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This study explored the relationships among multicultural training, racial identity attitudes, gender identity attitudes, and multicultural competencies in counseling trainees. Two principal research hypotheses were generated. The first generally stated hypothesis was that racial identity and gender identity represent parallel processes for those whose racial and gender identities share a cultural status (minority-minority or majority-majority) and are independent processes for those whose identities do not share a cultural status (minority-majority). The second generally stated hypothesis was that multicultural training predicts racial identity attitudes, gender identity attitudes, and multicultural competencies, and that both racial and gender identity attitudes predict multicultural competencies. The hypotheses were explored separately for four racial/gender groups (Women of Color, White Women, Men of Color, and White Men). A survey was sent to 1309 counseling and counseling psychology graduate students either enrolled at a midwestern university or members of the Association of Multicultural Counseling and Development. The survey contained measures of the variables under study. Canonical Correlations and Structural Equation Model Analysis were used to test the hypotheses. Partial support was found for the hypothesis that identity attitudes...
would correlate in ways that matched the cultural statuses of the participants' racial/gender group. The results for Women of Color (minority-minority) and White Men (majority-majority) were parallel as predicted. The result for Men of Color (minority-majority) showed no relationship between the two types of identity as predicted. Results for White Women (majority-minority) were not as predicted. The hypothesis about the predictive relationships among variables was not supported. The lack of support for the final hypothesis appears to be due to two things, strong correlations between identity attitudes and lack of effect between multicultural training and identity attitudes. The strong correlations between identity attitudes (racial and gender) demonstrate shared variance. Therefore, one identity provides a good explanation for the variance in multicultural competencies, but adding a second identity type to the variables in the prediction does not add substantial explanatory power. These two effects suggest that while identity attitudes may be important in the acquisition of multicultural competencies, multicultural training may not be effecting substantial change in identity attitudes.
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CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW AND INTRODUCTION

Overview of Dissertation and Chapter I

This dissertation explores the various relationships among the following four variables: Multicultural training, gender identity attitudes, racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies. The major emphasis of this dissertation is on explication and evaluation of a model that explains these relationships in a specific way. This dissertation is written in five chapters. At the beginning of each chapter the reader will find an introduction outlining the contents of the material contained within that chapter. Chapter I provides a brief summary of the entire dissertation and begins with coverage of key theoretical and research areas in the literature that led to the current study. Following the overview of the background literature, a brief synopsis of the proposed study's methods is covered. This is followed by a section that summarizes the results in an abbreviated form. Finally, key issues in interpreting the study's results are covered in the final section. Chapters II, III, IV and V expand upon the material presented in Chapter I and provide further detail. Chapter II contains a review of the literature to familiarize the reader with relevant information and give insight into the rationale for this study. Chapter III describes the methods that were used in this research in sufficient detail for the reader to understand and duplicate
this study if desired. In Chapter IV the researcher describes the results of the study. Chapter V contains the researcher's discussion of those results.

Review of Literature Leading to Current Study

This section is further divided into six subsections. In the first of these the background literature, leading to the current focus on multicultural issues, is covered. In the second, third and fourth subsections, three specific areas in the multicultural literature are covered consecutively, racial identity, gender identity, and multicultural training and competencies. Multicultural training and multicultural competencies are covered in the same subsection because many of the studies exploring one of these variables included the other (e.g. exploring the effect of multicultural training on multicultural competency). After covering each of these areas within the multicultural literature individually, the literature in which these topics converge is described in the fifth subsection. This fifth subsection (on the convergence of racial identity, gender identity, multicultural training and competencies) is further divided into two parts, one on the convergence between racial identity and gender identity and the other on the convergence of racial identity, gender identity and multicultural training and competencies. The sixth subsection presents the rationale for the proposed study.

Background of Related Multicultural Issues

Increased awareness that cultural differences between counselors and clients play a role in therapeutic outcomes has spurred exploration of multicultural issues (Amir, 1976; Katz, 1976; Maykovich, 1973; Sue, 1978a, 1978b; Sue & Sue,
Cultural differences between counselor and client have been shown to effect a client's perceptions of counselor expertise (Gim, Atkinson, & Kim, 1991; Sodowsky & Taffe, 1991). Additionally, counselors' levels of understanding of specific cultural differences have been shown to impact the effectiveness of therapy sessions (Carter & Helms, 1992). Since the majority of counselors and therapists in the United States are White while large numbers of clients represent minority cultures, it has become increasingly important for counselor and psychologist educators to understand how individuals develop competence in working with culturally diverse clients and to develop training models and methods that can facilitate the acquisition of the requisite skills (Arredondo, 1999; Arredondo-Dowd & Gonsalves, 1980; Arredondo et al. 1996; Ibrahim & Arredondo, 1986; Katz & Ivey 1977; Pedersen, 1978; Sue, 1978a, 1978b; Sue & Sue, 1990; Vontress, 1971). In attempting to understand how multicultural competency is acquired, researchers identified two important areas of change exhibited by the culturally skilled counselor: Increased knowledge of other cultures (Atkinson, 1987; Atkinson, Morten & Sue, 1983; Carney & Kahn, 1984; Sue, 1978a, 1978b; Sue & Sue, 1990) and increased knowledge about his or her own culture and its influences on him or her (Cross, 1971, 1978; Helms, 1992, 1995a; Katz & Ivey 1977; Pedersen, 1978; Richardson & Molinaro, 1996; Sue, 1978a, 1978b; Terry, 1970; Thomas, 1970). In attempting to understand how individuals process information about their own and others' cultural differences and how change in the ways they process this information occurs, researchers developed models of racial and gender identity development (Carter, 1990a, 1990b; Carter & Helms, 1984, 1987, 1990, 1992; Carter & Parks, 1996; Cross, 1971, 1978, 1994, 1995;
Racial identity development is the process by which an individual becomes aware of being classified as a member of a high-status or low-status racial group and the individual’s reactions to this awareness. The process of racial identity development was first explored for racial and ethnic minorities (e.g. Cross, 1971; Jackson, 1975; Thomas, 1970; Williams, 1975). The majority of these models dealt with the development of the minority individual’s awareness of ethnicity, or race consciousness in the quest for self-identity. Cross conceived one of the most highly developed models in 1971, a model containing five stages. The stages proposed by Cross were Preencounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, Internalization, and Internalization-Commitment. In the Preencounter stage, the individual aligns him or
herself with dominant culture beliefs. This continues until the individual experiences an event or series of events (Encounter) that causes a reevaluation of personal racial attitudes. In processing these ideas, the individual becomes involved in minority culture (Immersion) and gradually develops an understanding of minority attitudes and values and the impact of minority identity (Emersion). The individual internalizes this new identity (Internalization) and may eventually choose to advocate for other same-group minority members or societal minority issues (Internalization-Commitment). Cross' model and many others emphasize interaction with the dominant culture as providing the impetus for progression through racial identity stages.

Three studies by Helms and colleagues (Carter & Helms, 1987; Helms & Carter, 1991; Helms & Parham, 1981) helped provide support for the stages of Cross's model. Two of these studies considered the impact of racial identity attitudes on preferences for either White or Black counselors (Helms & Carter, 1991; Parham & Helms, 1981). The results from these two studies found that Black students' preference for either a Black or White counselor was consistent with theoretically anticipated results (Preencounter attitudes corresponded to a preference for a White counselor, Encounter attitudes corresponded to a preference for a Black counselor, and Internalization attitudes corresponded to a preference for a Black counselor). The other study evaluated the relationship between cultural values and racial identity attitudes (Carter & Helms, 1987). In a study of Black undergraduate students, Carter and Helms (1987) found that stronger endorsement of higher level racial identity attitude statuses corresponded to greater adherence to Afro-centric values. Helms
(1990a, 1995a, 1995b), then went on to expand on the Cross (1971) model, developing models for Blacks and Persons of Color that stressed the importance of oppression in the creation of an individual's sense of racial identity.

Helms (1990b) also proposed an interrelated model for racial identity development for Whites that explored how members of the majority population develop a racial identity. In this theory, the impetus for change is grounded in an individual's sense of fairness and his or her ability to recognize societal inequities, rather than in the experience of being oppressed. Helms has expanded her Black and White models from their original form (1990b, 1995a, 1995b, 1996) to explain interpersonal interactions between members of various races. Other researchers (e.g. Parham, 1989; Ponterotto, 1988; Sabnani et al., 1991) have expanded on Helms's models to explain the racial identity development experienced by counselor and therapist trainees. In the present study, the models of racial identity that will be used are Helms's White (1990b) and Persons of Color (1995b) models.

In Helms's model of White Racial Identity (1990b, 1992, 1995a) there are six statuses. Helms (1995a) uses the term status rather than stage to denote a greater flexibility in movement between statuses than that implied by the term stage. The six statuses within Helms model of White racial identity are: Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, Immersion/Emersion and Autonomy. Individuals in the Contact status tend to be oblivious to racial identity (their own and others) and naive about the consequences of racial group membership. When an individual begins to interact with others who represent different races, they begin to discover the effects of racial group membership in the society. This knowledge
causes a "disintegration" of their former naïveté and belief structure. From this Disintegration status, the individual can further adapt in one of two ways. The first way is by retreating back into White culture and defending this retreat by systematic rationalization. Individuals who do this enter the Reintegration status wherein they seek to defend the status quo of majority culture dominance. The second way an individual may adjust to the disruption of their belief system is by increasing their exploration in an attempt to understand other racial groups and to formulate a new set of beliefs based on the new information. Individuals who choose this second path, enter the Pseudo-Independence status. In the Pseudo-Independence status, the individual begins to explore racial issues. However, these individuals tend to explore primarily at an intellectual level. They may retain many "toned down" racial stereotypes and continue to enjoy the benefits of "White privilege" without feeling any need to acknowledge it as such. The two remaining statuses, Immersion/Emersion and Autonomy involve going beyond intellectual exploration and taking emotional risks in exploring one's own racial identity and the impact of race on others and society. In Immersion/Emersion, the individual immerses him or herself in racial issues in an effort to develop a "nonracist" white identity. These individuals often interact with sympathetic persons of color or other whites who are also trying to develop a "nonracist" white identity. In the Autonomy status the individual has internalized a "nonracist" identity and feels comfortable and enjoys interacting with others from a wide variety of races and racial identity attitude statuses.

Results of several studies, most using the WRIAS support Helms's conceptualization of her White Racial Identity Development Model (Block, Roberson
& Neuger, 1995; Carter, Gushue & Weitzman, 1994; Claney & Parker, 1989; Helms & Carter, 1991; Steward et al., 1998; Tokar & Swanson, 1991). Some of these studies considered how racial identity attitudes relate to other feelings, attitudes, and behaviors involved in interracial experiences (Block et al., 1995; Carter et al., 1994; Claney & Parker, 1989; Helms & Carter, 1991). The remaining studies investigated the developmental aspects of racial identity as demonstrated by relationships with personal orientation and self actualization (Tokar & Swanson, 1991), and relationships with other forms of development, specifically cognitive development (Steward et al., 1998).

Four studies compared other racially related values and attitudes with racial identity attitudes. Claney and Parker (1989) polling 339 White undergraduate students, found a curvilinear relationship between racial identity attitudes and comfort with Blacks. Helms’s theory predicts just such a curvilinear relationship in comfort levels for individuals strongly endorsing particular subscales. Helms and Carter (1991) polling 183 White undergraduate students found that White racial identity attitudes predicted subjects' preferences for White counselors. Higher levels of Disintegration and Pseudo Independence attitudes were related to an increased preference for White counselors, while higher levels of Autonomy attitudes were related to a decreased preference for White counselors. The results for the Pseudo-Independence status and Autonomy status in particular strongly support Helms’s theory. This is related to the level of emotional comfort with racially different others expected of individuals operating from within these particular statuses. According to Helms’s theory, Pseudo-Independence involves an intellectual acceptance of racially
different others but does not encompass emotional comfort with racial issues, while Autonomy involves engagement in racial issues at both an intellectual and emotional level. Carter et al. (1994) polled 109 White undergraduate students. They found a relationship between a pattern of racial identity attitudes, containing a strong endorsement of Reintegration attitudes, which they labeled "White superiority attitudes" and a pattern of values that are involved in maintaining attitudes of cultural superiority or adhering to dominant culture. Block et al. (1995) polled 98 part time MBA students (76% men, 24% women). They found statistically significant relationships between patterns of endorsement of racial identity attitudes and patterns of reactions to interracial situations at work that matched theoretical expectations for these relationships.

Two studies investigated the developmental aspects of racial identity. Tokar and Swanson (1991) polled 308 White undergraduate students using the WRIAS and a measure designed to evaluate self-actualization and capacity for intimate contact. Tokar and Swanson (1991) found statistically significant relationships between four WRIAS subscales (Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, Autonomy) and measures of self-actualization, and capacity for intimate contact. All results were in directions expected from racial identity development theory (i.e. negative with Disintegration and Reintegration and positive with Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy).

Finally, Steward et al. (1998) polled 82 White counseling graduate students using the WRIAS and a scale designed to assess cognitive development. They assessed the following cognitive strategies: Dualism, relativism, commitment, and
empathy. They found statistical significance for a relationship between Dualism and two racial identity attitudes, Contact and Reintegration. This parallel between a lower level cognitive processing strategy and lower levels of racial identity development provides some support for the developmental nature of Helms's White racial identity theory.

In Helms's "Black and Persons of Color" racial identity model (1995a) there are five statuses. The five statuses in this model are: Conformity/Preencounter, Dissonance, Immersion/Emersion, Internalization, and Integrative Awareness. In the Conformity/Preencounter status an individual identifies with the majority culture and tends to denigrate their own race. In the Dissonance status, the individual, likely due to personal experiences with racism, begins to feel ambivalent about their adherence to majority culture and confused about how they fit, in racial terms, in the society. In order to overcome the confusion and ambivalence of the Dissonance status, the individual increases his/her interaction with people and activities representative of his/her own culture. This change in focus from interaction with Whites and White culture to interaction with members of their specific racial group heralds the change to the Immersion/Emersion status. The latter half of this status involves starting to emerge from an almost total focus on one's own culture toward a focus that can include other cultures as well. Once the individual has developed a racial identity that involves a positive commitment to their own culture and an internalized racial self identity, they have entered the Internalization status. The final status, Integrative Awareness includes this internalized sense of self and positive commitment to one's own culture and adds an empathy toward members of other cultures.
Racial identity development is an aspect of identity development that seems to effect the acquisition of multicultural competencies. This suggests that racial identity development is a valuable process for counselors and therapists who plan to work with a diverse population of clients. Three studies provide evidence to support the importance of covering racial identity development in counselor and psychologist training programs. In the first study (Carter & Helms, 1992), researchers demonstrated that the racial identity development of the therapist impacts on the working quality of the therapeutic milieu. Therapists who operated from higher level racial identity statuses than their clients established the most productive relationships. In the second study (Burkard, Ponterotto, Reynolds, & Alfonso, 1999), researchers identified relationships between racial identity attitudes and the establishment of therapeutic working alliance. They found that higher levels of racial identity development were associated with more effective therapeutic alliance formation. In the third study (Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999) researchers identified two additional areas of multicultural competency that should be addressed in training (definitions and racial identity). The first area, definitions involves an understanding of the terms used in multicultural research and practice. The second additional area, racial identity, involves the process of racial identity development, which Holcomb-McCoy and Myers (1999) suggest is a competency area that improves ability to work with diverse populations that is separate from the Knowledge, Skill, and Awareness competency areas proposed previously (Sue et al., 1982). The results of these three studies suggest that racial identity is a valuable component in multicultural competency.
While other researchers were considering the impact of racial identity on multicultural competencies, some (Ponterotto, 1988; Sabnani et al., 1991) were proposing models for implementing racial identity training into multicultural education. Ponterotto's (1988) use of a stage model of racial identity in his multicultural classes and Sabnani and colleagues (1991) model and recommended counselor training goals suggest that racial identity development may be an important aspect of any multicultural training. More recent writings on the place of racial identity development in multicultural training corroborate its value in this area (Constantine, 1999; Pack-Brown, 1999; Watt, 1999). Finally, results from the studies reported above (Burkard et al., 1999; Carter & Helms, 1992; Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999) provide empirical evidence to support the importance of racial identity development for multicultural competency.

**Gender Identity**

As with racial identity development theory, gender identity development theory suggests that differences exist in the development of gender identity attitudes between members of dominant and non-dominant groups. Early research on gender stressed differences between men and women and attempted to explain these differences, often in terms of innate biological differences (Atkinson, 1987; Zuckerman, 1989). From this stress on male-female difference, research shifted to a study of behaviors and gender roles (e.g. Burke & Weir, 1976; Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, & Vogel, 1970; Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972; O'Neil, Fishman, & Kinsella-Shaw, 1987;
Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, & Broverman, 1968). The emphasis of this research centered on the concept of androgyny and resulted from a reaction, generally by women, to being labeled deficient (Bem, 1974, 1977; Cook, 1987; Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1975). Many researchers, dissatisfied with the ability of the androgyny construct to explain within group differences, began to explore ways to account for individual variance in gender role adherence. Borrowing heavily from racial identity research, they began to propose theories of gender identity development (Downing & Roush, 1985; Gilligan, 1982; Helms as cited in Ossana, Helms & Leonard, 1992; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Wade, 1998). In this study, two theories of gender identity development are used. One for women (Helms as cited in Ossana, et al., 1992) and one for men (Wade, 1998).

**Women's Gender Identity**

The women's theory of identity development, called Womanist Identity Development (Helms as cited in Ossana, et al., 1990) is similar to Helms's People of Color racial identity development theory (Helms, 1995a). Both of these identity development models are based on experiences of oppression by majority culture and its members and presume that interaction with the majority culture and its members is necessary to propel identity development. The womanist model contains four statuses that mirror the first four statuses of the People of Color model. These statuses are: Preencounter, Encounter, Immersion/Emersion, and Internalization. In the Preencounter status, the individual accepts the opinions and attitudes of the majority culture (masculine culture) often unthinkingly and may idealize men and
male culture as well. In the Encounter status, the individual has some experience, usually negative that causes them to begin to question the societally imposed definitions of women's identity. In the Immersion/Emersion status, the individual increases their association with women and involvement in women's activities in a quest for a new gender identity. This immersion in women's attitudes, activities, etc. is often accompanied by a devaluation of men and male culture. When the individual is able to begin to re-appreciate the contributions of both male and female culture while maintaining a positive womanist gender identity they have moved into the Internalization status.

Helms's womanist identity development model has been used in four studies to assess correlation of stages of womanist identity with various other factors. The factors that have been correlated with womanist identity stages are mental health symptoms (Carter & Parks, 1996), measures of self esteem (Ossana et al., 1992), and racial identity measures (Parks et al., 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997).

Two studies found that mental health symptoms had differential correlations associated with different stages of identity development in White Women (Carter & Parks, 1996; Ossana et al., 1992). Self-esteem and psychological symptomatology were both related to the same gender identity subscales, albeit in opposite directions. Higher endorsement of lower level subscales (Preencounter, Encounter, Immersion/Emersion) was related negatively to self esteem and positively to psychological symptomatology. Higher endorsement of the highest level subscale (Internalization) yielded correlations that were opposite of those obtained for lower
level subscales. These results support Helms's model of Womanist identity development in several ways. The first is that high levels of Preencounter attitudes correspond to conformity to the dominant and less valued (White male) view of women. This viewpoint is inversely related to self esteem and correspondingly directly related to psychological symptomatology. The second is that high scores for Encounter and Immersion/Emersion scales which measure attitudes that involve an identity in flux are inversely related to self esteem, and directly related to psychological symptomatology. Finally, high scores for the Internalization scale which measures attitudes that reflect a fully formed positive womanist identity are positively related to self esteem and negatively related to psychological symptomatology.

The studies by Parks and colleagues (1996) and Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson (1997) found correlations between womanist identity stages and racial identity statuses for Black women (these two studies are further addressed later in this chapter in the section on convergence of racial identity, gender identity, multicultural training and multicultural competencies). The similarities reported by Parks et al. (1996) and Poindexter-Cameron and Robinson (1997) between racial identity development and gender identity development suggest that the stages for these processes are related. This supports the developmental and identity aspects of the Womanist Identity Model.
Men's Gender Identity

The model of masculine identity development used in this study is the Reference Group Identity Dependence model proposed by Wade (1998). This model proposes that masculine identity is developed through association with reference groups of other males. Wade (1998) proposed a three status model with each status involving a different level of association with male reference groups. The first status proposed by Wade's model is labeled No Reference Group. Men in this status are disassociated from other men and male reference groups. Their masculine identity tends to be tentative and/or unformed. The second status is Reference Group Dependent. In this status individuals identify strongly with specific reference groups and rely on these reference groups for their masculine identity. In the third status, Reference Group Non Dependent, there are two types of identification, with all males or only with males similar to oneself. Individuals who are Reference Group Non Dependent have a strong sense of their own masculinity, however they do not rely on specific groups of males to provide this identity. Rather they utilize more universal referents. The first of the Reference Group Non Dependent types, labeled Diversity involves a feeling of connectedness with all males. The second Reference Group Non Dependent type, labeled Similarity, involves feeling connected only to males who are similar to oneself.

A study done by Wade and Gelso (1998), provided support for Wade's (1998) theory of reference group dependence for men. In this study, the Reference Group Identity Dependence Scale (RGIDS) based upon Wade's theory was correlated with a measure of ego identity and with a measure of gender role conflict.
Results from the comparison with the measure of ego identity, suggests that male reference group identity operates similarly to ego identity. Results from the comparison with the measure of gender role conflict showed that male reference group identity status was related to levels of gender role conflict, in particular, the lowest level status of male reference group identity was related to the highest levels of gender role conflict.

