaction and Main Effects for Credits on the Affective Subscale

Variables	DF	Seq SS	Adj SS	Adj MS	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Age	2	134.65	86.11	43.06	2.97	0.06
Gender	1	0.00	2.70	2.70	0.19	0.67
Race/Ethnic	1	44.46	40.84	40.84	2.82	0.10
Diversity	1	1.17	1.38	1.38	0.10	0.76
Experience	1	48.83	4.48	4.48	0.31	0.58
Credits	3	17.08	16.50	5.50	0.38	0.77
Accreditation	1	6.78	7.06	7.06	0.49	0.49
Age*Credits	6	22.86	13.28	2.21	0.15	0.99
Gender*Credits	3	2.04	1.59	0.53	0.04	0.99
Race/Ethnic*Credits	3	20.73	26.10	8.70	0.60	0.62
Diversity*Credits	3	51.61	51.24	17.08	1.18	0.32
Experience*Credits	3	11.21	11.21	3.74	0.26	0.86
Error	125	1810.11	1810.11	14.48		
Total	153	2171.54				

R-squared = .17 for all variables.

Partial eta-squared = .009 for the credits variable.

Those results indicate that after accounting for differences in age, gender, race/ethnicity, prior experience in multicultural/diversity coursework or workshops, and experience as a counselor, counselor trainees who have completed 43 or more credits in programs with CACREP accreditation do NOT score significantly higher on the cognitive and affective subscales of the QDI than counselor trainees who have completed 12 or fewer credits in programs with CACREP accreditation.

Research Question 3

This research question sought to examine if counselors-in-training with 12 and fewer credits from programs that do not have CACREP accreditation scored significantly lower on the cognitive and affective subscales of the QDI than counselors-in-training with 43 and more credits from programs that do not have CACREP accreditation. There were no participants in non-accredited programs who completed 12 or fewer credits, so this research question was not examined. However, seeing that the research question bears the underlying assumption that as counselors-in-training complete more credits their scores on the QDI will increase, it was considered justifiable to examine whether trainees with 13 to 30 completed credits in non-accredited programs scored significantly lower than those with 43 and more completed credits in non-accredited programs.

It must be recalled, however, that Table 2 shows that there were only 14 participants from programs not accredited by CACREP. Of those 14, 6 had completed 43 or more credits, 3 had completed 31-42 credits, and 5 had completed 13-30 credits. Because of the small number of participants in these subgroups, chance variation might very likely play a large role in results based on data from them. Seeing that the analysis

would involve only 5 participants from programs that do not have CACREP accreditation, the results from the analyses for this research question must be regarded with caution.

An examination of Table 6 shows that only one interaction effect is below $p = .05$. This is the interaction effect between experience and accreditation ($p = .02$). This outcome suggests that the interaction between those two variables significantly affects scores on the cognitive subscale and that the results of the main effect of the variable accreditation cannot be trusted.

Table 6

Interaction and Main Effects for Accreditation on the Cognitive Subscale

Variables	DF	Seq SS	Adj SS	Adj MS	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Age	2	61.12	144.83	72.41	2.15	0.12
Gender	1	65.86	105.45	105.45	3.13	0.08
Race/Ethnic	1	17.98	133.21	133.21	3.95	0.05
Diversity	1	19.90	17.98	17.98	0.53	0.47
Experience	1	55.95	41.68	41.68	1.24	0.27
Credits	3	41.89	65.75	21.92	0.65	0.58
Accreditation	1	17.19	51.93	51.93	1.54	0.22
Age*Accreditation	2	101.50	157.70	78.85	2.34	0.10
Gender*Accreditation	1	29.49	23.64	23.64	0.70	0.40
Race/Ethnic*Accred	1	22.98	120.19	120.19	3.56	0.06
Diversity*Accredita	1	2.96	25.97	25.97	0.77	0.38
Experience*Accredi	1	180.67	180.67	180.67	5.36	0.02
Error	137	4620.65	4620.65	33.73		
Total	153	5238.16				

R-squared = .12 for all variables.

Partial eta-squared = .004 for the accreditation variable.

Ranging from $p = .06$ to $p = .38$, the interaction effects between accreditation and the other predictor variables are not statistically significant. Those results permit an examination of the main effect of accreditation on the cognitive subscale. As Table 6 shows, at $p = .22$, that effect is not statistically significant. This indicates that accreditation status has no statistically significant relationship with the scores on the cognitive subscale of the QDI at the predetermined p value. There is no statistical justification in proceeding further to examine the levels of the accreditation predictor variable.

Table 7 shows the results for the variable accreditation with regard to the affective subscale. An examination of those results shows that the interaction effects of the variable accreditation and the other predictor variables on the response variable affective subscale are not statistically significant (p values range from .25 to .92). Because those results are not statistically significant, they permit an examination of the main effect of accreditation on the affective subscale. As the Table shows, however, at $p = .16$, that effect is not statistically significant. This indicates that accreditation status has no statistically significant relationship with the scores on the affective subscale of the QDI at the predetermined p value. There is no statistical justification in proceeding further to examine the levels of the accreditation predictor variable.

It is important to note that when taking into account the effect of the variable accreditation on the cognitive and affective subscales, the Wilks' lambda value produced by the MANOVA procedure was .96, which supports the main effects results that there was no difference between the mean scores of the two levels of accreditation.

These results indicate that after accounting for differences in age, gender, race/ethnicity, prior experience in multicultural/diversity coursework or workshops, and experience as a counselor, counselor trainees who have completed 43 or more credits in programs that do not have CACREP accreditation do NOT score significantly higher on the affective subscales of the QDI than counselor trainees who have completed 13-30 credits in programs that do not have CACREP accreditation.

Table 7

Interaction and Main Effects for Accreditation on the Affective Subscale

Variables	DF	Seq SS	Adj SS	Adj MS	F	p
Age	2	134.65	25.04	12.52	0.94	0.39
Gender	1	0.00	6.05	6.05	0.45	0.50
Race/Ethnic	1	44.46	2.87	2.87	0.22	0.64
Diversity	1	1.17	10.12	10.12	0.76	0.39
Experience	1	48.83	4.88	4.88	0.37	0.55
Credits	3	17.08	15.75	5.25	0.39	0.76
Accreditation	1	6.78	27.15	27.15	2.04	0.16
Age*Accreditation	2	17.03	2.17	1.09	0.08	0.92
Gender*Accreditation	1	0.91	11.42	11.42	0.86	0.36
Race/Ethnic*Accred	1	36.43	16.20	16.20	1.22	0.27
Diversity*Accredita	1	28.28	17.99	17.99	1.35	0.25
Experience*Accredi	1	12.43	12.43	12.43	0.93	0.34
Error	137	1823.48	1823.48	13.31		
Total	153	2171.54				

R-squared = .16 for all variables.

Partial eta-squared = .004 for the accreditation variable.

Summary

This chapter has reported results on the analyses conducted to answer the research questions outlined for this study. The first research question about the differential scores

of counselors-in-training with 12 credits and fewer in programs not accredited by CACREP and those in programs accredited by CACREP could not be investigated because there were no participants from non-accredited programs with 12 credits and fewer. Results for the second research question, relating to the differential scores of counselors-in-training with 12 credits and fewer in CACREP-accredited programs and those with more than 43 credits, indicated that there was no statistically significant difference.

Results returned a partial answer for the third research question, which investigated the scores of similar groups as in the second research question but from programs that do not have CACREP accreditation. Results indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between the scores for the two groups on the cognitive subscale after accounting for age, gender, race/ethnicity, experience with diversity, and experience as a counselor. With regard to the affective subscale, a similar conclusion was reached after accounting for age, gender, race/ethnicity, and diversity experience, but not experience as a counselor. A statistically significant interaction effect between experience as a counselor and accreditation indicated that the affective subscale was being influenced by the experience as a counselor variable in the sample under consideration.

CHAPTER 5 – DISCUSSION

Review of the Study

Background

This study investigated the relationship among credits completed by counselors-in-training, program accreditation status with CACREP, and the racial attitudes of counselors-in-training as measured on the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI). Specifically, the goal was to determine if scores on the cognitive and affective subscales of the QDI differed significantly between those who had completed 12 or fewer credits and those who had completed more than 43 credits and between those who were in programs with and without CACREP accreditation.

The research questions arose from the results of research studies, which suggested that the acquisition of multicultural counseling competencies correlates with improved provision of counseling services. However, discussions in the literature raised the concern that many practicing professionals harbor racial attitudes. The position taken to formulate the basis for this study was that although the correlation between competencies and counseling services suggests that the acquisition of the competencies might improve counseling services, it was still not known to what extent counselors were taking into their beginning practices racial attitudes that were likely to inhibit even greater improvement in their provision of those services. It was argued in this study that an appropriate juncture at which to investigate the extent of counselors' racial attitudes was the preparation stage for entry to the counseling profession; that is, the master's level of counseling programs.

From that argument, the overriding question came to focus, not merely on the extent of the racial attitudes of counselors-in-training, but on whether master's level counseling programs were contributing to positive changes in racial attitudes, as measured on a published attitude scale. Two criteria were chosen for the investigation of this question: the amount of credits completed in the master's program and the program's accreditation status with the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). Research studies suggest that besides credits and accreditation status, racial attitudes might be influenced by other factors such as age, gender, race/ethnicity, experience with diversity issues, and counseling experience; therefore, those factors were accounted for in the analytical procedure used in the study.

Summary of Procedures

For this study, data were collected over a period of ten days from 170 respondents, out of which 154 provided all required data to be included in the study. Data from a demographic and coursework survey was used to formulate the independent or predictor variables as identified in the literature, and a published measure for racial attitudes was used to collect data for the dependent or response variable. Furthermore, a rationale was given for the choice of the levels of the variables used for carrying out the analytical portion of the study. The analysis of the data was performed through a MANOVA procedure after entering the variables of accreditation status, amount of credits completed, age, gender, race/ethnicity, diversity experience, and counseling experience into a general linear model (GLM) as fixed predictor factors rather than

random factors. After that, statistical analyses were conducted for interaction and main effects.

Findings and Conclusions

From a comparison of scores that represented the racial attitudes of subsamples that had completed 43 and more credits with subsamples that had completed 12 and fewer credits (in the case of one subgroup it was 13-30 credits), the results indicate that the credits completed over the course of a master's level counseling programs, with and without CACREP accreditation, do not significantly influence the racial attitudes of counselors-in-training.

Furthermore, because the analytical procedure used in the study allows a comparison of the means of the subgroups (or levels of the predictor variables), an examination of the results show that there is not even a trend in the directionality of the influence of credits on racial attitudes. On the other hand, the other predictor variables show a positive directionality on both subscales except for the diversity variable on the affective subscale. Overall, the directionality observed in the result of this study concurs with reports in the literature that age, gender, race/ethnicity, experience with diversity issues, and experience as a professional counselor show a relationship with racial attitudes. It must be noted that the directionality under discussion is observed from the means of the respective levels of the variables (or subgroups) without considering interaction effects among the variables themselves. Furthermore, statistical significance is not taken into consideration in referring to the directionality shown by the variables.

Although, unlike the variable of credits, the variable of accreditation shows a trend on the cognitive and affective subscales for participants in CACREP-accredited programs to score higher than those in non-CACREP accredited programs, caution must be taken with that inference because of the small subsample of participants from non-CACREP accredited programs. The caution is particularly needed, seeing that analyses could not be carried out to investigate Research Question 1, which was to compare the scores of counselors-in-training with 12 or fewer credits in CACREP and non-CACREP accredited programs. That research question would have shed some light on whether students entering CACREP-accredited programs begin with higher racial attitudes scores than those entering non-CACREP accredited programs. It would have been used as a benchmark for examining change in scores between counselors-in-training from non-accredited programs and accredited programs at the credit level of 43 or more credits.

Limitations of the Study

The results of this study indicate that there is no statistically significant relationship between trainees' racial attitudes and the amount of credits completed in counseling programs or the accreditation status of those programs. It can be argued that the study was not rigorous enough to detect the effect that the amount of credits completed or the accreditation status of programs might have on racial attitudes. However, there is congruence between ancillary results from this study and suggestions in the research literature that racial attitudes are related to age, gender, race/ethnicity, and diversity and counseling experience. This concurrence supports the soundness of the

study and the dependability of the main results of the study. Nonetheless, those results need to be considered in light of certain limitations.

As with studies that rely on self-report instruments, the effect of social desirability responses must be taken into account. In the development of the QDI, Ponterotto et al. (1995) argued that one of the problems with instruments used to measure racial attitudes was their susceptibility to contamination by social desirability responses. That was one of the problems that Ponterotto et al. developed the QDI to address. It is fair to say, however, that although the QDI might have reduced the effect of social desirability responses, such responses are difficult to eliminate totally. Thus, the responses on the QDI, which were used as the dependent variable in this study, could be contaminated.

Inasmuch as the study is intended to investigate the relationship between counseling programs and the racial attitudes of trainees over time, the most appropriate manner in which to measure that relationship would have been to conduct a longitudinal study. In a longitudinal approach for such a study as this one, the same participants would be administered an instrument before and after experiencing the curriculum. With this approach, reassessing the same participants would not only allow examination of group differences in racial attitudes; it would also allow a “within trainee” examination; that is, an examination of changes in individual trainees, and even selected trainees.