**Multicultural Counseling: Training and Competencies**

Following the position papers of the Association of Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES: 1979) and Sue et al. (1982) that stressed the importance of multicultural competence for working with a multicultural population, many theorists and researchers struggled with the issue of how to convey the recommended competencies to practitioners in the field (e.g. Arredondo, 1999; Arredondo-Dowd & Gonsalves, 1980; Arredondo et al., 1996; Atkinson et al., 1983; Carney & Kahn, 1984). Several of these authors (Arredondo, 1999; Arredondo et al., 1996; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992; Sue & Sue, 1990) expanded on the overview of recommended multicultural competencies covering the three dimensions of (1) beliefs and attitudes, (2) knowledge, and (3) skills proposed by Sue et al. (1982). Sue and Sue suggested three goals to address in multicultural instruction: (1) developing cultural self-awareness, (2) learning and accepting others' worldviews, and (3) developing and practicing appropriate intervention strategies and skills. Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis (1992) provided a framework for what they believed to be necessary cross-cultural competencies by combining the goals proposed by Sue
and Sue (1990) with the dimensions of multicultural competency outlined by Sue et al. (1982). Arredondo et al. (1996) also expanded on the works of Sue et al. (1982) and Sue, Arredondo and McDavis (1992) by providing another component, a dimensional model of personal identity, to add to the former multicultural competencies models. Each theorist's intentions in each of the above models was to improve training in order to increase counselor abilities to work with multicultural populations.

As research in the area of diversity counseling expanded, knowledge about specific minority groups became more widely available (Atkinson, 1987; Gim et al., 1991; Helms, 1979; Lopez, Lopez & Fong, 1991; Maykovich, 1973; Robinson, 1989) and training programs were encouraged to implement multicultural components that focused on knowledge acquisition (Ibrahim & Arredondo, 1986; Mio & Morris, 1990). With the inclusion of multicultural material in training programs came the necessity to evaluate its effectiveness. Research was done on multicultural competencies to discern which variables most accounted for multicultural competence scores (McEwen & Roper, 1994; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994, Sodowsky, Kuo-Jackson, Richardson, & Corey, 1998; Talbot, 1996; Talbot & Kocarek, 1997). In these studies, researchers found that several demographic variables, including race, i.e. belonging to a minority race (McEwen & Roper, 1994, Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994), sexual orientation, i.e. identifying as gay, lesbian, or bisexual (Talbot, 1996) and being female (Talbot & Kocarek, 1997) predicted higher multicultural competency scores. Researchers also discovered that taking a multicultural course (Ottavi et al., 1994; Sodowsky et al., 1998), being involved in multicultural research (Sodowsky, Kuo-
Jackson, Richardson & Corey, 1998), receiving quality supervision (Allison, Echemendia, Crawford & LaVome Robinson, 1996) and seeing greater numbers of minority clients was positively related to multicultural competency (Allison et al., 1996; Sodowsky et al., 1998).

Although cultural self-awareness was described as an important piece of multicultural learning as early as Sue’s and colleagues’ (1982) call to the profession, multicultural education in many training programs tended to focus on the acquisition of knowledge about a variety of diverse cultures (Corvin & Wiggins, 1999; Mio & Morris, 1990). This focus was criticized by educators specializing in multicultural issues (Burn, 1992; Casas, Ponterotto & Gutierrez, 1986; and Das, 1995). Experts in the field of multicultural education (e.g. Casas et al., 1986; Christensen, 1989; D’Andrea, Daniels & Heck, 1991; Pedersen & Ivey, 1993; Ponterotto, 1988; 1998; Sue & Sue, 1990) stressed that knowledge alone was insufficient to prepare effective multicultural counselors and therapists (e.g. Arredondo-Dowd & Gonsalves, 1980; LaFromboise & Foster, 1992; Nwachuku & Ivey, 1991; Pedersen, 1978, 1988; Pedersen & Ivey, 1993; Ponterotto, 1988; Ponterotto & Casas, 1987; Sabnani et al., 1991). Some of these theorists and educators proposed alternative training models designed to raise trainee consciousness with regard to individual differences (LaFromboise & Foster, 1992; Locke & Kiselica, 1999; Nwachuku & Ivey, 1991; Pedersen, 1978, 1988; Pedersen & Ivey, 1993; Ponterotto, 1988; Sabnani et al., 1991). Among the theorists advocating for training beyond the acquisition of culture specific knowledge, were some who stressed personal cultural identity development as a step in becoming a culturally competent practitioner (Carney & Kahn, 1984;
Helms, 1979; Pack-Brown, 1999; Ponterotto, 1988; Richardson & Molinaro, 1996; Sabnani et al., 1991). These researchers and theorists suggested that in order to understand the impact of a culture on its subjects, one must have an understanding of how one's own culture impacts on personal behaviors, attitudes and beliefs (Helms, 1990a; Ibrahim & Arredondo, 1986; Katz, 1985; Richardson & Molinaro, 1996). Racial identity and gender identity are two specific areas of cultural identity that researchers have suggested be addressed in training programs (Helms, 1984, 1986; Ponterotto, 1988; Sabnani et al., 1991).

Convergence of Racial Identity, Gender Identity, and Multicultural Training and Competencies

Researchers have begun to explore how the variables of racial identity development, gender identity development, multicultural training, and multicultural competencies relate to each other. Several studies have explored how two of these four variables relate (Brown, Parham & Yonker, 1996; Parks et al., 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997; Steward et al., 1998) while others have explored the relationships between three or four of these variables (Neville et al., 1996; Ottavi et al., 1994; Parker et al., 1998). It is the intent of the researcher in the proposed study to incorporate all four of these variables, racial identity, gender identity, multicultural training and multicultural competencies, into a single model. To explain the rationale for this model, the results of the studies including two or more of these variables are described below. In order to provide greater ease in understanding, the studies are described by content area rather than by the number of variables they contain, beginning with the research on convergence of racial and gender identity variables.
and moving on to the research on convergence of multicultural training and competency variables with racial identity variables.

**Racial Identity and Gender Identity**

Racial identity and gender identity have been directly compared in two studies (Parks et al., 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997). In the study by Parks et al. (1996), surveying Black and White female undergraduate students, the authors reported a statistically significant relationship between racial identity and womanist identity attitudes for Black women but not for White women. In a second study (Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997) comparing racial identity attitudes, womanist identity attitudes and self-esteem, researchers surveyed only Black female undergraduate students. Statistically significant correlations were found between several gender identity and racial identity statuses, partially confirming the authors' hypothesis that racial identity attitudes would be positively related to comparable stages of female gender identity. Both studies demonstrated a correlation between some gender identity statuses and some racial identity statuses, supporting Helms's womanist and black racial identity development models. These models, based on a response to oppression, require that similar tasks be accomplished in order to progress in identity attitudes. The study by Parks, et al. (1996) found no correlation between womanist identity and white racial identity statuses in women. However, since the theory of female gender identity development is grounded in the experience of being oppressed, but the theory of white racial identity development is
grounded in the experience of having privilege, this lack of correlation also fits with Helms theoretical formulations.

**Racial Identity, Multicultural Training, and Multicultural Competency**

The areas of racial identity, multicultural training and multicultural competencies converge in four studies (Brown et al., 1996; Neville et al., 1996; Ottavi et al., 1994; Parker et al., 1996). In the first, racial identity attitudes were used to predict multicultural competencies (Ottavi et al., 1994). In the remaining three studies, change in racial identity attitude statuses was evaluated over the duration of a multicultural training course (Brown et al., 1996; Neville et al., 1996; Parker et al., 1998). The study by Neville et al. (1996) also assessed change in multicultural competencies in addition to change in racial identity attitude statuses over the duration of a multicultural training course. In the first study (Ottavi et al., 1994), researchers found that for 128 White counseling graduate students, White racial identity attitudes explained variation in multicultural competencies beyond that accounted for by demographic variables. In the second study (Brown et al., 1996), the authors assessed change in the White racial identity attitudes of 35 counseling graduate students across a multicultural training course. They reported the following findings: Men's scores in autonomy increased, women's scores in Pseudo Independence increased. This study (Brown et al., 1996), also provides evidence that for Whites there is a different effect on racial identity for White males than for White females as evidenced by increases in different types of attitudes. In the third study (Neville et al., 1996), researchers evaluated change in multicultural
competency and racial identity attitude status in 38 counseling graduate students across the duration of a multicultural training course. They also considered the relationship between racial identity attitude status and multicultural competencies. In analyzing the effects of training on racial identity attitude statuses, Neville et al. (1996) found statistical significance for increases in only the Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy racial identity statuses. In their evaluation of the effect of multicultural training on multicultural competencies, they found that multicultural training caused an increase in multicultural awareness, knowledge and skills. In considering the relationship between racial identity attitude status and multicultural competencies, Neville et al. (1996) found that higher levels of Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy attitudes were associated with stronger endorsements of multicultural therapy competencies. They also found that higher levels of Contact and Disintegration attitudes were significantly related to lower levels of reported multicultural therapy competencies. In the fourth study, Parker et al. (1998) assessed racial identity change in 116 White counselor education graduate students over the duration of a 15-week multicultural training course. The researchers noted an increase in the racial identity attitudes from three statuses: Contact, Pseudo Independence, and Autonomy. They reported no change for the other racial identity attitude statuses. Based on this pattern of results, they reported that multicultural training enhanced the awareness of the participants of themselves as racial beings.
Rationale for the Study

In the present study, this researcher explores the extent that multicultural training is related to racial identity attitudes, gender identity attitudes and multicultural competency, as well as the extent that racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes are related to multicultural competency. Additionally, the relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes is also explored. Based on the results of the studies outlined above, some results were hypothesized for this study.

The first two predictions concerned the relationships among multicultural training, racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies. The first prediction covered the relationship between multicultural training and racial identity attitudes. Results from the studies by Brown et al. (1996), Neville et al. (1996), and Parker et al. (1998) suggest that multicultural training produces change in racial identity attitudes for counseling graduate students, particularly Whites. The second predicted result was that racial identity attitudes would predict multicultural competencies. Results of this type were found in the studies by Ottavi et al. (1994) and Neville et al. (1996). These studies (Ottavi et al., 1994; Neville et al., 1996) only provided data to support racial identity attitudes effect on multicultural competencies for Whites. The overall trend within the studies cited above suggested that, for Whites, multicultural training would predict racial identity attitudes (Brown et al., 1996; Neville et al., 1996; Parker et al., 1998) and racial identity attitudes would predict multicultural competencies (Neville et al., 1996; Ottavi et al., 1994). There are no studies extant that consider the relationships among any combination of the
variables of multicultural training, racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies for People of Color. Those studies cited above that did include People of Color did not include sufficient numbers to provide statistical significance for that population demographic group. This study attempted to cover new territory by considering the relationship among these variables for People of Color as well as for Whites.

The third set of predictions concerned the relationship between multicultural training and multicultural competencies. Results from the Parker et al. (1998) and Neville et al. (1996) studies, suggest that multicultural training is likely to account for significant amounts of variance in multicultural competencies. These studies (Parker et al., 1998; Neville et al., 1996) focused primarily on a White population and provide minimal information about this relationship for People of Color.

This study’s fourth prediction was that racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes would be related. Two studies (Parks et al., 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997) have identified relationships between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes that suggest a parallel process between these two types of development for Black female undergraduate students. Only one of these studies (Parks et al., 1996) explored the relationship for White female undergraduate students. No statistically significant relationship was found between the two types of identity attitudes for this population. These studies are also used to support the fifth and sixth predictions.

The fifth and sixth predictions were concerned with the relationships among multicultural training, gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies. The
fifth prediction was that multicultural training would be related to gender identity attitudes. A combination of the studies that demonstrate a relationship between gender identity attitudes and racial identity attitudes (Parks et al., 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997) and the studies that demonstrate a relationship between multicultural training and racial identity attitudes (Brown et al., 1996; Neville et al., 1996; Parker et al., 1998) was used to support this prediction. However, there is a problem using these studies to support this prediction because the studies demonstrating a relationship between racial and gender identity attitudes found significance only for Women of Color while the studies that demonstrate a relationship between multicultural training and racial identity attitudes found significance only for Whites. The sixth prediction was that gender identity attitudes would be related to multicultural competencies. Support for this prediction was also garnered by combining studies that demonstrated a relationship between gender and racial identity attitudes (Parks et al., 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997) and those that demonstrated a relationship between racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies (Neville et al., 1996; Ottavi et al., 1994). The support for this prediction was also problematic because the studies that demonstrated a relationship between racial and gender identity attitudes found significance only for Women of Color while the studies that demonstrated a relationship between racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies found significance only for Whites. At this time there are no studies that specifically explore the relationship of gender identity attitudes to either multicultural training or multicultural competencies. This
was another area where this researcher attempted to expand the knowledge of
identity attitudes beyond that previously studied.

In order to explore these questions, this researcher proposed a model to
describe the interrelation of all of these variables. In this model, multicultural training
was hypothesized to predict all three other variables (racial identity, gender identity,
and multicultural competency). Gender identity and racial identity were proposed to
be correlated, but not predictive of each other. Gender identity and racial identity
were hypothesized to predict multicultural competency. And, finally, multicultural
training was hypothesized to have indirect effects as well as direct effects on
multicultural competency through the identity variables of race and gender. The
researcher explored the efficacy of this model across the demographic groups of
Women of Color, and White Women. For the groups of Men of Color and White Men
the model was unable to be explored in its entirety.

Methods

This section is divided into four subsections: Instruments, participants,
procedures, and research questions and statistical model. The instrument
subsection contains information on the four instruments designed or chosen to
measure each of the four variables being explored in the model. Following the
instrument subsection is a subsection that briefly describes the study participants.
The procedures subsection contains information on recruitment of participants, and
actual data collection operations. Finally, the subsection on research questions and
statistical model addresses the analysis of the question of the correlational
relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes and the analysis of the proposed model of the relationships among the four variables (Multicultural Training, Racial Identity, Gender Identity, and Multicultural Competencies). In the coverage of the four variable model, the model is outlined in operational terms, the measurement model (containing the measured variables) is then described and analysis procedures for testing the goodness-of-fit of this model are given.

**Instruments**

The instruments used in this study were a Personal Questionnaire (See Appendix C) designed by the researcher, two measures of racial identity attitude development (People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale: POCRIAS - Helms, 1995b, and White Racial Identity Attitude Scale: WRIAS - Helms, 1990a), two measures of gender identity attitude development (Womanist Identity Attitude Scale: WIAS - Ossana et al., 1992, and Reference Group Identity Dependence Scale: RGIDS - Wade & Gelso, 1998) and one measure of multicultural competencies (Multicultural Counseling Inventory: MCI - Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin & Wise, 1994). Permission forms or letters from the authors granting use of the instruments in this research project may be found in Appendix D. The instruments are covered in the aforementioned order within this section. Each is briefly described and an abbreviated overview of psychometric data is provided, as well as justification for instrument selection.
Personal Questionnaire

This questionnaire (See Appendix C) was created by the researcher for this particular study. It contains two sections. The first section consists of seven items. These items ask for basic demographic information from the participant about their race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic level, degree and year in program, age, and what percentage of respondent's last work (or school) environment was of the same ethnicity as the respondent. The second section, containing a total of nine items, contains questions that explore the participant's amount of prior clinical and multicultural experience. Clinical experience covers all client contact and all supervision, not just multiculturally specific experiences. Multicultural experience is considered from two different areas, formal and informal multicultural training. Formal multicultural training involves the amount of hours spent in classes, seminars, and supervision where the topic being covered was multicultural issues. Informal multicultural training involves the amount of hours spent with clients, supervisors or colleagues who represent cultures different from that of the respondent. Items were chosen for inclusion based on their ability to describe the sample population or to provide quantifiable measures of the constructs of clinical and multicultural training that are comparable to prior research.

People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (POCRIAS)

The POCRIAS (Helms, 1995b) consists of 50 items. It measures four of the statuses of racial identity attitude development suggested by Helms's (1984, 1995a) Black and People of Color racial identity attitude development theory:
Conformity/Preencounter, Dissonance, Immersion/Resistance, and Internalization. The measure requires subjects to respond to items using a 5-point Likert-type scale (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The scale contains 50 items, distributed among the subscales as follows: Conformity/Preencounter, 11 items; Dissonance, 15 items; Immersion/Resistance, 14 items; and Internalization, 10 items. All questions are scored in the same direction, higher scores indicate higher levels of the racial identity attitude status being measured. Due to unequal numbers of items contained in the various subscales, comparisons between subscale scores are made using averages (i.e. taking the total subscale score and dividing by the number of items in that subscale).

No psychometric information about the POCRIAS scales has been published (Helms, 1995b). Because the scale is based on similar theoretical constructs and item types as the Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS) and the Racial Identity Attitude Scale - form B (RIAS-B), reliability and validity of these instruments is used to suggest likely results for the POCRIAS. Reliability and validity data for the RIAS and RIAS-B have been reported in several studies. The following range of alpha coefficients have been reported for the RIAS subscales: .63 to .67 for Preencounter, .37 to .72 for Encounter, .66 to .72 for Immersion/Emersion and .37 to .71 for Internalization (Parham & Helms, 1981; Ponterotto & Wise, 1987). Ponterotto and Wise (1987) found low to moderate subscale intercorrelations ranging from -.15 to .49 in theoretically anticipated directions. Lemon and Waehler (1996), reported RIAS-B subscale test-retest reliabilities of .61 for Preencounter, .60 for Encounter, .66 for Immersion/Emersion, and .52 for Internalization. Using factor analytic
methods, Ponterotto and Wise (1987) found strong support for the constructs underlying three of the subscales: Preencounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization. Validation of the RIAS-B has been done by comparing it with three other measures assessing self-derogation, self-esteem, and ethnic identity (Lemon & Waehler, 1996). These comparisons produced significant correlations in ways predicted by racial identity theory.

Although many of the above-reported reliability and validity scores are not above the .7 cutoff to be considered psychometrically adequate (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 1989), researchers have agreed that the reliability and validity scores for the RIAS scales although insufficient for individual clinical use are acceptable for further research (Carter, 1996; Carter & Helms, 1990, 1992). As the POCRIAS is closely related, both theoretically and in item content to both the RIAS and the RIAS-B, it is hypothesized to have similar psychometric properties. At the present time, the POCRIAS is the only instrument measuring racial identity attitudes across the demographic category of People of Color, rather than measuring the attitudes of a specific race/ethnicity of people (e.g. Hispanics, Blacks). This study pools responses by all Persons of Color, therefore, the POCRIAS was chosen.

White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS)

The WRIAS (Helms, 1990a) consists of 50 items designed to assess the five attitudes of White racial identity development suggested by Helms (1984): Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo Independence, and Autonomy. Each subscale contains ten items. The measure requires subjects to respond to items using a 5-
point Likert-type scale (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). All items are scored in the same direction. Scores are obtained by summing responses across the items for each scale. Comparisons between subscale scores are made using averages (i.e. taking the total subscale score and dividing by the number of items in that subscale) for each of the subscale scores.

Reliability of the WRIAS has been reported in a number of studies (Carter & Helms, 1990; Lemon & Waehler, 1996; Ottavi et al., 1994; Reagan as cited in Helms, 1996; Swanson, Tokar, & Davis, 1994; Tokar & Swanson, 1991). Alpha coefficients for these studies range from .18 to .61 for the Contact subscale, .65 to .78 for the Disintegration subscale, .62 to .84 for the Reintegration subscale, .62 to .71 for the Pseudo-Independence subscale and .59 to .71 for the Autonomy subscale. Lemon and Waehler (1996) reported the following test-retest reliability coefficients: .64 for Contact, .80 for Disintegration, .86 for Reintegration, .69 for Pseudo-Independence, and .74 for Autonomy. Swanson et al. (1994) in an item analysis reported that 12 of 50 WRIAS items did not show the minimum internal consistency coefficient of .30. They also noted that only 18 of 50 items correlated more highly with their assigned subscale than with other subscales. However, in the results generated by these researchers (Swanson, et al., 1994; Tokar & Swanson, 1991), the items that correlated more highly with items from other scales did so in directions that correspond to theoretical subscale relationships (i.e. assignment of items to a status adjacent to the correct status, for example, encounter items with contact items) Helms's (1990b, 1995a).
Validity of the WRIAS has also been explored in a number of studies (Carter & Helms, 1990; Lemon & Waehler, 1996; Swanson, et al., 1994). Swanson et al. (1994) reported that the WRIAS data they submitted to item and factor analysis supported several different factor interpretations. They reported that the five-factor solution accounted for the most amount of variance, 37%, but that the five-factor solution did not account for a statistically significant greater amount of variance than that accounted for by other factor solutions. They also criticized the WRIAS because several items loaded on multiple factors, while others loaded on no factors. In another study, Swanson et al. (1994) reported that trained judges achieved hit rate percentages ranging from 16% for Pseudo Independence items to 90% for Reintegration items. Swanson et al. (1994) noted the following patterns in the incorrect assignment by the judges: Contact items assigned to Pseudo-Independence, Disintegration items assigned to Reintegration, and Pseudo-Independence items assigned to Autonomy. The high percentage hit rates reported for the Reintegration and Autonomy subscales strongly support these WRIAS subscales. The overall hit rate coupled with a pattern of errors that matches theoretical error predictions (i.e. in general higher level statuses and lower level statuses being assigned along this split), suggests that the WRIAS, although not a perfect measure, is fairly consistently measuring recognizable constructs. Although Swanson et al. (1994) argued against the use of the WRIAS based on these studies, their results provide some support for Helms's model, particularly in the hit rates for the Reintegration and Autonomy subscales. Lemon and Waehler (1996) in their comparison of the RIAS-B and WRIAS subscales to other measures of self-
derogation, self-esteem, and ethnic identity produced significant correlations in ways predicted by racial identity theory.

The above overview suggests that the WRIAS has sufficient reliability and validity for use as a research measure. Two of the subscales consistently demonstrate sufficient reliability for use as a research measure (Disintegration and Reintegration). Two other subscales have demonstrated sufficient reliability, albeit less consistently (Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy). Only one subscale (Contact) seems to be consistently problematic in reliability. However, as the WRIAS is one of only a few measures of White racial identity/consciousness attitudes (Choney & Behrens, 1996; Choney & Rowe, 1994; Claney & Parker, 1989; Helms & Carter, 1990) and each of the available measures has similar psychometric problems, the inadequacies of the instrument were determined to be insufficient to prohibit its use. Additionally, of the available instruments, it is considered the best researched (Carter, 1996; Choney & Rowe, 1994; Helms, 1996). For these reasons, combined with the shared interconnected theoretical base between the WRIAS and the POCRIAS, the WRIAS was chosen for this study.