However, three problems limited the use of the longitudinal approach. First, there was the cost of administering the instrument twice. Second, history might have rendered dissimilar the conditions under which each assessment was administered. For example, in the interim between assessments, program policies or curriculum might have changed.

Third, due to usual attrition of trainees out of the counseling programs, the likelihood exists that at the second administration of the assessment, the cohort of trainees might have been much smaller than it was when the assessment was first administered. As a result of attrition, the remaining trainees might not have been representative of the original cohort. Inasmuch as a cross-sectional design eliminated most of the major problems, it was considered the better approach to use in this study.

Another limitation of the study relates to the composition of the sample and, consequently, the size of subsamples. Clawson et al.'s (2004) national sample and other samples (such as those obtained by Neville, Heppner, Louie, Thompson, et al., 1996; Vinson & Neimeyer, 2003), indicate that the sample of participants used in this study is representative of the gender and racial composition of samples in the counseling field. However, the subsample of participants from programs that do not have CACREP accreditation was exceedingly small (14 out of 154 participants), to the extent that there were no such participants in the category of having completed 12 or fewer credits. Therefore, any inferences made with regard to non-CACREP accredited programs should be done with caution.

The 484 entry-level programs from which Clawson et al. (2004) collected data for their longitudinal study of counselor preparation programs, and the number of counselor trainees enrolled in each program indicate the size of the population of counselor trainees. In comparison, the sample size of 154 used in this study is quite small. The concern related to the size of the sample is exacerbated by its geographic composition. Forty-eight percent of the participants in the study were enrolled in counseling programs in the

Midwest, whereas 4% were in the Western region. The size and geographic bias of the sample limit the generalizability of the results of the study. Notwithstanding these limitations, the data collected and the results produced by the analyses of the data bear significant implications for counselor education.

Implications

The crucial implication of the results from this study relates to the curriculum of counseling programs. The study investigated a question that should lie at the center of counselor educators' concern about the extent to which counselors are trained to provide service to clients from backgrounds that are different from their own, especially racial/ethnic backgrounds, seeing that many students are likely to enter counseling programs with certain racial attitudes, some of which may be negative and held unconsciously (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1998; Helms, 1984; Locke, 1992; Remley & Herlihy, 2005; Ridley, 1995). In light of those attitudes, although multicultural counseling competencies may be acquired by counselors-in-training, it is not at all clear if those skills are hindered by racial thoughts when counselors are faced with the task of providing service to a client from a group that is racially or ethnically different from their own.

The results from this study point to the need to design and implement curricula that would affect the racial attitudes of counselors-in-training. Although Patterson (2004) is concerned with making applicants to counseling programs apprehensive about having their attitudes changed, Ponterotto, Fuertes, and Chen (2000) have reminded the profession that one of the purposes of counseling programs is to foster "nonracist

attitudes” towards racial and ethnic minority clients. If students begin their counseling programs with negative racial thinking and complete them without any change in attitude, then counselor educators would not be fulfilling one of the purposes of counseling programs as expressed by Ponterotto, Fuertes, and Chen.

Inasmuch as ancillary results from this study support the suggestions in the literature that variables such as age and gender are related to racial attitudes but does not support the hypothesis that the curricula of counseling programs do, it is likely that as many courses as possible need to be imbued with the kind of experiential activities that would allow counselors-in-training to experience at a deep level the cultural thinking, traditions, and activities of people who are different from themselves (see Arredondo & Arciniega, 2001).

It must be made clear that such experiences are not needed only for White counselors-in-training but all counselors-in-training. Counselors of color are also likely to have racial assumptions and attitudes about other racial or ethnic groups that could hinder the use of multicultural counseling skills.

In addition to preservice training, the study has implication for inservice training. If counseling programs are not affecting the unconscious and negative racial attitudes of counselors-in-training, it is likely that many of them are going into to professional practice in various settings with those attitudes. There may be a greater need than expected for inservice multicultural training.

A final implication relates to recruitment of master’s level students. The descriptive data from the study suggest that more effort should be made to recruit men

and especially people of color into the profession. Inasmuch as racial attitudes are the concern in this study, it is the issue of people of color in the profession that is addressed here. It can be argued that the socio-cultural forces that shape the gender composition of such occupations as nursing and elementary school teaching are also the forces underlying the comparatively small number of men in the counseling profession. However, one of the reasons for the scarcity of people of color in the counseling profession may be the quickly moving shift in the demographics of the United States population.

As many authors have cited in recent years, census projections had long predicted the demographic shift in the composition and color in the United States. More specifically, the 1990 U.S. Census revealed that by the year 2000, more than one third of the population would be racial and ethnic minorities (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). The 2000 U.S. Census supports the 1990 Census figure by reporting that approximately 69% of the population identified as White whereas the remaining 31% consisted of racial and ethnic minorities (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004). Of that 31%, approximately 13% indicated that they were African American, 13% Latino, 4% Asian, and 2.5% all other races including American Indian, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander. By the middle of this century, White Americans will constitute only half of the United States population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2004). In contrast, White Americans comprised 75% of the population in 1990 (Remley & Herlihy, 2005). It goes without argument that as the racial and ethnic groups increase so too should counselors who are representative of those groups. As society grows increasingly diverse, a more

diverse body of counselors-in-training would be an advantage as the profession responds to the changing demographic of its clients.

Recommendations for Future Research

Although research indicates that experiences of multicultural courses correlate positively with racial attitudes, only one relatively rigorous study has been conducted to test the effect of such courses over time (Neville, Heppner, Louie, Thompson, et al., 1996). Although the investigators gathered participants from three multicultural courses that shared many commonalities, none was used as a control class. That methodological deficiency weakened the study because many variables, as pointed out in this study, could have confounded the results. Moreover, although the investigators reported that the results indicated a change in racial attitudes, the results only did so for some of the subscales of the measure used, not all.

Such studies not only make results about the effect of multicultural courses inconclusive, but may also indicate the tenuous effect that the courses have on the counselors-in-training who take them. The location of the multicultural course in the sequence of courses taken is one the unintentional factors that could mitigate the effectiveness of the course. Also, there are other courses in counseling programs, such as supervision and practicum, in which experiences could work inadvertently in a counterproductive manner to offset the effect of the multicultural course. It would be beneficial then to continue studies similar to this current study, in which the effect of the entire counseling program on the racial attitudes of counselors-in-training is investigated.

In so far as the limitations of this study have been noted above, investigators of future studies could use qualitative methodology as complementary or alternative approaches to investigate more closely the attitudes of participants as they progress through counseling programs. It should be noted that qualitative methods are becoming appropriate approaches in counseling research. Recently Pope-Davis, Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, Ligiero, et al. (2002) used qualitative interviews to develop a model of clients' perspectives of multicultural counseling. As a follow up to that study, Ponterotto (2002) expanded on the increasing role of qualitative research methods in counseling psychology.

A step in the direction of qualitative research for studying racial attitudes of counselor trainees could include the development of a system for collecting and analyzing the recorded thoughts and feelings of counselor trainees throughout the duration of their stay in the program without compromising candor (on the part of the trainees), pedagogical principles, and training procedures. Even if change in racial attitudes is not statistically significant from one stage in a counseling program to another, the approach being suggested here is likely not only to produce a closer investigation of change in racial attitudes but also allow a within-subject examination of change in racial attitudes.

A qualitative approach could facilitate another line of investigation with an associated but different theoretical underpinning. Rather than investigating if there is change in racial attitudes on account of counseling program curricula, research could focus on what the change looks like. This study, for example, was designed to compare

the levels of credits at the ends of a continuum (12 and fewer credits versus 48 and more credits) but not to investigate if there was a recursive pattern in how racial attitudes function. Inasmuch as Helms's White racial identity development model (Carter, Helms, & Juby, 2004; Helms, 1984, 1990, 1995; Helms & Carter, 1990; Helms & Cook, 1999) involves the notion of the "disintegration" of attitudes before "reintegration" and more positive attitudes occur, it is likely that a close examination of the thinking and feelings of counselor trainees during the period of their programs could reveal a recursive or even curvilinear pattern rather than one that is linear. As in the approach suggested in the last paragraph, this associated approach will also accommodate an examination of within-subject change in racial attitudes.

Inasmuch as the outcome of this study suggests that there is no statistically significant relationship between the racial attitudes of counselors-in-training and the amount of credits they complete in their counseling programs, it suggests a line of research focused on the robustness of counseling programs. Findings from a national study (Steward, Morales, Bartell, Miller, & Weeks, 1998) suggest that programs with specific multicultural coursework and with courses infused with multicultural content did not result in trainees accepting the multicultural literature or understanding what multicultural competence is. The argument can be made that if one of the goals of counseling programs is to foster "nonracist attitudes" towards racial and ethnic minority clients, as Ponterotto, Fuertes, and Chen (2000) point out, then the curricula of counseling programs are not robust enough.

Considering the non-significant results of this study and the assertion that counseling programs are not robust enough to accomplish the goal of fostering nonracist attitudes, a line of research needs to focus on testing the effectiveness of strategies and techniques used, or that can be used, in counseling programs to facilitate nonracist attitudes. Arredondo and Arciniega (2001) have described a number of such activities that include structured written exercises, films and videos such as *The Color of Fear* and *True Colors*, guided imagery exercises, and reading and analysis of literature on such concepts as institutional racism. Although Arredondo and Arciniega state that they are sharing what they know has worked in curricula, they give no indication that research has been conducted to justify their statement. Research on the effectiveness of such activities and under what conditions they are effective might lead to identifying those that can contribute to the curricula of counseling programs developing a positive correlation with racial attitudes.

Appendix A

Recruitment Notice to CESNET

Dear Counselor Educators,

My name is Garbette Garraway and I am a Ph. D. candidate in Counselor Education and Supervision at The Pennsylvania State University. I am asking your assistance in publicizing a research study to increase student participation. The study, which is for my dissertation, examines the relationship among the social attitudes of master's level counselors-in-training, the amount of program credits they have completed, and counseling program accreditation.

Students are eligible to participate if they are currently enrolled in a master's level counseling program, or if their latest date of completing such a program was in December 2005. They will need to type or paste "www.psychdata.com" into their browser then when that webpage opens, type in the survey number "11178" in the space provided next to "Go to survey #" and press "GO". This will give them access to a letter of implied informed consent and two surveys that will take less than 15 minutes total to complete on-line.

Your assistance in publicizing this study in your departments, programs, and classes is greatly appreciated. Please provide students with the web link and number listed above to participate. You may forward or republish this email on other listservs used by counselor educators and supervisors, or by master's level counseling students.

Widespread participation will not only increase the generalizability of insights and implications resulting from the study, but also help a very worthwhile humanitarian cause. For every 100 eligible students who complete and submit the surveys, \$40 will be donated in the name of The Social Attitude Research Study 2006 to ACA Foundation for its continuing work in assisting those affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

If you have any questions, would like more information about the study, or wish to suggest other ways of increasing participation in the study, please contact me at gmg183@psu.edu. My dissertation supervisor is Spencer Niles, D. Ed.

Thank you.

Garbette Garraway
Counselor Education and Supervision Program
The Pennsylvania State University

APPENDIX B

Website Document Explaining the Study

Dear Master's Level Counseling Student,

My name is Garbette Garraway and I am a doctoral student in Counselor Education and Supervision at The Pennsylvania State University. I am conducting this research for my Ph.D. dissertation under the supervision of Dr. Spencer Niles. You are eligible to participate if you are currently enrolled in a master's level counseling program, or if your latest date of completing such a program was in December 2005.

There are two short surveys to be completed that will take a total of less than 15 minutes of your time. When you click "Continue" at the end of this page, you will find a letter of implied informed consent, then the two surveys.

Your input in this study is valuable. Specifically, your input will help to provide information and formulate implications regarding such aspects of counselor preparation as curriculum content, demographic composition and social attitudes of counselors in preparation to enter the profession, and the interaction of program accreditation with those factors. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Your participation will also help a worthy cause. For every 100 eligible students who complete and submit the surveys, \$40 will be donated in the name of The Social Attitude Research Study 2006 to ACA Foundation for its continuing work in assisting those affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

Thank you.

Garbette Garraway
Counselor Education and Supervision Program

The Pennsylvania State University

APPENDIX C

Implied Informed Consent Form for Social Sciences Research

The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Study: The Relationship Among Counseling Program Accreditation, Completion Status in Counseling Program, and the Racial Attitudes of Counselors-in-Training.

Principal Investigator: Garbette A. M. Garraway

C/o 327 CEDAR Building

The Pennsylvania State University

University Park, PA 16802

Telephone: (814) 235-1836

E-mail address: gmg183@psu.edu

Advisor: Dr. Spencer G. Niles

327 CEDAR Building

The Pennsylvania State University

University Park, PA 16802

Telephone: (814) 863-2412

E-mail address: sgn3@psu.edu

1. **Purpose of the Study:** The purpose of this research study is to explore the relationship among program accreditation, the social attitudes of counselors-in-training, and the credits they have taken in their programs.