**Womanist Identity Attitude Scale (WIAS)**

The Womanist Identity Attitude Scale (WIAS) was developed by Helms, in a work that was never published (cited in Ossana et al., 1992 & Carter & Parks, 1996), to assess women's attitudes toward their own gender identities. The WIAS is a 55-item self-report scale that uses a Likert-type format (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree) (Helms, 1990c). It contains five subscales that provide information
about four gender identity statuses. Items are unequally distributed among the subscales as follows: Preencounter - Masculine (9 items), Preencounter - Feminine (11 items), Encounter (13 items), Immersion/Emersion (11 items), and Internalization (11 items). All items are scored in the same direction. Raw scores are arrived at by adding scores for all of the items in a particular scale. Comparisons between subscale scores are made using averages (i.e. taking the total subscale score and dividing by the number of items in that subscale) for each of the subscale scores.

Ossana et al. (1992) reported internal consistency reliabilities of .55, .43, .82, and .77 for the Preencounter (a combination of Preencounter Masculine and Preencounter Feminine items), Encounter, Immersion/Emersion and Internalization subscales respectively. They also reported the following interscale correlations: Preencounter with Encounter, \( r = .22 \); Preencounter with Immersion/Emersion, \( r = .35 \); Preencounter with Internalization, \( r = -.28 \); Encounter with Immersion/Emersion, \( r = .53 \); Encounter with Internalization, \( r = .14 \); and Immersion/Emersion with Internalization, \( r = -.28 \). Carter and Parks (1996) reported Cronbach's alphas for the four subscales of .50 for Preencounter, .34 for Encounter, .71 for Immersion/Emersion, and .66 for Internalization. They report interscale correlations in the same direction as that reported by Ossana et al (1992). The reliability data for the WIAS suggests that only the two highest subscales demonstrate sufficient reliability. However, positive interscale correlations tend to pair theoretically close subscales, Preencounter and Encounter, Encounter and Immersion/Emersion. Two of these subscales (Preencounter and Encounter) are the subscales that exhibited
the lowest scale-specific reliability, which may be related to these interscale correlations.

The above overview, despite the problems with the Preencounter and Encounter subscales, suggests that the WIAS has sufficient reliability and validity for use as a research measure. Additionally, since the initial 43-item measure, Helms (unpublished manuscript, 1990c) has added 12 additional items and adjusted the scales. She did this by dividing the Preencounter subscale into two separate subscales (Helms, unpublished manuscript, 1990c) and redistributing other subscale items. Finally, the WIAS is one of only a few measures of female gender identity development (Carter & Parks, 1996; McNamara & Rickard, 1989; Ossana et al., 1992). Of these instruments it is the most available and has been used in several published studies (Carter & Parks, 1996; Ossana et al., 1992; Parks et al., 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997). For these reasons, combined with the shared interconnected theoretical base between the WIAS and the racial identity measures of the WRIAS and the RIAS-B, the WIAS was chosen for this study.

**Reference Group Identity Dependence Scale (RGIDS)**

The Reference Group Identity Dependence Scale (RGIDS; Wade & Gelso, 1998) is a 30 item measure composed of the following four subscales: No Reference Group, Reference Group Dependent, Reference Group Non Dependent Diversity and Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity. These subscales are designed to measure the three statuses of Wade's (1998) masculine reference group identity dependence theory, No Reference Group, Reference Group Dependent and
Reference Group Non Dependent. The third status, Reference Group Non Dependent is divided into two parts, one describing a man’s relationship to all males and the other describing his relationship to those males he perceives to be similar to himself. The two subscales designed to explore these two divergent aspects of the third status are labeled Reference Group Non Dependent Diversity and Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity. In completing the instrument, respondents are asked to report the degree to which they agree or disagree with statements representing feelings and beliefs about themselves as a male, about other males, and about their relationship with other males on a 6-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Items keyed to a particular subscale are summed to provide a total subscale score. Items are scored in the same direction with one exception, item 24, from the Reference Group Non-Dependent subscale, is reverse scored. Comparisons between subscale scores are made using averages (i.e. taking the total subscale score and dividing by the number of items in that subscale) for each of the subscale scores.

All psychometric data on the RGIDS comes from an introductory study by Wade and Gelso, (1998). In this study, researchers performed a cross-validation factor analysis, splitting the sample to provide two data pools, one for the exploratory analysis and the other for the confirmatory analysis. In this study the researchers also compared the RGIDS with a measure of ego identity development, several measures of psychological functioning, and the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; O’Neil, Helms, Gable, David & Wrightsman, 1986). Convergent and discriminant construct validity of the RGIDS was supported based on its relationship to these
other related instruments. Wade and Gelso (1998) proposed that the developmental
complexity and progression for various aspects of the constructs of ego identity and
masculine reference group identity would be similar. The relationships they found
between RGIDS subscales and subscales on a measure of ego identity supported
this premise. Wade and Gelso (1998) also suggested that as a person develops
identity (e.g. ego identity, masculine identity, etc.) they develop better coping skills.
They therefore hypothesized that higher levels of masculine identity development, as
measured by the RGIDS, would relate to more effective psychological functioning
and less identified difficulties in said functioning. This hypothesis was supported by
several relationships between subscales on the RGIDS and various measures of
psychological functioning. Finally, the relationship between reference group identity
dependence status and gender role conflict as measured by the GRCS (O'Neil,
Helms, Gable, David & Wrightsman, 1986) was used to provide a measure of the
RGIDS ability to measure masculine related constructs. Results of the correlations
between the RGIDS and the GRCS provided some support for Wade's theory,
although not all relations were supported as predicted.

The results of the comparison of the RGIDS to these other measures supports the use of the RGIDS as a developmental measure of masculine identity.
Additionally, the theoretical basis for the RGIDS relates closely to that of the other
instruments used in this study. Therefore, it was chosen for use in this study.
The Multicultural Counseling Inventory was developed by Sodowsky et al. (1994) to measure multicultural counseling competencies. It is a 40 item measure in which participants rate their own competency by responding to each item on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = very inaccurate to 4 = very accurate. Scale scores are obtained by adding the items specific to each scale; higher subscale scores indicate greater self-perceived multicultural competence in the respective areas. The subscales are labeled Skills, Knowledge, Awareness, and Relationship.

Sodowsky et al. (1994) using factor analytic methods, derived four subscales—Multicultural Skills, Knowledge, Awareness, and Relationship—with internal consistency reliabilities of .83, .79, .83, and .71. They reported low to moderate intersubscale correlations ranging from $r = .23$ to $r = .52$. They suggest that these intercorrelations demonstrate that the subscales are measuring different aspects of the overall construct of multicultural competence. In a study exploring the validity of the MCI, Sodowsky et al. (1994) reported statistically significant change in multicultural competency across the duration of a multicultural counseling course as reported by counseling graduate students ($N=42$). In another study exploring MCI validity, statistically significant MCI subscale and total score differences were found between counselors who did less than 50% of their work in multicultural counseling and those who did more than 50% of their work in multicultural counseling. This provided support for the predictive and concurrent validity of the instrument (Sodowsky et al., 1994). In support of the reliability of the MCI, Pope-Davis and Ottavi (1994) reported alpha coefficients for the MCI subscales at .81 for skills, .80
for knowledge, .80 for awareness, and .67 for relationship. They also reported moderate to low correlations between the four subscales ranging from $r = .56$ to $r = .27$ (Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994). Pope-Davis and Ottavi state that these correlations approximate MCI subscale correlations found during instrument development and suggest that the subscales on the inventory are measuring related, but different, constructs.

The above data strongly support the use of the MCI as a measure of Multicultural competencies. The reliability of three of the subscales consistently surpassed the .7 cutoff recommended by measurement experts (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 1989). The fourth subscale relationship was less consistent in reaching this cutoff point achieving reliability scores of .71 and .67 respectively. However, the lower .67 is very close to the recommended .7 cutoff. Additionally, interscale correlations between subscales are low to moderate. The relatively strong psychometric properties of this instrument support its choice for this study. Additionally, the length of the MCI (40 items) in contrast to the other available measures of multicultural competency (50 or more items) make it the desirable choice given the number of instruments contained in the study’s packet.

Participants

Participants ($N = 615$) were students in master’s and doctoral level programs in counseling or counseling psychology at a midwestern university, and/or master’s or doctoral student members of the Association of Multicultural Counseling and Development.
Procedures

Recruitment of participants is described first, followed by data collection procedures. The recruitment of participants accessed two different groups of people. Prior to beginning recruitment of participants, Human Subjects Review Board approval was obtained from the university where data collection took place. See Appendix F for letter of approval. Because the recruitment of participants involved two different strategies (nationwide and local) it utilized two separate sets of procedures with parts of each procedure being similar. The first set of procedures described below was for those individuals who were recruited through brief presentations in either the counseling or counseling psychology classrooms at a midwestern university. The other set of procedures described was for student members of the Association of Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD) whose names were acquired from a mailing list from the American Counseling Association (ACA).

In the recruitment of participants from the practitioner training program, permission to recruit subjects was acquired from the Chairperson of the department (See Appendix A for permission letter) and from the instructors in whose classrooms recruitment occurred. Request for participants was done by the researcher in the classrooms of professors who agreed to participate and was completed during the fall semester. Following a description of the data collection procedures involved in the study, each student in the classroom was handed a card which contained two printed questions, and space to print their name, current mailing address, race and gender (Card is in Appendix A). Students were asked to fill out portions of the card.
based on their interest or lack of interest in participating. After allowing time for all individuals to complete the relevant portions of the card, the researcher collected all cards (blank and completed). The information provided on the cards was used to compile a master mailing list for this group of subjects and to tally the total number of individuals that were asked to participate in the study.

Students from the training program who expressed interest in participating were mailed packets. Each packet contained instruments that corresponded to their identified racial and gender identities. Packets were color coded (i.e. printed on gold paper) to correspond to the training program. Each packet contained a letter with informed consent information (See Appendix B), the Personal Questionnaire (See Appendix C), one measure of racial identity (POCRIAS or WRIAS), one measure of gender identity (WIAS or RGIDS), the Multicultural Counseling Inventory (MCI), an incentive sticker saying “promote multiculturalism”, and a self addressed stamped envelope. Subjects completed the packet and return mailed it to the researcher.

The nationwide recruitment strategy began by acquiring a mailing list for student members of the AMCD from ACA (letter of permission to use that mailing list is included in Appendix A). The recruitment of subjects from the 1103 member AMCD mailing list was done by mailing each individual on the mailing list a packet containing a letter of introduction explaining the procedures for the study, the informed consent information and a request for their participation (See Appendix B). The packet also contained the Personal Questionnaire, racial identity measures, gender identity measures, the MCI, an incentive sticker saying “promote multiculturalism”, and a Self Addressed Stamped Envelope (SASE). These packets
were color coded for the AMCD mailing list (printed on white paper). Individuals whose names were acquired from the AMCD mailing list did not report their race or gender to the researcher prior to receipt of research materials. Since the researcher had no way of conclusively knowing any given individual's race or gender from their name and mailing address alone, these individuals were sent all measures of racial and gender identity attitudes that were used for the study. They were asked to complete only those measures of racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes that applied to the race and gender with which they identified. Following completion of the appropriate instruments, these participants were requested to return the packet in the SASE provided by the researcher. As an incentive to encourage participation in the study, the researcher provided one hundred dollars for a raffle that was awarded in a random drawing to one participant (from either recruitment source) who completed the survey.

In addition to the color coding system of printing instruments on different colored paper to identify recruitment source, individual packets from the university recruitment and the AMCD mailing list were coded individually. Individual coding numbers were placed in the upper right hand corners of the Personal Questionnaires. A master list of names associated with numbers was created. These numbers were used to track returned packets in order to identify who to send follow-up packets. When completed packets were received, the coding numbers were removed so that completed packets were no longer traceable to the individual who completed it. After two weeks, a follow-up letter (see Appendix E) and packet were mailed to students who had not yet returned a packet, reminding them about the
study and the deadline date (one month from the initial mailing) to be included in the raffle. The coding procedures were the same for the follow-up mailing as for the initial mailing.

Research Questions and Statistical Analyses

This study was designed to explore several related questions about multicultural training, racial identity attitudes, gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies. The principle methods of analysis were canonical correlation analysis and structural equation modeling. Canonical correlation analysis was used to determine the relationship between gender identity attitude statuses and racial identity attitude statuses. Structural equation model analysis was used to evaluate a proposed model of the relationships among multicultural training, gender identity attitudes, racial identity attitudes, and multicultural competencies. Separate analysis of the structural equation model for White women, and Women of Color was performed to determine if the model provided an equivalent explanation of the data for these two racial/gender demographic groups. A more limited analysis was run for Men of Color and White Men to provide some information about the efficacy of the proposed model for these two groups.

Canonical Correlation Model and Hypotheses

In order to explore the non-causal relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes canonical correlation analysis was employed. In the Canonical Correlation for this study, gender identity attitudes and racial identity
attitudes are labeled variables. The specific racial identity attitude and gender identity attitude subscales are called variates. In Canonical Correlation, two separate types of analysis are employed. The first type of analysis correlates all of one set of identity attitude variates collapsed into a single value with all of the other set of identity attitude variates also collapsed into a single value. The single value arrived at by collapsing all of the variates within a single variable is termed a composite score. This composite score is generated through weighting of scores to maximize the relationship between the two variables. The correlation between these two composite scores is the canonical correlation. If the canonical correlation is statistically significant, then further analysis is warranted. If the canonical correlation is not significant utilizing a system that maximizes the relationship between the two variables, it is assumed that none of the relationships between individual elements of the variables will be significant. If the overall relationship between the two groups is statistically significant, further analysis will identify which pairing of elements are most responsible for the statistically significant results. Pairs are only formed between racial identity attitude variates and gender identity attitude variates not between variates from within a single variable. For this study separate canonical correlation analyses were run for White men, Men of Color, White women and Women of Color. It was hypothesized that the canonical correlation (correlation between composite scores) would be statistically significant for both White men and Women of Color and for these two groups there would be several subscale pairings responsible for this relationship. The canonical correlation was predicted to not be statistically significant for White women and Men of Color.
The second research question was concerned with the relationship among the variables of multicultural training, gender identity attitudes, racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies. This relationship was explored through a structural equation model (See Figure 1, Chapter II, page 180) that contains all of the variables. Structural Equation Modeling employs the use of two models, the structural model which delineates the relationship between the conceptual variables in the model and the measurement model which lays out the relationship between the various measures designed to operationalize the conceptual variables.

In the structural model the researcher defines the direction of causality between the variables apriori. Most relationships within the model are unidirectional. This particular model contains several predictive relationships between the variables and one non-predictive reciprocal relationship. The model begins with Multicultural training. The next two variables in the model are racial identity and gender identity. The final or terminal variable in the model is multicultural competencies. Multicultural training according to this model has three direct unidirectional predictive relationships with other variables. These relationships are with racial identity, gender identity and multicultural competencies. Racial identity has two direct relationships, one which is predictive and unidirectional the other which is non-predictive and reciprocal. The relationship between racial identity and gender identity is non-predictive and reciprocal whereas the relationship between racial identity and multicultural competencies is predictive and unidirectional. Gender identity, like racial identity has
two direct relationships, one predictive and unidirectional and the other non-
predictive and reciprocal. The relationship between gender identity and racial identity
is non-predictive and reciprocal whereas the relationship between gender identity
and multicultural competencies is predictive and unidirectional. Finally, multicultural
training has two indirect unidirectional relationships. These indirect relationships are
between multicultural training and multicultural competencies through each of the
identity variables (gender and race). Analysis of the model was done using several
measures to represent the separate variables in the model. The analyses were
designed to determine if this model would fit the available data or if the researcher
must consider another model to explain the relationships between these variables.

Within the measurement model (See Figure 2, Chapter III, page 265) of the
structural equation model (SEM), each of the conceptual ideas of multicultural
training, racial identity, gender identity and multicultural competency are represented
by two or more measured variables. Multicultural training is represented by two
scores: One representing formal multicultural training and the other representing
informal multicultural training. Racial identity is measured by the subscale scores on
one of two instruments, the WRIAS (5 subscales) or the POCRIAS (4 subscales).
Gender identity is measured by the subscale scores on one of two measures as well,
the WIAS (5 subscales) or the RGIDS (4 subscales). Multicultural competency is
measured by the four subscale scores on the MCI. In this measurement model there
are several paths within each of the relationships outlined in the structural or
conceptual model. Each path corresponds to a relationship between specific
measured scores. So the relationship between multicultural training and racial
identity contains paths between each of the two multicultural training scores and each of the racial identity subscale scores. The relationship between multicultural training and gender identity likewise contains paths between the scores measuring formal and informal multicultural training and the gender identity subscales. The relationship between multicultural training and multicultural competencies contains eight paths between the two scores measuring multicultural training and the four subscale scores providing measures of multicultural competency. The relationship between racial identity and multicultural competencies contains paths between each racial identity subscale score and each multicultural competency subscale score. The relationship between gender identity and multicultural competencies contains paths between each gender identity subscale score and each multicultural competency subscale score. And the indirect relationships between multicultural training and multicultural competencies through both racial identity and gender identity likewise contain many paths.

Statistical analysis of Structural Equation Models involves testing the goodness-of-fit of the model as proposed by the researcher. If the model is accepted, all relationships within the model are also accepted. If any element within the model is rejected, the model is rejected. For the proposed study, the researcher hypothesized that the goodness-of-fit statistics would support the model for each of the groups under consideration: Men of Color, Women of Color, White men, and White women.
**Contingency Analysis Procedures**

Due to insufficient numbers of returns from either of the two men's racial groups, modified analyses procedures were used to analyze the data from these two groups. This modified data analysis involved using both structural equation model analysis and regression analysis. The structural equation model analysis explored a limited model containing only multicultural training, gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies. Regression analyses were then used to explore the relationship between the factors for each men's group (Men of Color and White Men) that were not covered in the structural equation model analysis (i.e. between multicultural training and racial identity attitudes, between multicultural training and multicultural competencies, and between multicultural training and multicultural competencies).

**Results**

This section contains a brief synopsis of the results obtained from the analysis of the study's data. It is broken down into five subsections. The first of these provides a description of the sample population. This subsection is followed by a second subsection covering the factor analysis and reliability assessment of the instruments used in the study. This information will help the reader to evaluate the potential effects of measurement error on the results. A reference to additional analyses found in Chapter IV and not included in Chapter I is contained under the heading Analysis Across Descriptive Data. This is included between the instrument psychometrics subsection and the subsections covering the primary analyses used.
in the study. The third subsection contains the canonical correlation analysis of gender identity and racial identity variables for each of the demographic groups. This is followed by a fourth subsection containing the structural equation model analyses of the four primary variables (Multicultural Training, Gender Identity Attitudes, Racial Identity Attitudes, and Multicultural Competencies) for two of the demographic groups (White women, Women of Color) and a structural equation model analysis of three of the primary variables (Multicultural Training, Gender Identity Attitudes, and Multicultural Competencies) for men combining the two racial groups (White Men and Men of Color). The full structural equation model analyses for the two groups of men (White, Persons of Color) were unable to be completed due to insufficient numbers of men for each demographic group. To provide information about various relationships within the structural equation model for these men's groups, regression analyses were performed. Therefore, the fifth and final subsection contains regression analyses of the three variables whose connections were not contained within the men's structural equation model analyses (Multicultural Training, Racial Identity Attitudes, and Multicultural Competencies) for each of the two male groups (White Men and Men of Color).

Description of the Sample Population

The number of individuals who returned packets was 615, 47% of those contacted. These individuals were student members of the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD: 505) or students in a counselor education/counseling psychology program at a midwestern university (110). Of those
who returned packets, 495 were women and 120 were men. Female participants identified as European American/White/Caucasian (281), Black/African American (84), Hispanic/Latin (37), Asian American/Pacific Islander (28), Multiracial (23), International (24), American Indian/Native American (10), and Other (7). Male participants identified as European American/White/Caucasian (59), Black/African American (25), Hispanic/Latin (15), Asian American/Pacific Islander (9), International (5), Multiracial (4), American Indian/Native American (1), and Other (2). Within the sample population individuals reported the following sexual orientations: 554 heterosexual, 43 gay/lesbian, 14 bisexual and 3 other. In identifying the socio-economic status of their family of origin, 7.3% reported lower economic, 21.7% reported lower-middle economic, 48.3% identified middle, 19.2% reported high middle, and 3.5% reported upper socio-economic backgrounds. Respondents ranged in age from 21 to 67 with the mean age being 36 and the most represented (modal) age being 25. Respondents reported being enrolled in master's programs (N = 343, 57 1st year, 286 2nd year), having recently completed their masters (N = 75), being enrolled in or having recently graduated from doctoral programs (N = 186, 41 1st year, 29 2nd year, 29 3rd year, 27 4th year, 60 5th year or beyond) or being enrolled in a specialists degree program (N = 3). In response to the question asking respondents to assess the percentage of individuals in their last work or school environment that matched their own race, the majority of individuals who reported identifying as being from a minority race reported work or school environments where less than half of the others present shared their racial designation. In contrast
the majority of individuals identifying as White reported that over half of the other individuals in their last work or school environment shared their racial designation.

Assessment of Instruments

This section covers the reliability and validity data generated from the responses of the sample population to the various instruments. Internal consistency reliability coefficients are reported and a brief summary of the confirmatory factor analysis solutions for each instrument are reported. The reliability and validity information is reported in six subsections, one for each instrument. The first subsection reports information for the Multicultural Training subscales of the Personal Questionnaire. The following subsections report psychometric information for the: POCRIAS, WRIAS, WIAS, RGIDS, and MCI respectively.

Multicultural Training Subscales

The reliability for the two training subscales contained in the Personal Questionnaire (Formal Multicultural Training and Informal Multicultural Training) were quite different. The Formal Multicultural Training subscale (4 items) demonstrated fairly good internal consistency reliability (.68) while the Informal Multicultural Training subscale (3 items) did not (.37). The results of exploratory factor analysis for each of these subscales suggest that each subscale is measuring multiple factors (3 for Formal, 2 for Informal) but that a single factor solution also provides a reasonable explanation for the data as well.
POCRIAS

The reliability of the POCRIAS for the sample population was fair. The internal consistency reliability was good for half of the subscales. Internal consistency reliability coefficients of the POCRIAS subscales for the study population (N = 235 Persons of Color) were as follows: .58 for the Conformity/Preencounter subscale; .72 for the Dissonance subscale; .78 for the Immersion/Resistance subscale; and .56 for the Internalization subscale.