2. **Duration:** It will take less than 15 minutes total to complete two short surveys.

3. **Procedures to be followed:** You will be asked to complete two surveys. Your professor, training supervisor, or other contact has been asked only to make available to you a secure website where you would find information about the study and the surveys to be completed. They will not know whether or not you have participated. Following the collection of all materials, the data will be analyzed for the purpose stated in item 1.

4. **Benefits:** The results from this study would provide information about and could have implications for curriculum content, demographic composition and social attitudes of counselors in preparation to enter the profession, and the interaction of program accreditation with those factors

5. **Statement of Confidentiality:** The surveys do not ask for any information that would identify who the responses belong to. Your responses are recorded confidentially. Your confidentiality will be kept to the degree permitted by the technology used. No guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet by any third party. In the event of any publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be shared because your name is not on the surveys and is in no way linked to your responses.

6. **Right to Ask Questions:** You can ask questions about this research. If you wish to do so, contact the researcher at gmg183@psu.edu or (814) 235-1836. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, contact The Pennsylvania State University's for Research Protections at (814) 865-1775.

7. **Compensation:** Participants will not be compensated for participating in this study. However, for every 100 participant packages returned 40 dollars will be donated to ACA Foundation for its continuing work in assisting those affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

8. **Voluntary Participation:** Your decision to be in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

You must be 18 years or older to take part in this research study.

Completing and submitting the surveys implies that you have read the information in this form and consent to take part in the research.

APPENDIX D

**DEMOGRAPHIC AND COURSEWORK QUESTIONNAIRE
INDIVIDUAL INFORMATION**

1. Age:
 - Under 20
 - 20-24
 - 25-29
 - 30-34
 - 35-39
 - 40-44
 - 45-49
 - 50 and over
2. Gender:
 - Female
 - Male
 - Other (e.g., Intersex)
3. Do you have a disability status?
 - Yes
 - No
4. What is your Racial/Ethnic identification?
 - African American
 - Asian American
 - Latino/Black
 - Latino/White
 - Native American
 - Pacific Islander
 - White
 - Biracial/Multiracial
 - Other (Please specify)
5. Please identify your sexual orientation:
 - Bisexual
 - Gay
 - Heterosexual
 - Lesbian
 - Other
6. Which type of area best describes the location where you were raised?
 - Rural
 - Suburban
 - Urban
7. How would you describe the socioeconomic status of your family during your childhood?
 - Lower
 - Middle
 - Upper

PROGRAM INFORMATION

8. What is your major program/area of study?
 - Career Counseling
 - College Counseling

Community Counseling
 Counselor Education
 Gerontological Counseling
 Marital, Couple, and Family Counseling/Therapy
 Mental Health Counseling
 School Counseling
 Student Affairs
 Other (Please specify)

9. Is your major program/area of study accredited by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)?

Yes
 No
 Don't Know
 Other accreditation agency (Please specify)

10. What is your enrollment status in your current program?

Full-time
 Part-time
 Completed in December 2005

11. How many credits have you completed so far in your current graduate program (Do not include credits you are taking this semester)?

0-6
 7-12
 13-18
 19-24
 25-30
 31-36
 37-42
 43-48
 49-54
 55-60

12. In which of the following regions is your university/college located?

Midwest: (IL, IN, IA, KS, MI, MN, MO, NE, ND, OH, OK, SD, and WI).
 North Atlantic: (CT, DC, DE, MA, ME, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, and VT).
 Southern: (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MD, MS, NC, SC, TN, TX, VA, and WV).
 Western: (AK, AZ, CA, CO, HI, ID, MT, NV, NM, OR, UT, WA, and WY).

SPECIFIC COURSEWORK

Many counseling programs offer courses that focus specifically on multicultural and diversity issues in counseling/psychology. The following questions relate to such courses.

13. Does your program offer a course on diversity (i.e. a specific course that addresses issues of race/ethnicity, multiculturalism, sexual orientation, disability, socioeconomic status, etc)? Yes

No
 Don't know

If you answered "No" or "Don't know," proceed to Question 18.

If you answered "Yes," respond to Questions 14, 15, and 16 then proceed to Question 17.

14. Is the diversity course you responded to in Question 13 a required course?

Yes
 No
 Don't know

15. Have you completed this diversity course?

Yes

No

16. If you answered “yes” to Question 15, indicate which of the following diversity topics was given the most course time in the course?

Age/generational

Disability

Gender

Indigenous heritage

Race/ethnicity

Religion/spiritual orientation

Sexual orientation

Socioeconomic status

Other (Please specify)

17. If you have NOT taken the diversity course, are you currently taking it?

Yes

No

EXPOSURE TO OTHER DIVERSITY INFORMATION

In answering questions 18, 19, and 20 DO NOT include the specific diversity course from Questions 13 through 17.

18. Indicate the degree to which diversity information in general is integrated into other required program courses.

Not Integrated

Somewhat Integrated

Very Much Integrated

19. In the last 5 years, how many semester- or quarter-long diversity courses have you taken (i.e. completed)?

None

1

2

3

More than 3

Currently Taking

20. In the last 5 years, how many diversity workshops have you attended (in their entirety)?

None

1

2

3

More than 3

Currently Attending

COUNSELING EXPERIENCE

21. Estimate the extent of your experience as a practicing counselor. NOT in duration (for example, not part-time over 3 = 3 years) but actual amount (for example, part-time over 3 years which approximates 1 full year).

None

6 Months

1 Year

2 Years
3 Years
4 Years
5 Years
More than 5 Years

22. What is/was the status of your practice as a counselor during that time?

Full-time
Part-time
Both, half and half
Both, but predominantly full-time
Both, but predominantly part-time

Thank you for participating!

APPENDIX E

(Investigator's note: Although permission to use the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI) in this study was granted by the copyright holder, in order to protect the copyright status of the QDI, this appendix contains only the directions for scoring and some samples items from the two subscales of the QDI used in the study. Directions for contacting the copyright holder are included below.)

Scoring Directions for the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI)

Introduction

Users of the QDI must have completed the "Utilization Request Form" before incorporating the QDI in their professional work.

The QDI is a 30-item Likert-type self-report measure of racial and gender attitudes. The instrument itself is titled "Social Attitude Survey" to control for some forms of response bias. Users of the QDI should read the development and validity studies on the QDI before use.

Scoring

There are two methods of scoring the QDI. First, you can simply use the total score, which measures overall sensitivity, awareness, and receptivity to cultural diversity and gender equality.