Factor analysis using the study population found mixed support for the POCRIAS subscales as defined by Helms (1995b) (for details see Chapter IV, page 286). One subscale was fairly well supported (Immersion/Resistance). The remaining three subscales demonstrated much less clear factor structure. Of these three subscales, Conformity demonstrated a two-factor structure, Dissonance had one primary factor amidst a four factor structure, and Internalization had a single factor structure containing many items from other subscales.

WRIAS

The reliability of the WRIAS for the sample population was fair. The internal consistency reliability was adequate for three of the subscales. For the remaining two subscales the internal consistency reliability was problematic. Internal consistency reliability coefficients of the WRIAS subscales for the study population (N = 354 Whites) were as follows: .45 for the Contact subscale; .72 for the Disintegration subscale; .74 for the Reintegration subscale; .68 for the Pseudo-Independence subscale; and .44 for the Autonomy subscale.
Factor analysis using the study population found mixed support for the WRIAS subscales as defined by Helms (1990a) (for details see Chapter IV, page 288). Two subscales were fairly well supported (Disintegration and Resistance). The remaining three subscales demonstrated much less clear factor structure. Of these three subscales, both Contact and Pseudo Independence subscales demonstrated a two-factor structure, and Autonomy had a single factor structure containing many items from other subscales.

WIAS

The reliability of the WIAS for the sample population was fair for all of the subscales, but it was not good for any of them. Internal consistency reliability coefficients of the WIAS subscales for the study population (N = 480) were as follows: .58 for the Preencounter/Masculine subscale; .69 for the Preencounter/Feminine subscale; .64 for the Encounter subscale; .68 for the Immersion/Emersion subscale; and .57 for the internalization subscale.

Factor analysis using the study population found mixed support for the WIAS subscales as defined by Helms (1990c) (for details see Chapter IV, page 292). Two subscales were fairly well supported (Immersion/Emersion and Internalization). Each of these subscales demonstrated a single factor structure. The two Preencounter subscales were supported as a single subscale rather than as two subscales (Masculine and Feminine). The remaining subscale (Encounter/Dissonance) demonstrated a two-factor structure.
**RGIDS**

The reliability of the RGIDS for the sample population was fair to good. Internal consistency reliability coefficients of the RGIDS subscales for the study population (N = 118 men) were as follows: .70 for the No Reference Group subscale; .51 for the Reference Group Dependent subscale; .66 for the Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity subscale; and .84 for the Reference Group Non Dependent Diversity subscale.

Factor analysis using the study population found fairly good support for the RGIDS subscales as defined by Wade (1998) (for details see Chapter IV, page 294). All of the RGIDS subscales demonstrated a primarily single factor structure. The best structure was demonstrated by the Reference Group Non Dependent Diversity (RGNDD) subscale since the factor that supported it contained almost exclusively items from the RGNDD subscale. The remaining subscales (No Reference Group, Reference Group Dependent, and Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity), although fairly clearly represented by single factors, tended to have items spread among multiple factors. Additionally, the factors representative of these subscales contained multiple items from other subscales.

**Multicultural Competencies Measure**

The reliability of the MCI for the sample population was good. Only one subscale demonstrated problematic reliability, the Relationship subscale. Internal consistency reliability coefficients of the MCI subscales for the study population (N =
were as follows: .84 for the Skills subscale; .79 for the Knowledge subscale; .82 for the Awareness subscale; and .56 for the Relationship subscale.

Factor analysis using the study population found good support for the MCI subscales as defined by Sodowsky et al. (1994) (for details see Chapter IV, page 296). All of the MCI subscales demonstrated a clear single factor structure. The four-factor solution distributed items among the subscales almost exactly as defined by Sodowsky et al. (1994). Only three items did not load most highly on their designated subscale.

Analysis Across Descriptive Data

Several analyses were done across descriptive variables. ANOVAs and T-Tests were run to explore mean differences in multicultural training and multicultural competency subscales across gender, race and education level. Mean differences in racial identity attitude subscales were compared across gender. Mean differences in gender identity measures were compared across race and across racial groupings (Women of Color, White Women, Men of Color, and White Men). Additionally, mean differences in multicultural training and multicultural competencies are compared across source groups (AMCD student membership, university recruited students). These analyses are not covered here. For details about the results of these analyses see the appropriate section (Analysis Across Descriptive Data or Comparison Across Recruitment Source Groups) in Chapter IV.
Canonical Correlation Analysis

The results of the correlational analysis of the relationship between racial identity and gender identity for each of the four demographic groups (Women of Color, White Women, Men of Color, White Men) are detailed in this section. This section is divided into four subsections one for each demographic group. The first subsection is for Women of Color. This is followed by a subsection for White Women. The third subsection details the results for Men of Color. The fourth and final subsection provides the results for White Men.

Women of Color

Canonical Correlation analysis of the relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes for women of color (N = 192) revealed a definite relationship between these two types of attitudes. The first canonical correlation yielded a .71 correlation which was statistically significant (p = .00). This result was achieved by collapsing all of the subscales from each measure (Womanist Identity Attitude Scale and People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale) into a single score. The two scores arrived at for each measure were then compared to each other. The procedure then identified the pairs of subscales, one from each measure that contributed most to this result. The POCRIAS Internalization and WIAS Internalization subscales contributed the most to this canonical result (R square = .62), contributing to 22% of the variance. Additionally, the following pairs were identified: POCRIAS Dissonance and WIAS Encounter (R square = .58, contributing to 6% of the variance), POCRIAS Immersion/Resistance and WIAS...
Immersion/Emersion (R square = .43, contributing to 1% of the variance), and POCRias Preencounter/Conformity and WIAS Preencounter/Feminine (R square = .27, contributing to < 1% of the variance). To determine the depth of the relationship between the two groups of variables involved, the procedure continues to run comparisons until it reaches a point where the relationship is no longer significant. In the second and consecutive steps of analysis, the comparison between both groups of variables is run again removing the correlation between the two variables that contributed most to the first, second, third, etc. canonical variable. For this analysis, the second and third canonical variates were also statistically significant.

**White Women**

Canonical Correlation analysis of the relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes for white women (N = 293) revealed a definite relationship between these two types of attitudes. The first canonical correlation yielded a .60 correlation which was statistically significant (p = .00). This result was achieved by collapsing all of the subscales from each measure (Womanist Identity Attitude Scale and White Racial Identity Attitude Scale) into a single score. The two scores arrived at for each measure were then compared to each other. The procedure then identified the pair of subscales, one from each measure that contributed most to this result. The WRIAS Disintegration with WIAS Encounter subscales contributed the most to this canonical result, contributing to 17% of the variance. The other subscale pairs identified within the first canonical variate include: WRIAS Pseudo Independence and WIAS Internalization (R square = .48,
contributing to 4% of the variance), WRIAS Reintegration and WIAS Preencounter/Feminine (R square = .38, contributing to 1% of the variance), WRIAS Contact and WIAS Preencounter/Masculine (R square = .14, contributing to < 1% of the variance), and WRIAS Autonomy and WIAS Immersion/Emersion (R square = -.12, contributing to < 1% of the variance). To determine the depth of the relationship between the two groups of variables involved, the procedure continues to run comparisons until it reaches a point where the relationship is no longer significant. In the second and consecutive steps of analysis, the comparison between both groups of variables is run again removing the correlation between the two variables that contributed most to the first, second, third, etc. canonical variable. The second, third and fourth canonical variates were also statistically significant.

Men of Color

Canonical Correlation analysis of the relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes for men of color revealed no relationship between these two types of attitudes. The result from the first canonical variate was an R square of .57 (p = .08).

White Men

Canonical Correlation analysis of the relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes for white men revealed a relationship between these two types of attitudes. The first canonical correlation yielded a .66 correlation. This was the only canonical variate that was statistically significant (p = .00). This
result was achieved by collapsing all of the subscales from each measure (Reference Group Identity Dependence Scale and White Racial Identity Attitude Scale) into a single score. The two scores arrived at for each measure were then compared to each other. The procedure then identified the pair of subscales, one from each measure that contributed most to this result. The WRIAS Disintegration and RGIDS No Reference Group subscales (.47 correlation) contributed the most to this canonical result, contributing to 19% of the variance. The other pairs identified in the analysis of the first canonical variate were: WRIAS Autonomy and RGIDS Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity (.44 correlation contributing to 4% of the variance), WRIAS Reintegration and RGIDS Reference Group Dependent (.26 correlation contributing to 1% of the variance), and WRIAS Pseudo Independence and RGIDS Reference Group Non Dependent Diversity (-.10 correlation, contributing to < 1% of the variance).

**Structural Equation Model Analyses**

This section contains the results of separate structural equation model analyses of the proposed model for Women of Color and White Women. These analyses are contained in the first two subsections. The third subsection contains the structural equation model analysis of a more limited model containing only multicultural training, gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies for the group of all men (White Men and Men of Color). Analysis for this limited model was done for all men because the number of returns necessary to run the separate full
model analyses for each male racial group (Men of Color, White Men) was not received.

Women of Color

The number of subjects necessary to run the Structural Equation Model analysis was achieved for Women of Color (N = 172). The hypothesized model (See Figure 3, Chapter IV, page 328) proposed that multicultural training predicts results in three other variables, racial identity attitudes, gender identity attitudes, and multicultural competencies. The model also predicts that each of the identity variables will predict results for multicultural competencies. Analysis of the proposed model did not provide a good fit for the data. The hypothesized model was compared to a more limited model generated from the results of previous research. This model forms a “racial triangle”, since it proposes a relationship that connects each factor in the model with each other factor in the model and contains only one type of identity attitude (racial). The racial triangle model proposes that multicultural training and racial identity attitudes predict multicultural competencies and that racial identity attitudes also predict multicultural competencies (See Figure 4, Chapter IV, page 329). This more limited racial triangle model provided a better fit for the data, although it still did not provide a good fit.

Two strategies were utilized to find a better fitting model. The first of these was to control for measurement error. To do this, subscales were eliminated from the model if their internal consistency reliability did not reach at least .60. Models modified by removing subscales are designated Measurement Error Control Models.
(MEC). For the models for Women of Color this resulted in the removal of the following subscales: POCRIAS Preencounter/Conformity, POCRIAS Integration, WIAS Preencounter Masculine, WIAS Internalization, and MCI Relationship. For both the models described previously, the measurement error control version provided a better fit for the data than its counterpart containing all instrument subscales. Although this correction did not result in a good fit for either the full model or the limited model previously tested.

The second strategy used to attempt to find a better fitting model, involved progressive simplification of the full model by removing variables. The first step was to compare another triangle model that included only multicultural training, gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies, by removing the racial identity factor. This model forms a “gender triangle”, since it proposes a relationship that connects each factor in the model with each other factor in the model and contains only one type of identity attitude (gender). The gender triangle model proposes that multicultural training and gender identity attitudes predict multicultural competencies and that gender identity attitudes also predict multicultural competencies (See Figure 5, Chapter IV, page 333). Results for the gender triangle model (Model 3) fared better than the full model. When corrected for measurement error, this model provided a fairly good fit for the data and was one of the best fitting models for Women of Color. Further parameter reduction yielded even more limited models containing only two of the four variables from the full model. Model 4 (See Figure 6, Chapter IV, page 335) considered only Multicultural Training and Multicultural Competencies. This model provided the best fit of the models analyzed prior to
compensating for measurement error. However, the Measurement Error Control (MEC) version of Model 4 did not provide a much better fit over its full counterpart. Model 5 (See Figure 7, Chapter IV, page 335) contained only Racial Identity Attitudes and Multicultural Competencies. The goodness of fit for this model was also better than the full model and comparable to the three variable model containing Multicultural Training, Racial Identity Attitudes, and Multicultural Competencies (Model 2). Model 6 (See Figure 8, Chapter IV, page 335) contained the two variables of Gender Identity Attitudes and Multicultural Competencies, this model also provided a better fit for the data than the full model and a comparable fit to the three variable model containing Multicultural Training, Gender Identity Attitudes, and Multicultural Competencies (Model 3). This model together with Model 3 were the best fitting models for Women of Color and were equivalent in goodness of fit (See Table 10, page 330 for fit indices for all models for Women of Color).

**White Women**

The number of subjects necessary to run the Structural Equation Model analysis was achieved for White Women (N = 277). The hypothesized model (See Figure 9, Chapter IV, page 337) proposed that multicultural training predicts results in three other variables, racial identity attitudes, gender identity attitudes, and multicultural competencies. The model also predicts that each of the identity variables will predict results for multicultural competencies. Analysis of the proposed model did not provide a good fit for the data. The hypothesized model was compared to a more limited model generated from the results of previous research. This model
forms a "racial triangle", since it proposes a relationship that connects each factor in the model with each other factor in the model and contains only one type of identity attitude (racial). The racial triangle model proposes that multicultural training and racial identity attitudes predict multicultural competencies and that racial identity attitudes also predict multicultural competencies (See Figure 10, Chapter IV, page 339). This more limited racial triangle model provided a better fit for the data, although it still did not provide a good fit.

Two strategies were utilized to find a better fitting model. The first of these was to control for measurement error. To do this, subscales were eliminated from the model if their internal consistency reliability did not reach at least .60. The subscales that were removed from the full model for White Women to control for measurement error were: WRIAS Contact, WRIAS Autonomy, WIAS Preencounter Masculine, WIAS Internalization, and MCI Relationship. For both models discussed previously (Hypothesized Full Model and Racial Triangle), the measurement error control version provided a better fit for the data than its counterpart containing all instrument subscales.

The second strategy used to attempt to find a better fitting model, involved progressive simplification of the full model by removing variables. The first step was to compare another triangle model that included multicultural training, gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies, by removing the racial identity factor. This model forms a "gender triangle", since it proposes a relationship that connects each factor in the model with each other factor in the model and contains only one type of identity attitude (gender). The gender triangle model proposes that multicultural
training and gender identity attitudes predict multicultural competencies and that
gender identity attitudes also predict multicultural competencies. For this model, see
Figure 5 on page 333 in Chapter IV, as the elements of the gender triangle model
are identical for Women of Color and White Women. The gender triangle model did
not provide as good a fit for the data as that provided by Model 2 (the racial triangle
model containing multicultural training, racial identity attitudes, and multicultural
competencies) for White Women. This contrasts with the results achieved for
Women of Color where the model containing gender identity attitudes provided a
better fit than the model containing racial identity attitudes.

The best fit results, among the various plausible alternative models were
achieved for even more limited models containing only two of the four variables from
the full model. Model 4 (See Figure 6, Chapter IV, page 335) considered only two
variables Multicultural Training and Multicultural Competencies. This model provided
the best fit of the models that did not control for measurement error that were
analyzed. The MEC version of this model provided a fit that was no better, if not
worse than the model containing all applicable subscales. Model 5 (See Figure 11,
Chapter IV, page 342) contained only two variables, Racial Identity Attitudes and
Multicultural Competencies. The goodness of fit for the version of this model that
controlled for measurement error was the best of the models for White Women. The
final model (6, See Figure 8, Chapter IV, page 335) contained the two variables of
Gender Identity Attitudes and Multicultural Competencies this model also provided a
better fit for the data than the full model or the three variable models. It did not
provide a better fit for the data than the two factor model containing only racial
identity attitudes and multicultural competencies (Model 5). For a complete listing of fit indices for all models for White Women see Table 11 on page 338 in Chapter IV.

**Men**

Insufficient numbers of male participants for either racial group were received to allow for the structural equation model analysis of the full model containing the four variables of Multicultural Training, Gender Identity Attitudes, Racial Identity Attitudes, and Multicultural Competencies. Sufficient numbers of male participants were achieved by combining packets received from the two men's racial groups (Men of Color and White Men) into one group (N = 114). Combining the two groups of men allowed the researcher to run a limited (gender triangle) structural model analysis where multicultural training predicts gender identity status and multicultural competencies, and gender identity status also predicts Multicultural Competencies (See Figure 12, Chapter IV, page 345). The analyses, done for all men, compared this gender triangle model with two other models that each contained only two of the three variables.

Results of the structural equation model analysis of the gender triangle model for men did not provide a good fit for the data. To control for the effect of measurement error on the structural equation model analysis, separate analyses were run for this model using fewer subscales for the various factors. Subscales were eliminated from the model if their internal consistency reliability did not reach at least .60. The subscales that were removed from the full model for the measurement error control models for Men were RGIDS Reference Group Dependent and MCI...
Relationship. The Measurement Error Control (MEC) model corresponding to the full model provided a better fit for the data than the full model containing all applicable subscales.

Two 2-factor models were generated for Men through the process of parameter reduction. Both of these models, containing multicultural competencies and either multicultural training or gender identity statuses (Models 2 see Figure 6, Chapter IV, page 335 and 3 see Figure 13, Chapter IV, page 348) provided a better fit for the data than the full model. The model (3) that proposed a direct effect from Gender Identity Attitudes to Multicultural Competencies provided a better fit for the study data than the model (2) that proposed a direct effect from multicultural training to multicultural competencies. This model in which gender identity statuses were directly related to multicultural competencies was the best fitting model considered in the analyses of the men's data. When these two models were run removing subscales that demonstrated problematic reliability, model three (containing gender identity statuses and multicultural competencies) provided significant improvement over its counterpart containing all subscales and was the only model among all of the model analyses that demonstrated a good fit for the data across all indices.

Regression Analyses for Male Racial Groups

The mailed survey generated insufficient numbers of responses from either male racial group (58 Men of Color, 62 White Men) to run the structural equation model analysis of the full model containing the variables of Multicultural Training, Racial Identity Attitudes, Gender Identity Attitudes, and Multicultural Competencies.
for these two groups. Multiple regression analyses were run to provide information that could suggest the relative effectiveness of this study's full model to explain the data. These analyses were designed to suggest structural model results for the racial triangle portion of the full model. To provide data about the portions of the model contained in the racial triangle, four sets of regression analyses were run for each population group (Men of Color, White Men). The first set of analyses regressed multicultural training onto racial identity attitudes. The second set of analyses regressed multicultural training variables and racial identity variables onto multicultural competency variables. The third and fourth sets of regression analyses regressed multicultural training and racial identity attitudes respectively onto each multicultural competency variable. These regression analyses, by evaluating the relationships between variables that make up the separate linkages in the model can provide some information about the overall model fit. For analysis that included the multicultural training variables, these were entered first, Formal followed by Informal. Then, for the analyses that included racial identity variables, the racial identity variables were entered in ascending order with lower level identity attitude subscales being entered first followed by progressively higher level identity attitude subscales. Separate regression analyses were run for each of the multicultural competency variables (Knowledge, Awareness, Skills, and Relationship) and for each of the racial identity variables (POCRIAS and WRIAS subscales). These results will be provided for each of the two male groups (Men of Color and White Men) in the succeeding paragraphs, beginning with the results for Men of Color.
Men of Color

The racial identity portion of the model being covered in these regression analyses contains several paths. Beginning with multicultural training one path leads from there to racial identity attitudes while another leads to multicultural competencies. There is also a path from racial identity attitudes to multicultural competencies. One set of regression analyses were done to evaluate the path from multicultural training to racial identity attitudes while the other sets of regression analyses were done to evaluate the remaining paths.

The first set of regression analyses exploring the effects of Multicultural Training on racial identity attitudes yielded one statistically significant result for Men of Color. Formal Multicultural Training was a significant predictor of Conformity/Preencounter racial identity attitudes. The second set of regression analyses exploring the effects of multicultural training and racial identity attitudes on multicultural competencies found that these variables predicted multicultural Knowledge (R square = .11, p = .02), Awareness (R square = .38, p = .00), Skills (R square = .25, p = .00), and Relationship competencies (R square = .19, p = .00). The multicultural Knowledge competency was predicted by racial identity Dissonance attitudes (Beta = -.33), Awareness competency was predicted by Formal Multicultural Training (Beta = .43), racial identity Dissonance attitudes (Beta = -.24), and racial identity Internalization attitudes (Beta = .34). The multicultural Skill competency was predicted by racial identity Conformity/Preencounter attitudes (Beta = -.46) and formal multicultural training (Beta = .37). The multicultural Relationship competency was best predicted by racial identity Dissonance attitudes (Beta = .44).
Two additional sets of regression analyses were run, regressing multicultural training and racial identity attitudes onto multicultural competencies respectively. These analyses, when combined with the two previous sets of regression analyses, provided information about the specific level of effects accounted for by training compared to identity attitudes on multicultural competencies. These results suggest an indirect effect of multicultural training on multicultural competencies through Conformity/Preencounter racial identity attitudes.

**White Men**

The racial identity portion of the model being covered in these regression analyses contains several paths. Beginning with multicultural training one path leads from there to racial identity attitudes while another leads to multicultural competencies. There is also a path from racial identity attitudes to multicultural competencies. One set of regression analyses were done to evaluate the path from multicultural training to racial identity attitudes while the other sets of regression analyses were done to evaluate the remaining paths.

The first set of regression analyses regressing Multicultural Training onto racial identity attitudes yielded three statistically significant results for White Men. Formal Multicultural Training predicted Disintegration attitudes (R square = .13, p = .00), Pseudo Independence attitudes (R square = .13, p = .00) and Autonomy attitudes (R square = .08, p = .03). The second set of regression analyses regressing multicultural training and racial identity attitudes onto multicultural competencies generated statistically significant results for Knowledge (R square =
.38, p = .00), Awareness (R square = .45, p = .00), Skill (R square = .37, p = .00),
and Relationship (R square = .12, p = .01) multicultural competencies. Autonomy
(Beta = .38) and Pseudo Independence (Beta = .29) racial identity attitudes predicted
Knowledge multicultural competencies. Formal Multicultural Training (Beta = .45) and
Pseudo Independence (Beta = .37) racial identity attitudes predicted Awareness
multicultural competencies. Pseudo Independence (Beta = .59) and Contact (Beta =
-.34) racial identity attitudes predicted Skill multicultural competencies. Finally,
Informal Multicultural Training (Beta = -.34) predicted Relationship multicultural
competencies.

Two additional sets of regression analyses were run, regressing multicultural
training and racial identity attitudes onto multicultural competencies respectively.
These analyses, when combined with the two previous sets of regression analyses,
provided information about the specific level of effects accounted for by training
compared to identity attitudes on multicultural competencies. These results suggest
an indirect effect of multicultural training on multicultural competencies through the
following racial identity attitudes: Pseudo Independence and Autonomy.

Discussion

This section contains a summarization and discussion of the results. It
contains four subsections: Canonical correlation summary and conclusions,
structural equation model summary and conclusions, problems in the study, and
suggestions for future research. The first subsection contains a summary of the
results and the conclusions drawn for the Canonical Correlation Analyses. This
subsection is further divided into two parts: Results Summary and Conclusions. The
Results Summary part contains paragraphs for the results from each of the
racial/demographic groups in the study (Women of Color, White Women, Men of
Color and White Men). The second subsection of the chapter contains a summary of
the results obtained for the Structural Equation Model Analysis and the conclusions
that were drawn from these results. The Results Summary portion of this subsection
contains paragraphs detailing the results for different groups in the study (Women of
Color, White Women, and Men. The third subsection provides a discussion of
problems that were found in the study. The fourth and final subsection details some
suggestions for future research suggested by the results of the study.

Canonical Correlation Summary and Conclusions

Results Summary

Correlational analyses were used to explore the relationships between racial
identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes for the four racial/gender demographic
groups in this study (Women of Color, White Women, Men of Color, and White Men).
The results for each of these four groups are summarized in the following
paragraphs.

The researcher hypothesized that there would be a parallel relationship
between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes for Women of Color.
This hypothesis was based upon the idea that both gender identity development and
racial identity development are oppressed identities for this demographic group and
therefore development should progress similarly. The results tended to support a
parallel relationship between these two variables. Lower level subscales from one instrument correlated positively to lower level subscales from the other. The highest level subscales from each instrument correlated positively. Lower level subscales from either instrument correlated negatively with the highest level subscale from the other instrument. Additionally, the magnitude of the relationships, as demonstrated by the values of the correlations (which were all at least half a standard deviation in value), between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes also supports the hypothesis that these processes are parallel for Women of Color.

The researcher hypothesized that for White Women, there would be either no relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes or that there would be a non-parallel relationship between these two types of attitudes. This hypothesis was based upon the idea that racial identity development is a majority culture identity development process for White Women, but that female gender identity development is a minority identity development process. Minority identity development and majority identity development are proposed to progress separately due to different cultural stimuli and are therefore not expected to demonstrate parallel processes. Contrary to the proposed hypothesis, correlational results for White Women suggested that there exists a parallel process between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes. Lower level subscales from each measure correlated positively with lower level subscales from the other measure. The two highest level subscales for racial identity (Pseudo Independence and Autonomy) correlated positively with the highest level subscale for gender identity (Internalization). The two highest level subscales for racial identity correlated
negatively with the lower level gender identity subscales. The highest level subscale for gender identity correlated negatively with two of the lower level subscales from racial identity (Disintegration and Reintegration). However, there is evidence to suggest that these two types of identities are not as closely related for White Women as for Women of Color. The magnitude of the correlations (most values were less than half a standard deviation and many were less than a third of a standard deviation) between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes is much smaller. The power for these analyses for White Women was very high, much higher than that for Women of Color, and suggests that the analyses are identifying trivial relationships for White Women.

The researcher hypothesized that for Men of Color there would be no relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity statuses. This hypothesis was based upon the idea that racial identity development is a minority culture identity development process for Men of Color, but that male gender identity development is a majority identity development process. Minority identity development and majority identity development are proposed to progress separately due to different cultural stimuli and are therefore not expected to demonstrate parallel processes. The results of the correlational analysis for Men of Color supported this hypothesis. There was no relationship found between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes for Men of Color.

The researcher hypothesized that there would be a parallel relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity statuses for White Men. This hypothesis was based upon the idea that both gender identity development and
racial identity development are majority culture identities for this demographic group and therefore development should progress similarly. The results tended to support a parallel relationship between these two variables. Lower level subscales from racial identity correlated positively with lower level subscales from gender identity. Higher level subscales from both types of identity correlated positively with each other. Lower level subscales from one type of identity correlated negatively with higher level subscales from the other. The magnitude of the relationships (as demonstrated in the values of the statistically significant correlations, all at least half a standard deviation in value and many over a full standard deviation) also tends to support the parallel relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity statuses for White Men.

Conclusions

There is fairly strong support for the hypothesis that racial and gender identity development will be more closely related when both gender and racial identity share a cultural perspective (both are majority or both are minority/oppressed) than when gender and racial identity flow from different cultural viewpoints (one is majority and the other is minority/oppressed). In previous studies, findings that these processes were related for Black Women (Parks et al., 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997), but not for White Women (Parks et al., 1996) suggested this hypothesis. The results from this study confirm the prior findings for Women of Color. This relationship, between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes for Women of Color, and the one found between racial identity attitudes and gender identity
statuses for White Men support the effect of a similar cultural perspective across identity types on the parallel development of these identities. The lack of relationship found for Men of Color also supports this hypothesis, since for Men of Color the cultural perspectives differ. The results for White Women, would appear to challenge the hypothesis that identity development across different cultural perspectives is not related. However, values of the correlations for White Women tend to be small and are strongly influenced by measurement issues (due to similarities between the racial identity attitude measure and the female gender identity attitude measure) and power issues (due to the ability of very high power to identify very small differences). Because of these issues, the results for White Women do not provide a strong argument against the hypothesis that similar cultural perspectives across identity types (racial and gender) point to a parallel process in identity development while dissimilar cultural perspectives suggest unrelated identity development processes.

**Structural Equation Model**

This subsection contains two parts. The first part summarizes the results of the model analyses for each racial/gender demographic group. This is done in the following order: Women of Color, White Women, Men of Color, and White Men. The summaries for the two men's groups use the results from the structural equation model analysis for the pooled men's data and the regression analyses for the specific groups (Men of Color and White Men) to explore the full model. These summaries are followed by a part that draws conclusions by comparing the results from the separate racial/gender groups.
Results Summary

The hypothesis for the structural equation model analysis for each of the demographic groups in the study (Women of Color, White Women, Men of Color and White Men), was the same. This hypothesis suggested that a model (the full model, see Figure 1, page 181 in Chapter II), would provide a good fit for the study data. In the full model, multicultural training predicts racial identity attitudes, gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies, and racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes each predict multicultural competencies. In addition to exploring the absolute goodness of fit of this model, a second hypothesis suggested that this full model would provide a better fit for the data than a more limited model (Model 2 - Racial Triangle) containing only multicultural training, racial identity attitudes, and multicultural competencies.

For both groups of women, the full model did not provide a good fit for the data. The more limited model (Model 2 - Racial Triangle) did not provide a good fit for the data either, although it provided a somewhat better fit than the full model. Consideration of the model and its components suggested that measurement error might be responsible for this lack of fit. To compensate for measurement error, subscales whose internal consistency reliability did not reach at least .60 were removed from the analysis. The structural equation model analysis of the two models (Full and Model 2 - Racial Triangle) containing only subscales with internal consistency reliability at or above .60, still did not find the models a good fit for the data. Since the more limited model (2 - Racial Triangle) provided a better fit for the data than the full model, parameter reduction (removing factors from the model) was
used to generate additional models. These models provided differing levels of fit for the two different women's groups (Women of Color and White Women).

The best fitting model for Women of Color was one that contained gender identity attitudes but not racial identity attitudes. When these models were corrected for measurement error, both the three-factor gender-triangle and two-factor (containing gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies) models provided a fairly good fit for the data and nearly equivalent fit statistics. The two-factor model containing multicultural training and multicultural competencies provided the next best fit for the data for this demographic group. This was followed by the models that contained racial identity attitudes and not gender identity attitudes.

The relative fit of the models for Women of Color suggest that there is an overlap of effect in identity attitudes. This overlap appears to create a situation where the addition of the second set of identity attitudes into the model does not add to the explanatory power of the model. This explains the better fit results for three- and two-factor models over the full model. Although the identity attitudes overlap extensively, however, it appears that for Women of Color, gender identity attitudes explain model effects better than racial identity attitudes when taken separately.

The best fitting model for White Women was one that contained racial identity attitudes and not gender identity attitudes. After correcting for measurement error, both the three-factor racial-triangle model and the two-factor model containing only racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies provided a similar, and adequate fit for the data. For White Women, both the best fitting racial identity models (containing racial identity attitudes and not gender identity attitudes) and the
two gender identity models (3- and 2-factor) performed better than the model containing only multicultural training and multicultural competencies.

The relative fit of the models for White Women suggest that there is an overlap of effect in identity attitudes. Although the strength of this overlap is less for White Women than for Women of Color. This overlap appears to create a situation where the addition of the second set of identity attitudes into the model does not add to the explanatory power of the model. This explains the better fit results for three- and two-factor models over the full model. Although the identity attitudes overlap extensively, however, it appears that for White Women, racial identity attitudes explain model effects better than gender identity attitudes when taken separately.

In order to explore the proposed model for men, a different analysis strategy was required. The total number of responses from both men's groups (Men of Color and White Men) allowed for the structural equation model analysis of a limited model containing multicultural training, gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies (See Figure 12, Chapter IV, page 345) which was used to explore the gender-triangle portion of the full model. Successive structural equation model analyses included only variables from those that composed the gender triangle. The other portion of the full model (racial-triangle) containing multicultural training, racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies was explored through regression analyses for the two different men's racial groups (Men of Color and White Men).

For Men, the best fitting model (See Figure 13, Chapter IV, page 347) from among those explored through structural equation model analysis, was one that corrected for measurement error and contained only two factors (gender identity
attitudes and multicultural competencies). This model provided the best fit results of any model in the study, demonstrating a good fit across all indices even the robust and problematic Chi Square. This model provided a much better fit than the two-factor model containing multicultural training and multicultural competencies (See Figure 6, Chapter IV, page 335). This suggests that for all men (both Men of Color and White Men), gender identity statuses may be of greater importance in the acquisition of multicultural competencies than multicultural training.

Two different sets of regression analyses were run for each men's group (Men of Color and White Men) to explore the racial triangle of the full model. The first set of regression analyses regressed the two multicultural training variables onto racial identity attitude subscales. The second set of regression analyses regressed multicultural training variables and racial identity attitude subscales onto multicultural competency subscales. Results of these regression analyses for men demonstrated partial support for the racial triangle of the proposed full model. Some of the subscales representing various aspects of multicultural training or racial identity were useful in explaining other variables. For both Men of Color and White Men, Formal and Informal Multicultural Training were useful predictors. Formal Multicultural Training explained variance in both racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies. Informal Multicultural Training only explained variance in multicultural competencies.

For Men of Color, multicultural training was minimally predictive of variance in racial identity attitudes. Formal Multicultural Training was predictive only of Preencounter/Conformity Racial Identity Attitudes. Both racial identity attitudes and
multicultural training were predictive of multicultural competencies. Lack of support for the connection between multicultural training and racial identity attitudes, suggests that the racial identity triangle does not provide a good fit for the data for Men of Color.

The regression analyses for White Men, found that multicultural training (formal) was predictive of variance in three racial identity attitudes, Disintegration, Pseudo Independence and Autonomy. Multicultural training was less predictive of the multicultural competencies than multicultural training was of racial identity attitudes for White Men. Racial identity attitudes were also predictive of multicultural competency scores. Scores on three racial identity attitude subscales were predictive of multicultural competencies (Contact, Pseudo Independence and Autonomy). These results suggest that for White Men the connection between multicultural training and racial identity attitudes is a more valuable component in the full model than it is for Men of Color. However, the connection between multicultural training and multicultural competencies was more tenuous, supported only by a relationship between Informal Multicultural Training and Relationship Multicultural Competencies and Formal Multicultural Training and Awareness Multicultural Competencies. The results of these regression analyses for White Men suggest that the three-factor racial-triangle model may not provide a good fit for the data, due to the minimal connection between multicultural training and multicultural competencies.

Pooling the two racial groups for men likely created the extremely poor fit found for the two-factor model containing multicultural training and multicultural
competencies in the structural equation model analysis. Results of the regression analyses for these two groups suggest that multicultural training has a differential effect on multicultural competencies for Men of Color and White Men. This effect undoubtedly influenced the results obtained for the three-factor racial-triangle model as well. The regression results for the relationships between multicultural training and multicultural competencies suggest that three-factor racial-triangle model and the two-factor model containing multicultural training and multicultural competencies might provide substantially better fit results than that obtained for all men for the subgroup of White Men, and worse fit results for Men of Color.

Conclusions Across Racial/Gender Group Models

Results of the analyses for the different structural equation models for women (Women of Color and White Women) and men (Men of Color and White Men) suggest several considerations for the acquisition of multicultural competencies. The first of these is that multicultural training alone is insufficient to explain the acquisition of multicultural competencies. Previous studies had begun to explore this idea by including racial identity attitudes into their exploration of multicultural competencies. Ottavi et al. (1994) found that racial identity attitudes added to the prediction of multicultural competencies in a regression model, while Neville et al. (1996) found a relationship between higher scores on specific racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies. In the current study, the structural equation model analyses for Women of Color, White Women, and Men (pooling both racial groups: Men of Color and White Men) found that models containing identity constructs (racial
or gender) provided better fit statistics than models containing only multicultural training when the models were adjusted for measurement error. For Men, the model in which gender identity statuses predicted multicultural competencies was better than the model in which multicultural training predicted multicultural competencies. The regression analyses for White Men also support the importance of identity attitudes in explaining variance in multicultural competencies. These analyses, found few or no relationships between multicultural training and the various multicultural competency subscales, but found several relationships between racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies.

The results reported above also support the second conclusion which is that identity attitudes are important in the acquisition of multicultural competencies. The study by Ottavi et al. (1994) touched upon this when they reported that racial identity attitudes contributed to the prediction of multicultural competencies in a statistically significant way. In the results from this study, reported above, a model containing identity constructs (attitudes or statuses) provides a better fit for the data for each racial/gender group than the model that does not contain any identity constructs (between multicultural training and multicultural competencies). However, the type of identity (racial or gender) that was most important in the prediction of multicultural competencies varied across these racial/gender groups.

The third conclusion states that the type of identity attitude that most influences acquisition of multicultural competencies depends upon racial/gender group membership. Gender identity attitudes were most influential for Women of Color. Racial identity attitudes were more influential for White Women. Gender
identity attitudes were important for both groups of men, however it is less clear how racial identity attitudes fit for these two groups due to the analyses used for men.

The fourth and final conclusion is that multicultural training (either as measured or as currently disseminated) does not influence identity attitudes equally for all groups. Previous research explored only the effects of multicultural training on racial identity attitudes for Whites (Brown et al., 1996; Neville et al., 1996; Ottavi et al., 1994; Parker et al., 1998). The results from this study demonstrated differences in the effect of multicultural training on identity constructs (attitudes and statuses) across the four racial/gender groups. For Women of Color and White Men, multicultural training appears to influence identity attitudes more strongly than it does for Men of Color and White Women. The difference in the efficacy of multicultural training to influence identity attitudes between these two groups suggests that individuals who have an affiliation with both a majority culture and a minority culture acquire their identity attitudes differently than individuals whose affiliation is within a single cultural status (majority or minority).

Problems in the Current Study

As indicated previously, the psychometric qualities of several of the instruments used in this study create problems in interpreting the achieved results. The tangled factor structure of some of the subscales eliminates any type of clear differentiation between statuses whose items intermingle. The lower than .70 internal consistency reliability recommended by measurement experts (Kaplan & Sacuzzo, 1989) of some subscales suggest that these subscales may not be measuring...
distinct statuses. However, removal of subscales to compensate for this measurement error is also problematic. Each subscale of any of the identity measures contains items designed to represent ideas and attitudes associated with one status in a developmental continuum. Removing some subscales truncates the measurement of the developmental continuum. This results in a model that can only speak to specific types of identity development attitudes rather than to the entire range of identity development attitudes. This problem seems to effect many of the studies that use the instruments included here to explore these types of questions. For example, Ottavi et al. (1994) in their analyses found relationships only for two subscales. One subscale (Autonomy) that demonstrated only moderate reliability provided evidence to support one relationship included in the model used in this study. The other subscale (Pseudo-Independence), that demonstrated the only good reliability of the subscales in the Ottavi et al. (1994) study, provided evidence to support five relationships among the variables for the model used in this study. Other study results also appear to be effected by the psychometrics of these instruments (Brown et al., 1996; Neville et al., 1996).

Another problem with the current research was the inability, due to insufficient numbers, to run full model structural equation analyses for the two men's racial groups (Men of Color and White Men). The lack of sufficient numbers created two problems, one caused by pooling the data from the two men's racial groups and the other caused by the use of regression analyses to explore portions of the full structural equation model. Poor fit findings for the model containing multicultural training and multicultural competencies for the pooled group of men may have been
influenced by the lack of relationship between these two variables for only one group (White Men). While, the regression analyses done for the two men's groups does not explore the complex relationships among factors that are analyzed by the structural equation model analyses.

A third problem in the current study is in the measurement of multicultural training. The measures of multicultural training for this study were all quantitative. Sheer numbers of experiences may be less relevant to personal development (for this study racial and gender identity development or the acquisition of multicultural competencies) than the quality of experience. This study is limited to numbers and has no information about the type, content or quality of the multicultural training experiences of the respondents. This lack may be partially responsible for the failure of multicultural training in explaining study data.

Suggestions for Future Research

This researcher was unable to acquire sufficient numbers of subjects to analyze the full structural equation model for men. The analysis of the full model for each group of men might provide additional insight into the role of race and gender group membership, and the role of the various factors on multicultural competencies. Results of the analyses that were done suggest that different models are likely to provide the best fit for each group.

Another area not covered in this research, which results of this research suggest needs to be addressed is analyzing the way multicultural training is done. The results of this study suggest that identity attitudes (racial and gender) are
important in explaining multicultural competencies. These results also suggest that multicultural training (as measured by this study) does not provide a complete explanation for variance in identity attitudes for any racial/gender group in the study. The extent that multicultural training influences identity attitudes as suggested by the results of this study, differs across racial/gender group membership. Therefore, it could be useful to identify whether identity development (racial or gender) can be taught. If it is possible to teach identity development (racial and gender), it would be valuable to determine what are effective racial and gender identity instruction methods.

One of the major problems for this research was the psychometrics of the identity instruments. Despite the psychometric insufficiencies of the instruments used, this study's structural model analysis suggests that identity attitudes (racial and gender) are important in explaining multicultural competencies. If identity attitudes are important, they need further study. In order to do this, better measures are needed. In order to effectively address the roles of these types of identity, more effective measures of the various identity statuses need to be devised. For the purposes of structural equation modeling, measures that incorporate a wider range of identity status markers (not just attitudes) would be particularly useful. Specifically, it might be useful to include a measure of behaviors as an additional measure to be included with a measure of attitudes in future research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview of the Chapter

Within the fields of counseling and psychology an awareness that cultural differences play a role in counseling, training, and societal outcomes gradually emerged (Amir, 1976; Cross, 1971, 1978; Katz, 1976; Katz & Ivey 1977; Maykovich, 1973; Pedersen, 1978; Sherif & Sherif, as cited in Ponterotto, 1988; Sue, 1978a, 1978b; Terry, 1970; Thomas, 1970; Vontress, 1971). This awareness led to a call for the inclusion of multicultural training in counselor and psychology training programs (Association for Counselor Education and Supervision: ACES. 1979; Sue et al. 1982). Following the position papers of ACES (1979) and Sue and colleagues (1982) regarding the importance of multicultural competencies for counselors, experts in the field struggled to identify factors that would explain individual success in working with multicultural others (e.g. McEwen & Roper, 1994; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994; Richardson & Molinaro, 1996; Sodowsky, Kuo-Jackson, Richardson & Corey, 1998; Talbot, 1996; Talbot & Kocarek, 1997). Recently this search has led to an incorporation of identity variables, especially racial identity statuses into the research on multicultural training and multicultural competencies (e.g. Brown, Parham & Yonker, 1996; Ottavi, Pope-Davis & Dings, 1994; Parker, Moore & Neimeyer, 1998). In this study, the researcher attempted to expand on these prior studies by including
gender identity statuses as well as racial identity statuses. In the previously cited studies, the relationships of racial identity statuses to multicultural training and multicultural competencies have been considered for populations representing limited demographic categories. These studies have not attempted to include populations whose parameters cross the spectrum of gender and racial categories. This study explores the relationships among the following variables: multicultural training, racial and gender identity attitudes, and multicultural competencies. Additionally, it uses participants from four different groups: Women of Color, White women, Men of Color and White men. This study is the first to bring together all of these variables into one study. It is also be the first to explore the relationships among these variables across each of the above mentioned demographic groups.

The background literature for this study is fairly voluminous. In order to understand the importance of the issues involved, the background literature in multicultural issues in general needs to be covered briefly. Additionally, for each of the four variables under consideration there exists a body of literature that covers a variety of theories and applications for that variable. There are also studies that include two or more of these variables (e.g. Brown et al., 1996; Parks, Carter, & Gushue, 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997). It is necessary to provide adequate coverage of this extensive body of literature to effectively explain the rationale for the study. To do this, Chapter II - Review of the Literature, is presented in six sections. In section one, a brief background of the multicultural issues which led to research in the areas of racial identity development, gender identity development, multicultural training and multicultural competencies is covered.
Section two and three further elaborate on two of the current themes in the multicultural literature, racial and gender identity development respectively. Section four explores the multicultural training literature including how multicultural competencies are addressed in this training literature. In section five, the studies that provide a convergence of the four variables of racial identity, gender identity, multicultural training and multicultural competency, by incorporating two or more of them into the same study design are described. Finally, section six provides an overview of the research questions and a rationale for the proposed study based on the literature review.

Background of Multicultural Issues in Counseling

Three aspects of the background literature are addressed in this section. They are covered within the following three subsections: Historical overview, worldview, and majority culture views and issues. In the first subsection, labeled historical overview a brief overview of the history of multicultural issues in the field of counseling and psychology is provided. In the second subsection, labeled worldview, the construct of worldview is highlighted and provides a lead into the section on majority culture viewpoint. This subsection on worldview also provides a lead into the concepts of gender identity, and racial identity which can be found in later sections of this paper. In the third subsection, the changes in majority culture perspective are traced from viewing multicultural issues as a problem of the other (i.e. belonging to the members of the minority cultures) to a more inclusive view that sees the
dominant culture as one of many cultural viewpoints and allows that each of these viewpoints can provide viable alternatives for solving societal problems.