The second scoring procedure involves scoring three separate subscales (factors) of the QDI. This is the preferred method at this time given that both exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis support the construct validity of the three-factor model.

Method One: QDI Total Score

Of the 30 items on the QDI, 15 are worded and scored in a positive direction (high scores indicate high sensitivity to multicultural/gender issues), and 15 are worded and scored in a negative direction (where low scores are indicative of high sensitivity). Naturally, when tallying the Total score response, these latter 15 items need to be reverse-scored. Reverse scoring simply means that if a respondent circles a "1" they should get five points; a "2" four points, a "3" three points, a "4" two points, and a "5" one point.

The following QDI items need to be reversed-scored:

1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 23, 25, 29, 30.

Score range is 30 to 150, with high scores indicating more awareness, sensitivity, and receptivity to racial diversity and gender equality.

Method Two: Three-Factor Model

If scoring separate subscales (factors), the researcher should not also use the Total score. As expected, the total score is highly correlated with subscale scores and to use both would be somewhat redundant.

When scoring separate subscales, only 23 of the total 30 items are scored.

Factor 1: General (Cognitive) Attitudes Toward Racial Diversity/Multiculturalism (Items in parentheses are reverse-scored)

9 items: (3), (9), (13), (18), (19), 22, (23), 26, 27

(Score range = 9 to 45)

Factor 2: Affective Attitudes Toward More Personal Contact (Closeness) with Racial Diversity (Items in parentheses are reverse-scored)

7 items: 4, 8, 11, (15), 17, 24, (29)

(Score range = 7 to 35)

Factor 3: Attitudes Toward Women's Equity (Items in parentheses are reverse-scored)

7 items: (1), 6, (7), 14, (16), 20, (30)

(Score range = 7 to 35)

 Samples of items from Factors 1 and 2 of the Quick Discrimination Index

I really think affirmative action programs on college campuses constitute reverse discrimination.

I feel I could develop an intimate relationship with someone from a different race.

I would feel O.K. about my son or daughter dating someone from a different race.

Most of my close friends are from my own racial group.

I think that it is (or would be) important for my children to attend schools that are racially mixed.

I think white people's racism toward racial minority groups still constitutes a major problem in America.

If I were to adopt a child, I would happy to adopt a child of any race.

I think it is better if people marry within their own race.

The Quick Discrimination Index (QDI) is Copyrighted© by Joseph G. Ponterotto, Ph.D.,
 Counseling Psychology Program, Division of Psychological and Educational Services, Room
 1008, Graduate School of Education, Fordham University at Lincoln Center,
 113 West 60th Street, New York, New York 10023-7478 (212-636-6480).

APPENDIX F

Recruitment Notice to COUNSELORGRAD

Dear Master's Level Counseling Students:

My name is Garbette Garraway and I am a Ph. D. candidate in Counselor Education and Supervision at The Pennsylvania State University. This is an invitation for you to participate in a research study that I am completing for my dissertation. The study examines the relationship among the social attitudes of master's level counselors-in-training, the amount of program credits they have completed, and counseling program accreditation. Your participation will consist of completing two surveys that will take less than 15 minutes total.

Please note that an invitation to participate in this study was posted on another listserv, so if you have already completed the surveys on account of reading that posting, you should not do so a second time.

You are eligible to participate if you are currently enrolled in a master's level counseling program, or if your latest date of completing such a program was in December 2005. You will need to type or paste "www.psychdata.com" into your browser then when that webpage opens, type in the survey number "11178" in the space provided next to "Go to survey #" and click on "GO". This will give you access to a letter of implied informed consent and two surveys to complete on-line.

Your participation will not only increase the generalizability of insights and implications resulting from the study, but also help a very worthwhile humanitarian cause. For every 100 eligible students who complete and submit the surveys, \$40 will be donated in the name of The Social Attitude Research Study 2006 to ACA Foundation for its continuing work in assisting those affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

Your participation in this study is greatly appreciated. If you have not participated already, please use the website and the survey number listed above to do so. You may pass on this invitation to participate to other master's level counseling students. PLEASE NOTE: If you need to contact me for any reason before I have completed the data collection process, please make sure you DO NOT do so through the listserv but directly to gmg183@psu.edu.

Thank you.

Garbette Garraway
Counselor Education and Supervision Program
The Pennsylvania State University

REFERENCES

- American Psychological Association. (2003). Multicultural guidelines for education and training, research, practice, and organizational development for psychologists. *American Psychologist, 58*, 377-402.
- Armitage, C. J., & Conner, M. (2004). The effects of attitudinal ambivalence on attention-inattention-behavior relations. In G. Haddock & G. R. Maio (Eds.), *Contemporary perspectives on the psychology of attitudes* (pp. 121-143). New York: Psychology Press.
- Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., Akert, R. M. (2005). *Social psychology* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall,
- Arredondo, P., & Arciniega, G. M. (2001). Strategies and techniques for counselor training based on the multicultural counseling competencies. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 29*, 263-274.
- Arredondo, P., & Toporek, R. (2004). Multicultural counseling competencies = Ethical practice. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 26*, 44-55.
- Arredondo, P., Toporek, R., Brown, S. P., Jones, J., Locke, D. C., Sanchez, K., & Stadler, H. (1996). Operationalization of the multicultural counseling competencies. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 24*, 42-78.
- Association for Counselor Education and Supervision. (1977). Standards for the preparation of counselors and other personnel service specialists. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 55*, 596-601.

- Barnes, P. W., & Lightsey, O. R. (2005). Perceived racist discrimination, coping, stress, and life satisfaction. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 33*, 48-61.
- Behrens, J. T. (1997). Does the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale measure racial identity? *Journal of counseling Psychology, 44*, 3-12.
- Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (2003). *Are Emily and Greg more employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A field experiment on labor market discrimination*. Working paper. MIT.
- Blumenfeld, W. J., & Raymond, D. (2000). Prejudice and discrimination. In M. Adams, W. J. Blumenfeld, R. Castaneda, H. W. Hackman, M. L. Peters, X. Zuniga (Eds.). *Readings for diversity and social justice: An anthology on racism, anti-Semitism, sexism, heterosexism, ableism, and classism*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1996). *Educational research: an introduction*. New York: Longman.
- Burkard, A. W., Jones, J. A., & Johl, M. P. (2002). Hierarchical factor analysis of the Quick Discrimination Index. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 62*, 64-78.
- Burkard, A. W., Medler, B. R., & Boticki, M. A. (2001). Prejudice and racism: Challenges and progress in measurement. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed.). (pp. 457-481). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

- Carter, R. T. (1990). The relationship between racism and racial identity among White Americans: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69*, 46-50.
- Carter, R. T. (1996). Exploring the complexity of racial identity attitude measures. In G. R. Sodowsky & J. C. Impara (Eds.), *Multicultural Assessment in Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, (pp.193-223). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.
- Carter, R. T., Helms, J. E., & Juby, H. L. (2004). The relationship between racism and racial identity for White Americans: A profile analysis. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 32*, 2-17.
- Claney, D., & Parker, W. M. (1989). Assessing White racial consciousness and perceived comfort with Black individuals: A preliminary study. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 67*, 449-451.
- Clawson, T. W., Henderson, D. A, Schweiger, W. K., & Collins, D. R. (2004). *Counselor preparation: programs, faculty, trends* (11th ed.). New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Constantine, M. G. (2002). Racism attitudes, White racial identity attitudes, and multicultural counseling competence in school counselor trainees. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41*, 162-175.
- Constantine, M. G., & Yeh, C. J. (2001). Multicultural training, self-construals, and multicultural competence of school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 4*, 202-207.

- Constantine, M. G., Juby, H. L., Liang, J. J. C. (2001). Examining multicultural counseling competence and race-related attitudes among White marital and family therapists. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 27, 353-362
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2001). *CACREP accreditation standards and procedures manual*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Cross, W. E. Jr. (1971). The Negro-to-Black conversion experience: Toward a psychology of Black liberation. *Black World*, 20, 13-27.
- Cumming-McCann, A., & Accordino, M. P. (2005). An investigation of rehabilitation counselor characteristics, White racial attitudes, and self-reported multicultural counseling competencies. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 48, 167-177.
- D'Andrea, M., & Arredondo, P. (2002, September). Multicultural competence: A national campaign. *Counseling Today*, 33, 36, 41.
- D'Andrea, M., Daniels, J., & Heck, R. (1991). Evaluating the impact of multicultural counseling training. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70, 143-150.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1998). On the nature of contemporary prejudice: The causes, consequences, and challenges of aversive racism. In J. Eberhardt & S. T. Fiske (Eds.), *Confronting racism: The problem and the response* (pp. 3-32) Newbury Park CA: Sage.
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Kawakame, K., & Hudson, G. (2002). Why can't we just get along? Interpersonal biases and interracial distrust. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 8, 88-102.

- Fischer, J. M., & Chambers, E. (2003). Multicultural counseling ethics and assessment competencies: Directions for counselor education programs. *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 34*, 17-25.
- Gollnick, D. M., & Chinn, P. C. (2002). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society* (6th ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Green, R. G., Hamlin, H. Ogden, & Walters, K. (2004). Some normative data on mental health professionals' attitudes about racial minorities and women. *Psychological Reports, 94*, 485-494.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review, 102*(1): 4-27
- Haddock, G., & Huskinson, T. L. H. (2004). Individual differences in attitude structure. In G. Haddock & G. R. Maio (Eds.). *Contemporary perspectives on the psychology of attitudes*. (pp. 35-56). New York, NY: Psychological Press.
- Hays, P. A. (2001). *Addressing cultural complexities in practice: A framework for clinicians and counselors*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Helms, J. E. (1984). Toward a theoretical model of the effects of race on counseling: A Black and White model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 12*, 153-165.
- Helms, J. E. (Ed.). (1990). *Black and white racial identity: Theory, research, and practice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms' White and People of Color Racial Identity Models. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.),

- Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed.). (pp.181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Helms, J. E., & Carter, R. T. (1990). Development of the White racial identity inventory. In J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 67-80). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Helms, J. E., & Cook, D. A. (1999). *Using race and culture in counseling and psychotherapy: Theory and process*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Heppner, P. P., Kivlighan, D. M. & Wampold, B. E. (1999). *Research Design in Counseling*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Holcomb-McCoy, C. (2004). Assessing the multicultural competence of school counselors: A checklist. *Professional School Counseling, 3*, 178-187.
- Jacobson, C. K. (1985). Resistance to affirmative action: Self-interest or racism? *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 29*, 306-329.
- Katz, J. H. (2003). *White awareness: Handbook for anti-racism training* (2nd ed.). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Kleg, M. (1993). *Hate, prejudice, and racism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Korman, M. (1974). National conference on levels and patterns of professional training in psychology: Major themes. *American Psychologist, 29*, 441-449.
- LaFromboise, T. (November/December 1998). A compelling class seen through the eyes of professor and student. *Understanding racial and ethnic identity: Increasing self-*

understanding. *Stanford Today Online*.

<http://www.stanford.edu/dept/news/stanfordtoday/ed/9811/9811fea301.shtml>

Retrieved 23 August, 2005

Leonhardt, D. (2002, May 1). Wide racial disparities found in costs of mortgages. *The New York Times*.

Lewis, A. C., & Hayes, S. (????). Multiculturalism and the school counseling curriculum. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70, 119-126.

Locke, D. C. (1992). *Increasing multicultural understanding: A comprehensive model*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

National report. (2001, April 19). *Jet*.

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

Neville, H. A., Worthington, R. L., & Spanierman, L. B. (2001). Race, Power, and Multicultural Counseling Psychology: Understanding White Privilege and Color-Blind Racial Attitudes. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed.). (pp.181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ottavi, T. M., Pope-Davis, D. B., & Dings, J. G. (1994) Relationship between White racial identity attitudes and self-reported multicultural counseling competencies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 41, 149-154.

- Parham, T. A., & Helms, T.E. (1981). The influence of Black students' racial identity attitudes on preferences for counselor's race. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 28, 250-257.
- Parker, W. A., Moore, M. A., & Neimeyer, G. J. (1998). Altering White racial identity and interracial comfort through multicultural training. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 76 (3), 302-310.
- Parker, W. M., Freytes, M., Kaufman, C. J., Woodruff, R., Hord, R. (2004). The Mentoring Lab: A small group approach for managing emotions from multicultural counselor training. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 29 (4), 361-375.
- Parker, W. M., & Schwartz, R. C. (2002). On the experience of shame in multicultural counselling: Implications for white counsellors-in-training. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, (pp. 311).
- Patterson, C. H. (2004). Do we need multicultural counseling competencies? *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 26, 67-74.
- Pincus, F. L. (2000). Discrimination comes in many forms: Individual, institutional and structural. In M. Adams, W. J. Blumenfeld, R. Castaneda, H. W. Hackman, M. L. Peters, X. Zuniga (Eds.). *Readings for diversity and social justice: An anthology on racism, anti-Semitism, sexism, heterosexism, ableism, and classism*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ponterotto, J. G. (2002). Qualitative research methods: The fifth force in psychology. *Counseling Psychologist*, 30, 394.