**Historical Overview**

The American Psychological Association (APA) sponsored a conference in Vail, Colorado in 1973 (Korman, 1974), which recommended that counseling persons of culturally diverse backgrounds by persons not trained or competent to work with such groups should be regarded as unethical. In response to the scrutiny on multicultural issues generated by the Vail conference and subsequent publications, committees and boards were established within two of the professional organizations representing practitioners in the fields of Counseling and Psychology (American Psychological Association - APA and American Counseling Association - ACA, formerly the American Association of Counseling and Development - AACD) to address these concerns. Objectives, guidelines, and recommendations were formulated to improve the responsiveness of the profession to the training of practitioners, to attend to needed research agendas and ethical issues of studying ethnic populations, and to provide for the service needs of racial and ethnic minority groups (ACES, 1979; Sue et al., 1982).

Greater attention to racial and ethnic minority concerns did not immediately change the environmental milieu in either the U.S. society as a whole or the fields of counseling and psychology in particular. Deeply seated beliefs and entrenched social structures supporting the majority culture and excluding other cultures were slow to change. Within the counseling and psychology professions this resistance to
change translated into maintaining therapy practices and training curriculums based primarily on theories of counseling that were conceived through the experience of working with members of white western culture. Sue (1981) pointed out that counseling theories have progressed through stages that reflected the biases and prejudices of the White theorists who conceived of them. He labeled these stages as (a) the pathological view of minorities, (b) the genetic deficiency model, (c) the culturally deficient model, and (d) the culturally different model. The culturally different model led researchers to consider the strengths and differences of a variety of cultures including that of racial minorities, women, those of differing sexual orientation and handicapped status. The explosion of information about different cultures led theorists to seek unifying constructs to provide a framework for working with a wide range of cultural differences.

**Worldview**

One unifying construct proposed by Sue (1978a, 1978b, 1981) was the concept of worldview. Worldview is a socially created construct which Sue (1978a, 1978b, 1981) suggested constitutes every individual's psychological orientation in life and can determine how they think, behave, make decisions, and define events. He further proposed that cultural learnings and life experiences frequently determine or influence worldviews, in this way worldviews are socially constructed. Sue (1996) stated that worldviews are a "function of individual, group and universal experiences" (p. 280). Several other professionals have noted the importance of understanding the worldviews of self and others in order to understand multicultural interactions.
The concept of worldview encompasses all aspects of an individual’s personal identity as well as their belief structure for understanding and relating to the world around them. Some examples of elements in a given worldview are locus of responsibility (e.g. self or others, individual or group) (Sue, 1978b), locus of control (e.g. self or others, individual or group) (Sue, 1978b), personal value system (Sue, 1981), racial identity (e.g. Cross, 1971; Helms, 1984), and gender identity (Cook, 1990; Downing & Roush, 1985; Helms as cited in Ossana, Helms, & Leonard, 1992; Wade, 1998).

Worldview and the elements contained within it (e.g. racial identity) are socially constructed schemata that provide meaning to a given individual’s interactions with self, others and society in general. Change in these socially constructed schemata usually involve a shift from adherence to believing in one group’s constructs (e.g. majority group) to adherence to believing in another group’s constructs (e.g. minority group). Specific elements of worldview that will be addressed in the study proposed within this paper are the constructs of personal identity described in racial identity theory and gender identity theory. Both gender identity development theories (Cook, 1990; Downing & Roush, 1985; Ho, 1995) and racial identity development theories (Cross, 1971, 1978, 1994, 1995; Helms, 1984, 1990b, 1995a; Myers, et al., 1991; Parham, 1989) describe a piece of a given individual’s worldview formation, how they see themselves and others as racial or gendered beings. These theories, like the worldview theory proposed by Sue, suggest that racial and gender identity is formed through learnings acquired in socialization and social interactions and then influences further behavior regarding
racial and gender roles. These aspects of worldview, gender and racial identity, will be further described later in this chapter.

**Majority Culture Views and Issues**

Worldview, racial identity and gender identity were all initially conceived of and described from the viewpoint of the non-dominant or minority culture. A guiding principle within each of the concepts and their related theories, however, was that everyone, dominant and non-dominant group members alike, has a worldview, a gender identity, and a racial identity. Theorists and researchers in multicultural issues began to stress the need for members of the majority culture to also consider the impact of their worldview and cultural values on themselves and others (Cook, 1990; Gushue, 1993; Helms, 1984, 1986; Sue, 1978a, 1981). Several of these scholars noted a tendency among dominant culture members to overlook the impact of the dominant culture on themselves and other members of the dominant culture (Cook, 1990; Helms, 1984, 1986; Sue 1981). A start towards recognizing the impact of the dominant culture on both itself and the non-dominant cultures with which it interacts can be found in the anti-racism literature (Amir, 1976; Katz, 1976; Terry, 1970; Weissbach, 1976). Exploration of racism and how to develop non-racist attitudes widened the lens with which multicultural issues were viewed to include the dominant culture as a cultural entity with its own cultural values and worldview. Katz (1985) noted that the counseling profession itself exhibits its own worldview encapsulated within the dominant culture worldview. She labeled counseling "a sociopolitical act in which counselors utilize a core set of cultural values and norms by which to judge
and evaluate clients" (p. 615). She suggested that most counselors were unaware of these biases. Her response to this lack of awareness within the profession was to suggest that the profession must be willing to engage in self-examination in order to make the field of counseling psychology more responsive to the needs of multicultural populations. Christensen (1989) agreed, noting that in the past, most counseling theories and conceptual models tended to reflect White western cultural values. She listed several consequences of this cultural embeddedness: (a) a tendency to assume that psychosocial development occurs similarly for all; (b) a minimization of ethnic and racial awareness and identity as important aspects of the psychosocial development process; (c) a building of cultural biases, including those relating to racism, prejudice, and discrimination, into many of the models and their underlying theoretical assumptions; (d) "a feeling by members of society who do not represent the dominant culture that most models do not 'fit' their life experience" (p. 271); (e) "an ensuence of theories of deviance, deprivation, disadvantage, and abnormality, based on the extent to which the life experiences of various groups differ from the models proposed" (p. 271); and (f) "an incorporation of the biases and blind spots inherent in monocultural theoretical models research and interpretation" (p. 271).

Several authors (Constantine, 1999; Katz, 1985; Locke & Kiselica, 1999; Pack-Brown, 1999; Ponterotto, 1998; Ponterotto & Casas, 1987; Robinson, 1999; Sue, 1981; Sue & Sue, 1990) have begun to address the importance of counselors and therapists understanding their own cultural values, biases, group identities and worldviews in addition to understanding these aspects of their clients lives. Sue et al.
(1982), in their position paper on multicultural issues in counseling and psychotherapy, provided a rationale of the need for a cross-cultural perspective, defined cross-cultural counseling and therapy, and outlined cross-cultural competencies for counselors and therapists. They stressed the importance for counselors and therapists of acquiring a greater understanding of their own ethnicity and its overt and covert influences on their personalities and interpersonal styles. They stated that this would improve the counselor's or therapist's ability to recognize the ways in which ethnic background influences different individual behavior, peer interaction, values and life goals. Several other practitioners, researchers and educators (Brandyberry, 1999; Croteau, 1999; D'Andrea, 1999; Delgado-Romero, 1999; Durodoye, 1999; Fukuyama, 1999; Herring, 1999; Jackson, 1999; Kiselica, 1999; Ortiz, 1999; Parrilla de Kokal, 1999; Talbot, 1999; Tate, 1999; Thomas, 1999; Weeber, 1999; Wilbur, 1999; Williams, 1999) concurred with Sue about the importance of self-understanding and outlined their own identity development in a special issue of the Journal of Counseling and Development titled Racism: Healing Its Effects (Vol 77/1). The issue of counselor self-understanding will be further addressed within the context of racial identity and gender identity development in the next two sections. The competencies recommended by Sue et al. (1982) will be covered in the section on multicultural competencies and training.

Racial Identity

This section contains the following three subsections: Historical background, Black and People of Color racial identity development, and White racial identity.
development. In the first subsection, historical background, an overview of the background of racial identity development theory is provided. In the second subsection, Black and People of Color racial identity development models are discussed. This subsection contains separate areas covering the models of Thomas (1970), Cross (1971) and Helms (1984, 1990a, 1990b, 1995a). It is Helms's Black and People of Color model (1995a) that will be used to conceptualize racial identity development for Persons of Color for this study. In the third and final subsection, White Racial Identity Development is covered. This section contains descriptions of the models of Helms (1984, 1990b), Ponterotto (1988), and Sabnani, Ponterotto, and Borodovsky (1991). Helms's model of White racial identity development will be used to conceptualize racial identity development for Whites for this study (1990b).

Historical Background

Part of the socially constructed worldview prevalent in the United States, is the tendency to assume that there are two and only two sides to any given issue (i.e. dichotomization) (Helms, 1992; Terry, 1970). Examples of this dichotomization that impact at the social and cultural level include rich/poor, majority/minority, and man/woman. Within the society some aspects of these social/cultural dichotomies are valued more than others. In general aspects perceived to belong to the dominant culture are valued above aspects perceived to belong to various minority cultures (Helms, 1992; Sue, 1981). Individuals belonging to various combinations of these dichotomous groups develop awareness of the impact of that membership at differing rates (Parks et al., 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997). The
process by which minority individuals develop this type of awareness, i.e. of being classified as a member of a high-status or low-status group, began to receive attention in the minority identity development theories put forth during the 1970s (Cross, 1971; Jackson, 1975; Thomas, 1970; Williams, 1975).

At that time, several authors presented models dealing with the psychosocial development of minority populations (Cross, 1971; Jackson, 1975; Thomas, 1970; Williams, 1975). These models incorporated aspects of racial, ethnic, and cultural awareness, as well as the social implications attendant on such awareness. The majority of these models dealt with the development of the minority individual's awareness of ethnicity and/or race consciousness, in the quest for self-identity. The theoretical structures of these models helped highlight the heterogeneity within ethnic/racial groups which had previously been ignored. These ethnic and racial identity models fell into three categories: (1) minority typologies, (2) developmental approaches, and (3) those based on shared experiences of oppression (Christensen, 1989).

Minority typologies divide ethnic or racial groups into typologies based on the degree of identification with the group in question. Most models considered whether individuals depended on the culture of the dominant society for their sense of self-definition, as opposed to identification with the cultural and societal concerns of their ethnic or racial minority group (Maykovich, 1973; Vontress, 1971). Minority typology models were later criticized for mistaking behaviors and attitudes related to an individuals' environmental situation for stable personality traits (Banks, Stitt, Curtis, & McQuarter. 1977). Another drawback to the minority typology models was that in
most of them there was no clear indication of how movement across categories occurred.

Developmental approaches considered minority identity as a developmental process in which individuals move through stages, with attitudes and behaviors changing with this progression. Models by Crawford and Naditch (1970), Thomas (1970), and Sherif and Sherif as cited in Ponterotto (1988) were formulated based on the life experiences of Black Americans coming to terms with the changing nature of race relations after the 1960s. Cross conceived one of the most highly developed models in 1971, a five-stage model describing stages in what he called the “conversion from Negro to Black” (p. 13). This conversion involved the individual changing their attitudes from pro-White and anti-Black attitudes to pro-Black and tolerant of White belief structure attitudes.

Oppression as a common experience, which Christensen (1989) says is the third and most recent approach to minority psychosocial development is closely tied to prior developmental models. The oppression as common experience approach utilizes similar developmental stages or statuses to previous models and these stages or statuses incorporate related behavioral and attitudinal markers. The two approaches, developmental and oppression as common experience, also share an emphasis on interaction with the dominant culture providing the impetus of progression through stages/statuses and a conceptualization of stages/statuses as a continuous process, one blending into another, not necessarily in a particular order. In the oppression as common experience approach, the experience of oppression is considered common to several identifiable groups, including Asians, Latinos, Blacks,
and Aboriginal peoples (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1983; Christensen, 1989). By considering oppression as a common experience, this approach allows the previous developmental approaches conceived for specific racial groups to be applied to other racial groups that share the experience of oppression.

Cross (1994) states that the appearance of racial identity models is a fairly recent event. He ties this development to the contemporary Black social movement, which he states began with the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court school desegregation decision, continued into the mid 1970s and consisted of two phases: Civil Rights (1954-1965) and Black Consciousness (1965-mid to late 1970s). The changes which Blacks experienced in their racial self-designation provided the observations, taken in diverse parts of the country by different observers, which culminated in theories of black racial identity development (Crawford & Naditch, 1970; Cross, 1971, 1994; Sherif & Sherif, as cited in Ponterotto 1988; Thomas, 1970).

**Black and People of Color Racial Identity Development**

In the early 1970s, researchers began to consider the development of racial identity in Black Americans. They were interested in understanding how African-Americans developed a positive Black identity in a White-valued, often hostile and racist society. Sherif and Sherif as cited in Ponterotto (1988) propelled much of this work through their contention that “acceptance of one’s blackness is not developed in a vacuum, but accrues through a progressive and systematic process” (p. 147). They hypothesized that “initial feelings of inferiority and shame arising from growing up in a White-emphasized society, lead to guilt and rage, which could be translated
into feelings of Black pride" (p. 147). Through the developmental process, these feelings of Black pride become “internalized and integrated as self-confidence and a positive self-concept” (p. 147). Thomas (1970) provided more detail about how this process occurred.

**Thomas Model**

Influenced by the work of Sherif and Sherif as cited in Ponterotto (1988), Thomas (1970) conceptualized a five-stage developmental process in which Blacks work through and eventually accept their identity as Black persons in a White world. Thomas (1970) believed most Blacks experienced “Negromachy”, which he defined as confusion about Black identity and use of the dominant society for self-definition. He hypothesized that Blacks must retreat into themselves in order to reexamine and renegotiate relationships with other racial and ethnic groups. The withdrawal process characterizes the first stage of the Thomas (1970) model. In the second stage, individuals testify to the pain experienced in denying oneself and learn to express anxieties about becoming Black. The third stage is characterized by processing information around Black cultural heritage. Information processing leads into working with Black subgroups to find a connection to the larger Black experience (stage four). Finally, in the fifth “transcendental” stage, Blacks lose previously held hang-ups about social class and race and see the self as part of the greater human culture. A difficulty with the Thomas model, which may explain the lack of follow-up research using this model, is that the details and specifics of the particular stages are not well explained (Ponterotto, 1988). The Cross (1971, 1978) model conceived during the
same time frame provided greater detail about how the process of change in racial identity attitudes comes about and more description of the attitudes and behaviors exhibited by individuals in the various stages.

**Cross Model**

Cross (1971, 1978) proposed another stage theory of Black racial identity development, the Negro-to-Black Conversion Experience. This model received considerably more research attention than the Thomas (1970) model (e.g. Parham & Helms. 1981; Ponterotto & Wise, 1987). In this cognitive developmental model of racial identity the author proposed that, as their racial identity evolves, Blacks progress through a sequence of five stages, each of which is composed of different racial attitudes and value orientations.

The first stage is Preencounter. In this stage the individual devalues his or her race or racial group and attempts to deny membership in that group. His or her value orientation mimics that of White Americans. In the second stage, Encounter, the individual is involved in two steps. The first step is experiencing the encounter. The encounter is usually an experience where the individual is treated unfairly because of their race, although the encounter could also involve a vicarious experience like witnessing another being treated unfairly. Following the encounter, is the second step, beginning to reinterpret the world based on this experience. This reinterpretation usually involves developing positive attitudes about being Black. While struggling to reinterpret their understanding of the world, the individual's value-orientation is in flux.
During stage three, Immersion-Emersion, the individual seeks to discover what it means to be Black. This is done through submerging the self into Black culture and rejecting White, or majority, culture. The individual may change their hair style, dress, name, and activities in an effort to experience what it means to be Black. In stage four, Internalization, the person internalizes positive attitudes of Black identity which were discovered and explored in the Immersion-Emersion stage. These individuals are accepting of their Black identity and feel a sense of satisfaction about their position in life. Because of this satisfaction, they may be receptive to ideas regarding changing problems in the system, but are unlikely to risk their personal safe position to help impel change. Cross (1971) suggests that the satisfaction of having developed a positive Black identity causes many individuals to stagnate at this point. He stresses that it is important for individuals not to stop the developmental process with the Internalization stage.

The final stage of Cross’s model is Internalization-Commitment. In this stage the person’s attitudes of racial identity remain positive toward Blackness. However, in addition to maintaining a positive personal racial identity, the individual also focuses on changing society to improve all minority individuals’ positions. These individuals, in addition to a positive Black identity, also develop an activist stance toward racial inequities within society. Helm’s extension of Cross’ Black racial identity development model and the instrument she developed to measure aspects of these models (RIAS) has been used in many studies (Carter, 1991; Carter & Helms, 1987; Helms & Carter, 1991; Neville, Heppner & Wang, 1997; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997).
Helms's Expansion of the Cross Model

Helms's (1984, 1990a) contribution to the expansion of Cross's model of Black racial identity development was the development of a self-report instrument to measure four of Cross's five stages: Preencounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization. The first manifestation of this instrument, the Racial Identity Attitude Scale (Short Form A) based item content on the items contained in a Q-sort created by Cross and colleagues to assess stages of his theory (Hall, Cross & Freedle, 1972). The instrument was revised using factor analysis to improve the internal consistency of the measure (Helms & Parham, 1984) and some items were dropped from the measure. The revised instrument, still containing most of the items from the original was called the Racial Identity Attitude Scale (Short Form B). A third version, the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale was developed by adding items in order to increase the reliability of the instrument (Helms & Parham, 1984). Using various versions of this instrument, Helms and other researchers (Carter & Helms, 1987; Helms, 1990a; Helms & Carter, 1991; Helms & Piper, 1994; Parks et al., 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997; Pomales, Claiborn, & LaFromboise, 1986) considered many ways that racial attitudes relate to self-esteem, other identity measures, and the counseling process.

Results of three studies done using Helms's instruments provide support for the stages of Cross' model (Carter & Helms, 1987; Helms & Carter, 1991; Parham & Helms, 1981). Two of these studies considered the impact of racial identity attitudes on preferences for either White or Black counselors (Helms & Carter, 1991; Parham...
& Helms, 1981). The other study evaluated the relationship between cultural values and racial identity attitudes (Carter & Helms, 1987).

Helms and Carter (1991) and Parham and Helms (1981) evaluated the effect of racial identity attitudes on preferences for Black or White counselors. Both studies polled Black undergraduate students using a version of the RIAS (RIAS - Parham & Helms, RIAS-B - Helms & Carter) and a measure of counselor preference. Parham and Helms surveyed 92 students (52 women, 40 men) and Helms and Carter surveyed 76 students (52 women, 24 men). In the first study, Parham and Helms (1981) found that Preencounter attitudes were negatively related to a preference for a Black counselor (-.58) and positively related to a preference for a White counselor (.37). They also found that Encounter attitudes were positively related to a preference for a Black counselor (.38). In the second study, Helms and Carter (1991) found that Internalization attitudes statistically significantly predicted a preference for a Black counselor. Results of these two studies support Cross' stages in several ways. The results that individuals who endorse high levels of Preencounter attitudes prefer White counselors over Black counselors, suggest that the individual in the Preencounter stage is immersed in White culture and holds values that are pro-White and anti-Black as suggested by Cross for this stage of identity development. The result that individuals endorsing high levels of Encounter attitudes prefer Black counselors also fits Cross' theory. Cross proposed that when an individual enters the Encounter stage he or she begins to reevaluate his or her pro-White and anti-Black stance, choosing a Black counselor would allow for greater exploration of these values. Finally, the result that individuals endorsing higher levels
of Internalization attitudes prefer Black counselors fits Cross’ theory in that these individuals are likely to be actively processing racial information on a regular basis and therefore prefer to work with someone whom they perceive to be more aware of these types of issues.

Carter and Helms (1987) polled 174 (66 men and 108 women) Black undergraduate students. They used the RIAS and an instrument to measure intercultural values. They found that higher scores on the statuses of racial identity that represent higher levels of racial identity development (Immersion/Emersion, Internalization) predicted the following Afro-Centric values (as identified by Afro-Centric theorists): Collateral social relations, doing activity orientation, and harmony with nature. These values were identified in relationship to the following five value areas: Human nature (good, mixed, or bad); relationship with nature (subjugation to, harmony with, mastery over); time orientation (past, present, or future); activity orientation (being, being in becoming, or doing); and social relations (lineal, collateral, or individual). This result fit with Cross’ conceptualization of Black identity development where higher levels of identity development accompanied positive attitudes toward Blacks and Black values.

Helms’s later expanded her model of Black racial identity to include People of Color (1995a). In Helms’s interpretation of Black and People of Color racial identity, she suggests that each of the five stages of identity development has a characteristic set of attitudes, behaviors and emotions. The length of time an individual spends in each stage and movement to the next stage are affected by the amount and type of his or her cross-racial experiences. Cross-racial experiences
lead to questioning accepted attitudes and beliefs and propel the individual into the next stage. Helms has since modified this theory (1995a), changing the term stages to statuses in order to indicate that movement between statuses can occur in either direction rather than only linearly from Preencounter or Conformity to Internalization as implied by the term stages. She also stressed that the term statuses implies a more flexible application of descriptors than does the term stages. This allows for overlap between the statuses wherein an individual may utilize strategies from more than one status simultaneously.

Her more recent expansions of her racial identity models (Helms, 1995a, 1996) also include a theoretical model to describe how interactions between individuals exhibiting attitudes indicative of two given statuses might occur. For example, this interactional model proposes different types of interactions between individuals where both members are in the same racial identity status and between individuals where one member is in a higher status than the other member. This interactional model also incorporates racial and gender differences. Thus, interactions might differ between two individuals who are both at the same racial identity status based on the race or gender of the individuals in the pair (i.e. both men, one man one women, both Black, one Black one White, etc.).

In this study, Helms’s People of Color model is used because it describes identity development for all People of Color not just one specific minority group (Helms, 1995a; 1995b). Researchers describing earlier models usually limited themselves to specific racial groups (e.g. Blacks: Thomas, 1970; Cross, 1971). Additionally, Helms has created an instrument designed to measure racial identity for
People of Color to accompany this model (Helms, 1995b). Other models of minority identity development have no corresponding instrumentation (e.g. Sue & Sue, 1990). The combination of a universal minority identity approach and instrumentation to measure this development make Helms's People of Color model the ideal choice for inclusion in this study.