- Ponterotto, J. G., Burkard, A., Rieger, B. P., Grieger, I., et al. (1995). Development and initial validation of the Quick discrimination index (QDI). *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 55*, p. 1016-31.
- Ponterotto, J. G., Fuertes, J. N., & Chen, E. C. (2000). Models of multicultural counseling. In S. D. Brown & R W. Lent (Eds.). *Handbook of counseling psychology* (3rd ed.). (pp. 639-669). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Ponterotto, J. G., & Pedersen, P. B. (1993). *Preventing prejudice: A guide for counselors and educators*. New York, NY: Sage Publications.
- Ponterotto, J G., Potere, J. C., & Johansen, S. A. (2002). The Quick Discrimination Index: Normative Data and User Guidelines for Counseling Researchers. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 30*, 192-207.
- Pope-Davis, D. B., & Ottavi, T. M. (1992). The influence of White racial identity attitudes on racism among faculty members: A preliminary examination. *Journal of College Student Development, 33*, 389-394.
- Pope-Davis, D. B., Toporek, R. L., Ortega-Villalobos, L., Ligiero, D. P., et al. (2002). Client perspectives of multicultural counseling competence: A qualitative examination. *Counseling Psychologist, 30*, 355.
- Remley, T. P., & Herlihy, B. (2005). Ethical, legal, and professional issues in counseling, 2nd ed., Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Ridley, C. R. (1995). *Overcoming unintentional racism in counseling and therapy: A practitioner's guide to intentional intervention*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Roberts, R. E., & Phinney, J. S. (1999). The structure of ethnic identity of young adolescents from diverse ethnocultural groups. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 19*, 301-323.
- Sabnani, H. B., Ponterotto, J. G., & Borodovsky, L. G. (1991). White racial identity development and cross-cultural counselor training: A stage model. *The Counseling Psychologist, 19*, 72-102.
- Sanders-Thompson, V. L. (1992). A multifaceted approach to the conceptualization of African American identification. *Journal of Black Studies, 23*, 75-85.
- Sandhu, D. S., & Aspy, C. B. (1997). *Counseling for prejudice prevention and reduction*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Smith, T. W. (2000). Taking America's pulse II: A survey of intergroup relations. National Conference for Community and Justice.
- Sodowsky, G. R., Kuyoo-Kackson, P. Y., Richardson, M. F., & Corey, A. T. (1998). Correlates of self-reported multicultural competencies: Counselor multicultural social desirability, race, social inadequacy, locus of control racial ideology, and multicultural training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45*, 256-264.
- Sodowsky, G. R., Taffe, R. C., Gutkins, T. B., & Wise, S. L. (1994). Development of the Multicultural Counseling Inventory: A self-report measure of multicultural competencies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41*, 137-148.
- Steward, R. J., Morales, P. C., Bartell, P. A., Miller, M., & Weeks, D. (1998). The multiculturally responsive versus the multiculturally reactive: A study of

- perceptions of counselor trainees. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 26*, 13-27.
- Strous, M. (2003). *Racial sensitivity and multicultural training*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Tatum, B. D. (1997). *Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria? And Other Conversations About Race*. New York, NY: Basic Books
- Tatum, B. D. (2000). Defining racism: 'Can we talk?' In M. Adams, W. J. Blumenfeld, R. Castaneda, H. W. Hackman, M. L. Peters, X. Zuniga (Eds.). *Readings for diversity and social justice: An anthology on racism, anti-Semitism, sexism, heterosexism, ableism, and classism*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Utsey, S. O., & Ponterotto, J. G. (1999). Further factorial validity assessment of scores on the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI). *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 59*, 325-335.
- Vargas, P. T. (2004). The relationship between implicit attitudes and behavior: Some lessons from the past, and directions for the future. In G. Haddock & G. R. Maio (Eds.). *Contemporary perspectives on the psychology of attitudes*. New York, NY: Psychological Press.
- Vinson, T. S., & Neimeyer, G. J. (2000). The relationship between racial identity development and multicultural counseling competency. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 28*, 177-192.

- 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*, 262-263.
- Vontress, C. E., & Jackson, M. L. (2004). Reactions to the multicultural counseling competencies debate. *Journal of Mental Health counseling, 26*, 74-80.
- Weinrach, S. G., & Thomas, K. R. (2002). A critical analysis of the multicultural counseling competencies: Implication for the practice of mental health counseling. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 24*, 20-35.
- Wrenn, C. G. (1962). The culturally encapsulated counselor. *Harvard Educational Review, 32*, 444-449.

VITA

GARBETTE ACHERLEY MONTGOMERY GARRAWAY

EDUCATION

Doctor of Philosophy, Counselor Education, Department of Counselor Education, Counseling Psychology and Rehabilitation Services, The Pennsylvania State University (2006)

Master of Education, Counseling Psychology, Department of Educational and Counseling Psychology, and Special Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada (2002)

Master of Arts, English Education, Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, British Columbia, Canada (1989)

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Career Counselor and Instructor Intern, Career Services Center, The Pennsylvania State University (2005-2006)

Graduate Assistant, Counselor Education, The Pennsylvania State University (2003-2005)

Elementary School Counselor, Vancouver School District in British Columbia (2002-2003)

English Department Head, Vancouver School District in British Columbia (1999-2001)

Curriculum Integration Leader, Vancouver School District in British Columbia (1998-1999)

High School Teacher, Vancouver School District in British Columbia (1989-2002)

PUBLICATIONS

Harrington, T., Niles, S. G., & Garraway, G. A. M. (2005). *Career Planning*. Shoreview, MN: AGS Publication.

Garraway, G. A. M., Niles, S. G., & Trusty, J. (2005). Best Practices Resources Collection for the Pennsylvania Transforming School Counseling Initiative.

PRESENTATIONS

Garraway, G. A. M. (2006, April). *The effect of counseling programs on the racial attitudes of counselor trainees*. Annual conference of the American Counseling Association.

Garraway, G. A. M. (2005, November). *The pathway to interracial communication*. Annual conference of the Pennsylvania Counseling Association.

Amundson, N., Niles, S. G., & Garraway, G. A. M. (2005, June). *Engaging probability and possibility thinking*. Annual conference of the National Career Development Association.

Garraway, G. A. M. (2005, May). *Client resilience: Building on the self-healing process*. Annual conference of the Canadian Counselling Association.

Garraway, G. A. M. (2004, October). *Client needs: Beginning where the client is*. Annual conference of the Pennsylvania Counseling Association.

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

American Counseling Association, Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development, National Career Development Association, Association for Specialists in Group Work, Chi Sigma Iota International Counseling Honors Society, Pennsylvania Counseling Association.