Helms's People of Color model (1995a) has five statuses. These statuses are similar to the stages of Cross's model. These statuses are: Conformity, Dissonance, Immersion/Emersion, Internalization, and Integrative Awareness. The Conformity status corresponds to Cross's Preencounter stage. In this status the individual tends to be oblivious to the socio-political elements of racial identity and their beliefs and behaviors conform to the expectations of majority culture. Helms Dissonance status corresponds to Cross's Encounter stage. Individuals in this status tend to be confused about racial issues. They also are likely to experience ambivalence about their race and racial identity. Both Helms (1995b) and Cross (1971) labeled the third element of their respective models Immersion/Emersion. In Helms's People of Color model (1995b), individuals in this status immerse themselves in interactions and activities with others of their own race. Personal racial identity tends to be externally defined by the criteria of one's own racial group. The fourth status of Helms's People of Color model is Internalization. As with individuals in the corresponding Cross stage, individuals in this status have developed an internally defined racial identity and no longer rely on their racial reference group to determine racial self-identity. These individuals also have progressed to the point that they can interact effectively and without extreme emotional reactions (i.e. more
objectively) with members of the dominant culture. The fifth status of Helms People of Color model is Integrative Awareness. Helms suggests that individuals in this status have the ability to value all of the various aspects of their own identity, including but not limited to racial identity. She also posits that they are likely to be able to empathize with other oppressed individuals and may interact to promote the causes of their own and these other groups. This status of Helms model corresponds to the Internalization-Commitment stage of Cross’s model.

Helms expanded on Cross’s model in two ways. The first was by incorporating People of Color, creating a People of Color Racial Identity Theory and related instrument. The second way that Helms (1984, 1990b, 1995a, 1996) expanded on Cross’s model was by conceptualizing an interrelated model of Black and White racial identity. “Helms’s ‘Black and People of Color’, and ‘White’ models differ in content to reflect relevant societal themes, however, they are based on a common racial identity development theory” (p. 155). Helms (1996) identified the following four themes in racial identity development:

1. Racial identity develops in comparison to a contrast racial group;
2. Healthy racial identity development involves abandoning societal impositions of racial-self for a personally relevant self-definition;
3. Members of all racial groups develop racial identity through a sequential process where more complex differentiations of the ego evolve from earlier, less mature statuses; and
4. Qualitative differences in expression of racial identity statuses can be measured, but development must be inferred from responses to measures (p. 155).

Specific details regarding Helms’s theory of White racial identity development will be addressed in the next section.
White Racial Identity Development

White racial identity development is the last topic to be covered in the discussion of racial identity development. Theories of White racial identity development stem from two sources, the literature on minority identity development and the anti-racism literature. Initially, the focus in working with Whites was on the abandonment of racism rather than on racial identity development (Katz, 1976; Terry, 1970). Several researchers proposed models for developing a non-racist identity (Amir, 1976; Katz & Ivey, 1977; Terry, 1970). These models did not focus specifically on understanding one’s own racial heritage. Rather they focused on developing tolerance toward others and changing racist attitudes. Two elements of the non-racist identity construct were later incorporated into White racial identity. These elements are (1) the focus on individuals changing their attitudes from racist to non-racist and (2) a sense of fairness providing the impetus for individuals to change their attitudes from racist to non-racist.

Helms (1984) was the first to propose a model of White racial identity development. In order to explain dominant culture racial identity development, several of the ideas behind Black racial identity development were utilized (i.e. developmental process, need for a contrast group). White racial identity, like minority racial identity was viewed as a developmental process. Whites progress through a series of statuses with each advancing status involving a more complex understanding of race and racial identity. White racial identity development also requires a contrast race to provide the impetus for racial identity development. If an individual never experienced racial difference through comparing the self against
others perceived as different, racial development would never occur. However, the experience of oppression providing part of the impetus for racial identity development is absent from majority culture racial identity development theory. Instead, the experience of being an oppressor, or a member of an oppressing group, is integral to the process of racial identity development for majority culture individuals. It is here that the literature on anti-racism comes into play. Whites are proposed to begin developing anti-racist attitudes because of a sense of fairness and justice. It is this sense of fairness that also initially propels White racial identity development.

**Helms's Model of White Racial Identity Development**

Helms (1984) proposed a model of White racial identity development that shares many similarities with the Black racial identity development theories of Cross (1971) and Thomas (1970). All of these stage theories (Cross, 1971; Helms, 1984; Thomas, 1970) are progressive, characterized by early confusion and a poor sense of identity, and by later ethnic acceptance and identity integration (Ponterotto, 1988). White racial identity development theories differ significantly, however, due to the pervasive and often invisible nature of the dominant culture, especially to its own members. Katz (1985) suggested that “the need to make White culture explicit is significant when we realize that it exists but has rarely been acknowledged or investigated” (p. 616). According to Torrey (1972), Whites lack insight into their own culturally learned values and beliefs. He suggests that because of this lack of insight,
these values and beliefs are allowed to unconsciously provide criteria for judgment without the values and beliefs themselves ever having to be judged (Torrey, 1972).

Differences exist among racial groups as well as within each group (LaFromboise, as cited in Katz, 1985). Examples of differences among racial groups are between Black and White, or between Black and Latino/a, or between White and American Indian. These are typically labeled racial differences. Examples of within-group differences are the difference between German and Italian, or the difference between Mexican and Puerto Rican. Within-group differences are based on shared values, beliefs, communication styles, traditions, myths, and familial and societal structures (Hardiman & Jackson as cited in Katz, 1985). These are typically labeled ethnic differences. Members of the majority culture usually have no difficulty identifying other racially based cultures and ethnically based cultures within both the majority and minority cultures. However, it is often difficult for Whites to identify the White racial or majority culture. This is because White culture is omnipresent. Katz (1985) says that White culture "is so interwoven in the fabric of everyday living that members of the majority culture cannot step outside and see their beliefs, values, and behaviors as creating a distinct cultural group" (p. 617). This difficulty in identifying White culture creates a different type of problem for majority culture members in developing a personal racial identity.

The difficulty in identifying the culture in which one participates and the differences between the experiences of minority culture members and dominant culture members, particularly with societal oppression, lead to two different racial identity processes. Because Whites occupy a different position of social power in this
society, their experience of racial identity development differs greatly from that of
members of nondominant racial groups. For instance, as members of the dominant
group, Whites are to some extent free simply to disengage from the development
process through a variety of means. They can eliminate interactions with members
of other racial groups and ignore issues associated with race, ethnicity and racism
(Parks et al., 1996). Helms (1984) argues that although the process of acquiring an
internalized racial consciousness may be similar for Blacks and Whites, the content
or theme of the process is likely to be different because of the different socialization
experiences that accompany race in the United States.

Prior to Helms model of White racial identity development, no theory existed
(Helms, 1984) to explain how Whites develop attitudes about the racial group to
which they belong. Instead, studies of dominant or majority culture members
stressed understanding racist and non-racist adaptations to various social milieus
as a measure of White peoples' racial attitudes is that it provides no information
about how Whites feel about themselves as racial beings. Katz and Ivey (1977)
charge that Whites deny that they belong to a race. They argue that this denial
permits Whites to avoid acknowledging personal responsibility for perpetuating a
racist system.

Helms argues that racial identity development is based on the existence of
racial differences within the society. In a mono-racial culture, there is no impetus for
individuals to create a racial identity schema as part of their identity development
because there is no comparison or contrast group. She further argues that, since
Whites in America typically do not acknowledge attitudes about being White that are independent of attitudes about Blacks. A theory of White racial identity development should include the interplay between perceptions and evaluations of both White and Black Americans. This interplay, including attitudes about Blacks and Whites was used to provide the framework for creation of her White racial identity theory.

Helms (1984) originally proposed that Whites may progress through five stages of racial identity in becoming racially conscious. She expanded on the five stages, (1990b) adding a sixth stage and clustering the six stages into two phases. Phase I (Abandonment of Racism) consisted of the stages of Contact, Disintegration, and Reintegration, and Phase II (Defining a Nonracist White Identity) consisted of the stages of Pseudo-Independence, Immersion/Emersion, and Autonomy. She suggested that each of the six stages had a characteristic set of attitudes, behaviors and emotions. The length of time an individual would spend in each stage and movement to the next stage were affected by the amount and kinds of cross-racial experiences which led to moral dilemmas and questioning and propelled the individual into the next stage.

Helms has since modified this theory (1995a), changing the term stages to statuses in order to indicate that movement between statuses can occur in either direction rather than only linearly from contact to autonomy as implied by the term stages. She also stressed that the term statuses implies a more flexible application of descriptors than does the term stages. This allows for overlap between the statuses wherein an individual may utilize strategies from more than one status simultaneously.
Her more recent expansions of her racial identity models (Helms, 1995a, 1996) also include a theoretical model to describe how interactions between individuals exhibiting attitudes indicative of two given statuses might occur. For example, this interactional model proposes different types of interactions between individuals where both members are in the same racial identity status and between individuals where one member is in a higher status than the other member. This interactional model also incorporates racial and gender differences. Thus, interactions might differ between two individuals who are both at the same racial identity status based on the race or gender of the individuals in the pair (i.e. both men, one man one women, both Black, one Black one White, etc.). Helms' descriptions of beliefs, behaviors and attitudes that are manifested more frequently by individuals operating primarily within a particular status provide the basis for the interactional effects that might occur between two different individuals.

Helms’s (1990b, 1995a) Contact status is characterized by a naive curiosity about Blacks and racial differences. Individuals high in Contact attitudes are unaware of their Whiteness and see racial differences as interesting but unimportant. These individuals implicitly assume White behavior, values, and culture are normative and equate them with competence. Contact status individuals tend to idealize a “colorblind” perspective in self and organizations. Movement from the Contact status into the Disintegration status occurs when the individual encounters ideas and/or situations that are anomalous with their personal belief system.

The Disintegration status (Helms, 1990b, 1995a) begins when the individual starts to consider the discrepancies between previously held beliefs and anomalous
inter-racial experiences. Exploration of the anomalies between the new inter-racial experiences and previously held beliefs leads the individual to acknowledge his or her membership in a socially dominant race. This acknowledgment includes recognition of the consequences of this membership for the individual themselves and for members of other races. Both current and past events provide numerous examples of injustices against minority individuals which the individual White person must take into consideration. An added consideration for the individual White person is the ostracism which may occur if he or she transgresses against White racial norms that dictate behavior in cross-racial interactions. The conflict between the two beliefs/goals of social justice and acceptance lead the individual White person to feel anxious, guilty, and depressed. Various strategies are attempted by these individuals to reduce the dissonance created by the discrepancy of self-view and racism. The way any individual resolves this dissonance determines the next step in his or her racial identity development. If the individual is not supported in his or her development or experiences rebuffs from other Whites or Blacks while in the Disintegration status, he or she discontinues voluntary cross-racial contacts and retreats into White culture. If the individual is supported in his or her experiences he or she will continue these experiences gradually increasing both knowledge and understanding of race and racial issues.

The status describing the attitudes related to retreating into White culture is called Reintegration (Helms, 1990b, 1995a). The Reintegration status is characterized by hostility and anger toward Black culture and strong positive biases toward White culture. Racial factors may play a large role in life decisions as the
individual makes choices that physically distance him or her from racially different others. These individuals utilize selective perceptions and extreme negative stereotyping of minority group members to justify their continued racist attitudes and behaviors. The Reintegration status is fairly stable and it requires a much stronger event or series of events to cause the individual to move from this status than from the initial Contact status. If the individual experiences a significant enough event or series of events, however, they may reenter the Disintegration status and eventually proceed to the first of the statuses in the second phase of racial identity development, that of defining a non-racist White identity.

The first status in the second phase of White racial identity is called Pseudo-Independence (Helms, 1990b, 1995a). The attitudes related to this status involve beginning to develop a positive White racial identity. Pseudo-Independence is marked by genuine curiosity about cross-racial relations, and an intellectualized acceptance of African-Americans and the validity of other cultural perspectives and values. This acceptance of others is often not integrated into the individual's emotional responses or value system. Thus, the individual may claim an openness toward cultural differences while remaining fearful of cross-cultural interactions and maintaining many less obvious racist beliefs. An example of this type of covert racist attitude is the idea that Whites need to help racially different others become more like Whites. The individual does maintain a positive identification with his or her Whiteness. As in the Reintegration status, this White identification is often accompanied by selective perceptions of both majority and minority cultures. Individuals in the Pseudo-Independence status do not tend to seek out cross-racial
contacts, although they can be open to them when they occur. Individuals who remain open to these contacts, may begin to reshape their beliefs about other racial groups and advance to the next status. If they adhere strongly to White cultural norms and avoid challenging assumptions about minority culture individuals, they may retreat into the Reintegration status.

In Immersion/Emersion (Helms, 1990b, 1995a), stereotypes about Whites and Blacks are replaced with accurate information, and the individual searches for an answer to “Who do I want to be racially?” This may involve reshaping their beliefs about race, power, and racial interactions. The primary difference between this status and the previous Pseudo-Independence status is where the individual locates responsibility for racial issues and racial tension (Helms, 1992). In the Pseudo-Independence status, responsibility is ascribed to People of Color. In this status, the individual acknowledges the part that Whites play in the continued existence of racial problems. In response to the awareness of White culpability, the individual may tend toward hypervigilance in their racial interactions. As the individual develops greater comfort with their own racial identity and in their interactions with racially different others they move on to the final status in the model.

In Autonomy (Helms, 1990b, 1995a), the final status of White racial identity development, there is a deeper appreciation for racial differences, not just intellectually, but on an affective level as well. This intellectual and emotional appreciation is combined with active involvement in cross-racial interactions. These individuals no longer see White behavior and values as normative, but as one
valuable approach among many. Diversity is desired and felt to be a strength within organizations and groups, rather than an impediment to effective functioning.

According to this model, each of the statuses described above may be resolved either positively or negatively. Positive resolutions promote the progression from lower levels of racial consciousness (e.g. contact) to higher levels of racial consciousness (e.g. autonomy). Helms further hypothesized that positive resolutions (and thus progression from one status to the next) are associated with better cross-racial interactions and a greater degree of personal adjustment. Parham (1989) suggested that an individual may be at different statuses with respect to different issues in their lives and that recycling through the statuses as one reaches different life stages is to be expected.

Results of several studies, most using the WRIAS, support Helms's conceptualization of her White Racial Identity Development Model (Block, Roberson, & Neuger, 1995; Carter, Gushue, & Weitzman, 1994; Claney & Parker, 1989; Helms & Carter, 1991; Steward, Boatwright, Sauer, Baden, & Jackson, 1998; Tokar & Swanson, 1991). Some of these studies considered how racial identity attitudes relate to other types feelings, attitudes, and behaviors involved in interracial experiences (Block et al., 1995; Carter et al., 1994; Claney & Parker, 1989; Helms & Carter, 1991). The remaining studies investigated the developmental aspects of racial identity as demonstrated by relationships with personal orientation and self actualization (Tokar & Swanson, 1991), and relationships with other forms of development, i.e. cognitive (Steward et al., 1998).
Four studies compared other racially related values and attitudes with racial identity attitudes. The first of these was done by Claney and Parker (1989) and utilized an instrument designed by them (White Racial Consciousness Development Scale: WRCDS) to measure the stages of Helms model. A drawback to this study is that the WRCDS due to limited items had no subscales reach the .70 reliability recommended by measurement experts (Kaplan & Sacuzzo, 1989). Claney and Parker (1989) polled 339 White undergraduate students (125 women, 162 men, 52 did not report sex). Results of a comparison between attitudes measured by this instrument and an instrument that measured an individual's comfort with Blacks were statistically significant. The results indicated a curvilinear relationship between racial identity stage and comfort level. The following mean comfort levels were acquired for each stage: 94.81 for stage 1 (equivalent to Contact stage in Helms's model), 89.63 for stage 2 (equivalent to Encounter stage in Helms's model), 81.75 for stage 3 (equivalent to Reintegration stage in Helms's model), 91.16 for stage 4 (equivalent to Pseudo-Independence stage in Helms's model), and 99.5 for stage 5 (equivalent to Autonomy stage in Helms's model). Helms's theory (1990a, 1992, 1995) predicts just such a curvilinear relationship in comfort levels for individuals strongly endorsing particular subscales. The theory starts by presuming that no-contact equates to presumed comfort. As an individual experiences more interracial interaction their suppositions are challenged, this results in greater discomfort with racially different others. The retreat back into White culture detailed in the third status accompanies fear of interaction with racially different others and thus the lowest comfort level. Intellectual acceptance, a hallmark of the Pseudo-Independence status creates
more comfort. Finally the greater involvement coupled with emotional and intellectual
acceptance is tied to the highest levels of comfort with racially different others.

The second study was done by Helms and Carter (1991) who polled 183
White undergraduate students (124 women, 59 men) using the WRIAS and a
measure designed to assess counselor preference. They found that White racial
identity attitudes predicted subjects’ preferences for White counselors. The following
relationships statistically significantly predicted this preference: Higher scores on the
Disintegration subscale were related to an increased preference for White
counselors, higher scores on the Pseudo-Independence subscale were related to an
increased preference for White counselors, and higher scores on the Autonomy
subscale were related to a decreased preference for White counselors. The results
for the Pseudo-Independence status and Autonomy status in particular strongly
support Helms’s theory. According to Helms’s theory, Pseudo-Independence
involves an intellectual acceptance of racially different others but does not
encompass emotional comfort with racial issues. Therefore, these individuals prefer
White counselors because they do not feel ready to actively challenge their racial
identity beliefs. In Helms’s theory, Autonomy involves engagement in racial issues at
both an intellectual and emotional level. Because the individual is actively engaged in
racial issues and actively attempting to understand the issues involved and react to
them in a positive fashion, these individuals are willing to work with counselors of
other races.

In the third study, Carter et al. (1994) polled 109 White undergraduate
students (79 women, 30 men) using the WRIAS and a values scale designed to
measure values or satisfactions sought in life. They found a relationship between a pattern of racial identity attitudes and a pattern of values. The racial identity attitude endorsement pattern was: High Disintegration attitudes (.76), high Reintegration attitudes (.82), low Pseudo-Independence attitudes (-.47), and low Autonomy attitudes (-.38). The researchers labeled this pattern "White superiority attitudes". These attitudes related to the following values: Economic security (.65), advance (.58), cultural identity (.53), economic reward (.52), prestige (.41), authority (.38), altruism (-.38), and achievement (.38). The relationship between elements in this particular pattern of White racial identity attitudes and personal values meshes with Helms's theory particularly strongly for specific values. For instance, valuing own-culture cultural identity is important to maintaining attitudes of cultural superiority (high Reintegration). Many of the values matched to this pattern of racial identity attitudes also adhere to the values of the dominant culture (e.g. economic reward, prestige, authority, and achievement). These dominant culture beliefs are likely to be strongly endorsed by individuals who endorse high levels of Reintegration attitudes and less strongly endorsed by individuals who endorse high levels of Pseudo-Independence attitudes or high levels of Autonomy attitudes.

The fourth study was done by Block et al. (1995) and polled 98 part-time MBA students (76% men, 24% women). They used the WRIAS and a measure of how individuals reported reacting to interracial situations at work. They found statistically significant relationships between certain patterns of endorsement of racial identity attitudes and certain patterns of reactions to interracial situations at work. The first pattern of racial identity attitudes included endorsement of higher levels of
Disintegration attitudes, endorsement of higher levels of Reintegration attitudes, and endorsement of lower levels of Autonomy attitudes. This pattern was related to the following workplace reactions: Not endorsing equality in the workplace, not perceiving discrimination against Blacks, perceiving reverse discrimination against Whites, not supporting affirmative action or organizational, management, or interpersonal interventions designed to lead to more equitable treatment for all races.

The second pattern of racial identity attitudes included endorsement of higher levels of Contact attitudes, endorsement of higher levels of Disintegration attitudes, and endorsement of higher levels of Autonomy attitudes. This pattern was related to supporting organization-wide management interventions to promote racial equality in the workplace. The third pattern of racial identity attitudes included endorsement of higher levels of Pseudo-Independence attitudes and endorsement of lower levels of Contact attitudes. This pattern was related to the following workplace reactions: Perceiving racial discrimination against Blacks, being less likely to support management or personal interventions to promote racial equality in the workplace, being more likely to report feelings of comfort in work-related social situations involving Black colleagues. Additionally, these researchers reported that a curvilinear relationship between WRIAS subscale scores and comfort level with Blacks was supported by their data. This relationship was similar to that reported by Claney and Parker. Both the patterns they found between racial identity attitudes and reactions to interracial situations at work and the curvilinear relationship between WRIAS subscale scores and comfort levels with Blacks support Helms's theory. For a discussion of how the curvilinear relationship between comfort level with racially
different individuals and WRIAS subscale scores support Helms's theory see the argument following the study by Claney and Parker cited previously. For arguments about how the relationship between the patterns of WRIAS attitudes and endorsement of reactions to interracial situations at work support Helms's theory see below. In the first pattern, the WRIAS subscales indicate a White racist belief structure, which matches the reactions to interracial situations endorsed by this group (e.g. failure to see discrimination against Blacks, seeing reverse discrimination, against affirmative action). In the second pattern, the WRIAS subscales indicate a somewhat racially accepting viewpoint. This viewpoint matches the endorsement of supporting organizational interventions to promote racial equality in the workplace. In the third pattern, the WRIAS subscales indicate an attitude of intellectual liberalism without any active involvement with racially different others. This viewpoint also matches the reactions to interracial situations endorsed by this group (e.g. perceive racial discrimination against Blacks but are unlikely to support action to ameliorate this situation).

The two studies that investigated the developmental aspects of racial identity are detailed below. Tokar and Swanson (1991) polled 308 White undergraduate students (159 men, 149 women) using the WRIAS and a measure designed to evaluate self-actualization and capacity for intimate contact. Self-actualization was operationalized through the use of two scores, a time competence score and a inner directedness score. Tokar and Swanson (1991) found statistically significant relationships between four WRIAS subscales (Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-independence, Autonomy) and both measures of self-actualization and the measure.
of capacity for intimate contact. They reported the following relationships for time competence: -.37 for Disintegration, -.32 for Reintegration, .20 for Pseudo-Independence, and .30 for Autonomy. They reported the following relationships for inner directedness: -.35 for Disintegration, -.33 for Reintegration, .26 for Pseudo-Independence, and .33 for Autonomy. They reported the following relationships for capacity for intimate contact: -.25 for Disintegration, -.26 for Reintegration, .14 for Pseudo-Independence, and .20 for Autonomy. All of these relationships were in the expected directions anticipated by Helms's theory. The directions emphasizing that higher levels of racial identity development were related to greater self-actualization and greater capacity for intimate contact.

Finally, Steward et al. (1998) polled 82 White counseling graduate students (59 women, 23 men) using the WRIAS and a scale designed to assess cognitive development. They assessed the following cognitive strategies: Dualism, relativism, commitment, and empathy. They found statistical significance for a relationship between Dualism and two racial identity attitudes, Contact and Reintegration. This parallel between a lower level cognitive processing strategy and lower levels of racial identity development provides some support for the developmental nature of Helms’s White racial identity theory.

As evidenced in the above paragraphs, Helms’s model of White racial identity has been employed in explorations of racism (Carter, 1990b; Claney & Parker, 1989; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994b), work and cultural values (Carter et al., 1994; Carter & Helms, 1990), cognitive development (Steward, et al., 1998), counseling process (Atkinson, 1987; Carter, 1990a; Carter & Helms, 1992; Helms 1990b; Helms &
Carter, 1991; Robinson 1989), counseling supervision (Cook & Helms, 1988),
counselor training (Parker et al., 1998), multicultural counseling competencies (Ottavi
et al., 1994), and program level resistance to cross-cultural counselor training (Mio &
Morris, 1990). It has been expanded from its original form by Helms (1990b, 1995a,
1996) to explain interpersonal interactions between members of various races, and
by other researchers (Parham, 1989; Ponterotto, 1988; Sabnani et al., 1991).
Ponterotto (1988) and Sabnani et al. (1991) adapted the model to explain the racial
identity development experienced by counselor and therapist trainees in a
multicultural course. This latter expansion of Helms's White racial identity
development theory will be covered to provide the reader with an understanding of
how racial identity attitude development might be utilized in a multicultural training
environment. These models are discussed next.

Expansion of Helms's Model for Counselor and Therapist Trainees

Ponterotto (1988) formulated a stage model of White racial consciousness
development for counselor trainees based on the model proposed by Helms (1984).
He based this model on his experience teaching multicultural classes in a counselor
training program. His model proposed four stages of development in majority culture
counseling graduate students: (1) Pre-exposure, (2) Exposure, (3) Zealot-Defensive,
and (4) Integration. In this model he states that most students begin the multicultural
training course in the Pre-exposure stage. In this stage the counselor trainee has
given little thought to multicultural issues or to his or her role as a White person in a
racist and oppressive society. This stage is similar to the Preencounter stage of the
Cross (1971) model. Class activities and topics expose students to the realities of racism and prejudice, which many did not think still existed. These activities propel students into the Exposure stage where they are forced to examine their role as a White member of U.S. society. Students are led to examine their own cultural values and they learn how these Euro-American values have become encapsulated and taken for granted throughout most of the United States. The racial self-examination characteristic of this stage parallels that which occurs in the Contact stage of the Helms (1984) model and in the Encounter stage of the Cross (1971) model. Ponterotto reports that as the multicultural counseling class progresses, it becomes clear to students that the counseling profession is ethnocentrically biased and subtly racist. He suggests that at this point in the Exposure stage, many White students begin to feel both angry and guilty. The students' attempts and efforts to deal with these feelings of anger and guilt mark entrance into the third stage of development, the Zealot-Defensive. In this stage, the student responds in one of two ways, either by taking a pro-active minority stance or by retreating from multicultural issues altogether. The pro-active minority stance aspect of this stage is similar to Helms (1984) Disintegration stage, where the individual is attempting to minimize personal dissonance by reacting against racist attitudes which had previously gone unchallenged and unconsciously accepted. In contrast, the retreat aspect is similar to Helms Reintegration stage. However, Ponterotto (1988) points out that within the multicultural class context students are not allowed to retreat if they wish to complete the course. The final stage, Integration, occurs when the strong dichotomous feelings of the Zealot-Defensive stage subside. The students become more
balanced in their multicultural interests and endeavors, accepting both White and minority culture, and those that retreated become more open, acquiring a renewed interest, respect, and appreciation for cultural differences. This stage parallels closely the Internalization stage of the Cross (1971) model, and the Autonomy stage of the Helms (1984) model.

Sabnani et al. (1991) also provided a stage model of White counselor trainee development based on the models of Hardiman as cited in Katz (1985), Helms (1984) and Ponterotto (1988) and incorporating the idea of stage recycling and reprocessing suggested by Parham (1989). Their model includes six stages labeled: (1) Lack of awareness of self as a racial being (Preexposure), (2) interaction with members of other cultures (Conflict-1), (3) breakdown of former knowledge regarding racial matters; conflict (Conflict-2), (4) pro-minority stance (Prominority/Antiracism), (5) pro-white, anti-minority stance (Retreat into White culture), (6) internalization (Redefinition and Integration). These stages closely parallel Helms (1990b, 1995a) stages/statuses in later revisions of her model. Two significant contributions of the model are (1) specification of goals to promote trainee development and (2) explanation of movement through the stages. Each of these contributions will be explored in the following paragraphs.

Sabnani and colleagues (1991) provided several goals for individuals in each stage in order to promote development of a culturally effective White counselor identity. For their Preexposure stage, they suggested three principle goals. The first of these involves expanding the trainees awareness of his or her own and other's cultures through safe experiences with culturally different others. The second goal for
the Preexposure stage is for the trainee to expand his or her knowledge of own and other cultures through research and study. The third and final goal for this stage is for the trainee to begin developing general counseling skills that apply to most cultures. For the second and third stages in their model, Conflict 1 and 2, they also suggest three goals. The first of these involves exploring stereotypic, racist, and conflicting attitudes and beliefs surrounding one’s attitudes toward minorities. The second goal for this second stage involves learning about the effects of prejudice and racism. The third goal for this stage is for the trainee to begin learning culturally specific intervention skills. The fourth stage, Prominority, also contains three goals. The first of these involves becoming aware of tendencies to either over-identify or to adopt paternalistic attitudes toward minority members and the effect these tendencies have on the minority others. The second goal of the Prominority stage is to develop more in depth knowledge of minority history and culture. The third goal of this stage is to expand one’s repertoire of culturally specific intervention skills. For the fifth stage, Retreat, the individual is exhorted to focus on their anger in order to work through these feelings. They are also asked to explore topics like racial minority identity models to help them build empathy for culturally different others. Finally, they are asked to refocus their attention on universal counseling skills in order to circumvent the adverse affect on learning of negative emotions. The sixth stage, Integration focuses on three things: Developing a personal identity that acknowledges Whiteness, acquiring specific knowledge of racism within the field of counseling and the greater culture, and deepening cross-cultural counseling skills.
The second contribution of the model proposed by Sabnani and colleagues (1991) is the system they devised to explain movement through the stages of the model. They describe a series of decision points within the model which can result in either forward or backward movement among the stages. For example, between stage two and stage three they ask the question “Is the person too rigid?” (p. 83). Based on the answer to this question the individual may recycle to stage one or continue to progress to stage three. Another example of one of these decision points occurs following stage three. The question there asks “Is retreat into White culture a more viable way of dealing with conflict?” (p. 83). If the answer to this question is yes, the individual progresses to stage five (Retreat). If the answer to this question is no, the individual progresses to stage four (Prominority). These decision points occur between each stage except the movement from lack of awareness to interaction.

Three studies provide evidence to support the importance of covering racial identity development in counselor and psychologist training programs. In the first study (Carter & Helms, 1992), researchers demonstrated that the racial identity development of the therapist impacts on the working quality of the therapeutic milieu. In the second study (Burkard, Ponterotto, Reynolds, & Alfonso, 1999), researchers identified relationships between racial identity attitudes and the establishment of therapeutic working alliance. In the third study (Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999) researchers identified two additional areas of multicultural competency that should be addressed in training (definitions and racial identity).

Carter and Helms (1992) considered how the racial identity attitudes of counselors impacted on their relationship with their clients and the productivity of the
therapeutic work. This study demonstrated the importance of addressing racial identity in multicultural training. Carter and Helms (1992) used a subject pool of 33 pairs (n = 66) of individuals recruited from a counseling seminar on racial identity issues. The subjects consisted of 16 Blacks and 50 Whites of whom 52 were women and 14 were men. The subjects participated as either clients or counselors in mock therapy sessions. Client and counselor pairs were formed in all possible racial combinations for the available subject pool (i.e. Black-Black, Black-White, White-Black, White-White). In evaluating the data they considered the impact of parallel (both participants endorse similar racial identity attitudes), progressive (the counselor more strongly endorses attitudes from higher level statuses than the client) and regressive (the counselor more strongly endorses attitudes from lower level statuses than the client) combinations of client/counselor racial identity attitudes. These authors found significant correlations between racial identity attitudes and elements of therapist intentions, comfort of therapist, comfort of client, client perception of therapeutic relationship, and therapist perception of therapeutic relationship for each of the three types of relationships (parallel, progressive, regressive). For parallel relationships there were 15 statistically significant correlations. The combination of the statistically significant correlations for this relationship type suggests that counselor intentions are a more important process dimension than client reactions in these sessions. Additionally, they also suggest that this relationship may be counterproductive when counseling involves racial content. There were 14 statistically significant correlations between racial identity attitudes and the other measures for individuals engaged in progressive relationships. A finding from these
correlations is that greater focus is placed on client needs rather than counselor needs. The pattern of correlations gotten for the progressive type of relationship suggests that this therapeutic relationship is characterized by non-conflicted therapeutic work on the part of the counselor in response to client needs and self examination on the part of the client. Finally, there were 17 statistically significant correlations found for regressive relationships. The pattern of correlations for this type of relationship suggests that counselors in these types of relationships are likely to treat racial issues as the client's problem rather than their own or society's problem. The therapeutic relationship in regressive relationships based on the pattern of correlations is likely to contain greater session hostility due to client attempts to deepen knowledge and understanding of racial issues while the counselor attempts to maintain a sense of power and authority. The results of this study suggest that when dealing with racial issues it is best if the racial identity development of the counselor exceeds that of the client. Without interventions designed to help counselors and therapists develop their own racial identity it is unlikely that majority culture counselors will be able to effectively address racial issues with their minority culture clients.

Burkard et al. (1999) surveyed 124 White graduate counseling students (91 women, 33 men) using the WRIAS and a measure of therapeutic working alliance. They assessed the participants reactions to a vicarious counseling situation involving career related issues. These researchers found inverse statistically significant relationships between Disintegration (-.48) and Reintegration (-.35) subscale scores and therapeutic working alliance formation. They also found statistically significant
positive relationships between Pseudo-Independence (.37) and Autonomy (.29) subscale scores and therapeutic working alliance formation. This study suggests that racial identity attitudes influence the working alliance in a therapy session even when racial issues are not the topic under consideration. Thus higher levels of racial identity development are associated with more effective therapeutic alliance formation which suggests that Multicultural training addressing racial identity development has the ability to improve the counselor's or therapist's sessions with same culture individuals as well as other culture individuals.

Holcomb-McCoy and Myers (1999) polled 151 professional counselors (68% women, 32% men, 66% White, 19% Black, 6% Latino/Hispanic, 5% Asian American or Native American, 4% indicated other) using a measure developed by the researcher to assess multicultural counseling competence and training. They submitted their data to factor analysis and identified five factors of multicultural competency that explained 63% of the variance in the items: Knowledge, awareness, definitions, racial identity development, and skills. Their analysis added two additional factors to multicultural competency (racial identity development, definitions) beyond that addressed by Sue and other researchers working to develop multicultural competencies, models, and goals (Arredondo, 1999; Arredondo et al., 1996; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992; Sue et al., 1982; Sue & Sue, 1990). They also found that those individuals who had completed a multicultural counseling course reported statistically significant higher levels of multicultural counseling competence on the knowledge and racial identity dimensions. The results of this study suggest that racial identity development is a component of multicultural
competence and that multicultural training (taking a multicultural course) is related to higher levels of racial identity development.

Ponterotto's (1988) use of a stage model of racial identity in his multicultural classes and Sabnani and colleagues' (1991) model and recommended counselor training goals suggest that racial identity development may be an important aspect of any multicultural training. More recent writings on the place of racial identity development in multicultural training corroborate its value in this area (Constantine, 1999; Pack-Brown, 1999; Watt, 1999). Finally, results from the studies reported above (Burkard et al., 1999; Carter & Helms, 1992; Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999) provide empirical evidence to support the importance of racial identity development. While Helms's model of White racial identity attitude development will be used in this study due to its being operationalized for use in research, the two models described above suggest how racial identity development training may be operationalized in graduate level multicultural counseling courses. The models and research cited above suggest a direction of effect which the current study was designed to test. These directional predictions run from multicultural training to racial identity attitudes and from racial identity attitudes to multicultural therapy competence. The current study explored these relationships and others, with counseling and psychology trainees.

Gender Identity

Another aspect of cultural identity is that of gender identity. As with racial identity, theory suggests that differences exist in the development of gender identity.
attitudes between the dominant and non-dominant groups. To facilitate understanding of the issues related to gender identity, this section has been further divided into four subsections: Background, androgyny research, women's gender identity, and men's gender identity. The Background subsection covers the literature that stressed differences between men and women and resulted in women being labeled deficient when compared to men. This background should enable the reader to understand the inclusion of women as members of a non-dominant group. The next subsection describes the emphasis on androgyny that resulted from a reaction, generally by women, to being labeled deficient. The final two subsections explore the formation of models of gender identity development for both women and men that stemmed from the previous research.

Background

Many researchers have suggested that there exists in our society a socially constructed cultural difference between men and women, resulting from differences in societal expectations about appropriate behavior for each gender (Agonito, 1977; Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972; Gilligan, 1982; Gray, 1992; Lerner, 1985, 1989; Tannen 1990, 1994). In the past, researchers have looked at these differences by comparing men's and women's behaviors (Bem, 1974, 1977; Rodriguez, Nietzel, & Berzins, 1980; Rosen & Aneshensel, 1984; Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Tannen, 1990, 1994; Zimmerman & West, 1975), attitudes (Baker, Terpstra, & Larntz, 1990; Bird, Bird, & Scruggs, 1984), and psychological health (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, & Vogel, 1992).
1970; Rosen & Aneshengel, 1984; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). In accordance with the minority deficiency model previously mentioned (Sue, 1981), these comparisons have typically found women to be deficient in various ways when compared to men (Brems & Schlottmann, 1985; Gibson, 1990; Ochoa & Morey, 1990; Poole & Tapley, 1988). Through this research, focused on differences between men and women, descriptions of ideal male and female traits were produced. Broverman et al. (1970), using trait descriptions in which the ideal male was defined by instrumental traits and the ideal female was defined by passive and relational traits, found that ideal male traits were considered healthy while ideal female ones were not. Following the work of Broverman et al. (1970), many researchers pointed out the similarity between women's role descriptions and descriptions of depressive individuals (Abramson, Seligman, & Teasdale, 1978; Broverman et al., 1972; Whitley, Michael, & Tremont, 1991). This discrepancy between gender appropriate role behavior and perceived healthiness of individuals, particularly women, led researchers to question the value of adherence to rigid sex roles (Bem, 1974). Some researchers advocated for the benefits of including both instrumental (masculine) and expressive (feminine) behaviors into a single gender role concept which they labeled androgyny.

**Androgyny Research**

Researchers suggested that neither of the sex-typed roles, masculine or feminine, was healthy (Bem, 1974; Garnets & Pleck, 1979; Pleck, 1981). The focus of gender research then changed to how men and women incorporate both male (instrumental) and female (relational) traits into their personal repertoire. The
incorporation of both types of traits became known as psychological androgyny (Sharpe & Heppner, 1991).

Authors of the theories of androgyny suggested that masculinity and femininity represented two different constructs rather than being opposite ends of the same construct (Bem, 1974; Cook, 1987; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975). The earliest conception of androgyny was proposed by Bem (1974). She posited that androgynous individuals, those possessing both masculine and feminine personality traits, would be better adjusted psychologically than sex-typed individuals. The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974), designed by her, utilized a comparison between the masculinity and femininity subscales to determine masculinity, femininity and androgyny. Greater difference between scale scores indicated either masculinity or femininity. Minimal or no difference between subscales indicated androgyny. Based on this criteria, an androgynous individual would identify with both masculine and feminine traits equally. Spence et al. (1975) suggested that Bem’s model failed to account for differences within those individuals labeled androgynous. Specifically, they suggested that there was a difference between individuals who scored low on both subscales and those who scored high on both subscales. Using their own androgyny measure, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence et al. 1975), they labeled high-high scorers as androgynous and low-low scorers as undifferentiated. Bem (1977) later agreed with Spence et al. (1975) that there were enough differences between high-high and low-low scorers to warrant two separate categorizations.
Exploration of the construct of androgyny illuminated two areas which were instrumental in the development of theories of gender identity. The first was a focus on within-group differences, which can be seen in the differentiation between high-high and low-low scorers into two categories (Bem, 1977; Spence et al., 1975). This focus led to an exploration of how gender roles develop (Condry, 1984; Cook, 1987). The second area was illuminated through research utilizing the BSRI and PAQ. This research indicated that masculinity consistently correlated positively more strongly than femininity did with self-esteem, healthy ego identity, and global measures of psychological adjustment (Bem, 1977; Berzins. Welling & Wetter, 1978; Orlofsky, 1977; Spence et al., 1975). In a comprehensive review of the androgyny literature, Cook (1987) stated the following:

Despite femininity’s positive relationship with a range of variables, masculinity is more strongly related to various indices of psychological health. This consistently stronger relationship is one of the most stable results to emerge from androgyny research, holding across a variety of androgyny measures and dependent variables. (p. 476).

The research results obtained with various measures of androgyny and the lack of an exploration of differences within groups (i.e. between individual men or between individual women) led to an active exploration of alternatives. While the androgyny research alluded to a within-group difference, other researchers began to actively address this issue (Downing & Roush, 1985; Gilligan, 1982; Helms as cited in Ossana et al., 1992; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Wade, 1998). The models proposed by these researchers hypothesized that gender attitudes were developed through individual and societal interactions with men and women, similar to the racial identity development models proposed in the early to mid 1970s (Cross, 1971;
Jackson, 1975; Thomas, 1970; Williams, 1975). Additionally, many researchers disagreed with the conclusion that traditional male gender roles are psychologically healthy (Good & Mintz, 1990; Good et al., 1995; Good & Wood, 1995; O'Neil, 1981a; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). The conflict between the results obtained about masculine roles by androgyny researchers and these later scientists raised questions about the usefulness of the PAQ, BSRI and other androgyny instruments. Coupling developmental theories of gender identity with instruments designed to address within-group differences provided the next step in the research of gender (Helms as cited in Ossana et al., 1992; O'Neil, 1981a; Wade, 1998). This next step, the exploration of female and male gender identity development will be discussed in the next two subsections on gender identity.

**Women's Gender Identity**

In response to the negative connotations applied to women and women's roles by the mainstream gender researchers, several feminist scholars proposed alternative explanations and models to explain women's experiences (Downing & Roush, 1985; Gilligan, 1982; Helms as cited in Ossana et al., 1992; McNamara & Rickard, 1989). Gilligan (1982) was one of the first to propose an alternative model of woman's development. She proposed that the developmental tasks of women are different since they focus primarily on attachment while those of men tend to focus on developing autonomy. Downing and Roush (1985) proposed a model of feminist identity development based on Cross's (1971) model of black identity development. Within this model they suggested that women experience similar identity
development experiences to those of racial minority individuals. One similar type of experience is that of being oppressed by majority group individuals. This oppression is in the form of sexual discrimination and sexual harassment toward women. The model proposed by Downing and Roush (1985) provides a framework for understanding how women develop a positive gender identity despite the socially lower position of being a woman and the related sexism they experience in society. The model proposed a five-stage theory: (1) passive-acceptance, (2) revelation, (3) embeddedness-emanation, (4) synthesis, and (5) active commitment.

In stage 1, Passive-acceptance, the woman accepts traditional sex roles, seeing them as advantageous to her. She also considers men to be superior to women. She is "either unaware of or denies prejudice and discrimination" (p. 698) against women, and unquestioningly accepts the dominant system. She carefully selects her peers in order to maintain this belief system.

In stage 2, Revelation, "a crisis, or series of crises or contradictions occur that cannot be ignored or denied" (p. 698). These experiences elicit anger, and to a lesser degree, guilt. These emotions are intensely felt when the subject considers oppression experienced in the past and her participation in that oppression. Intense self-examination and questioning of previous roles then occurs. This stage is also "characterized by dualistic thinking regarding male-female relationships, where all men are seen as negative and all women as positive" (p. 700).

In stage 3, Embeddedness-emanation, a woman "develops close emotional connections with other similar women, providing her with the opportunity to discharge her anger in a supportive environment" (p. 701). These women also provide
affirmation for her new identity. Emanation occurs as more relativistic thinking replaces dualism. Women in this half of stage three also begin to interact with men again, albeit cautiously.

Stage 4, Synthesis, is characterized by the development of a positive feminist (i.e. proactive female) identity, where both "oppression-related explanations for events and other causal factors can be considered in making attributions" (p. 702). Sexism is no longer seen as the cause of all social and personal ills. The woman is able to take a stand that may separate her from many other feminists and yet still maintain her identity as a feminist. There is an integration of personal and feminist values that result in an authentic feminist identity.

Stage 5, Active commitment, is characterized by "translation of the consolidated feminist identity of stage four into meaningful and effective action" (p. 702). Women in this stage set personal priorities, based on their unique talents, for effecting societal change.

The Downing and Roush model (1985) has been used in two studies by Rickard, neither of which was ever published (Rickard as cited in McNamara & Rickard, 1989). This limits the amount of information available about the number of subjects and details of the research design. In the first study, Rickard (as cited in McNamara & Rickard, 1989) developed an inventory to measure level of feminist identity as proposed by the Downing and Roush model. She reported that factor analysis of that instrument supported the stages as proposed. She also correlated scores on that measure with a measure of self-esteem, a measure of androgyny, and a measure of attitudes about working women. She found a statistically positive
relationship between self-esteem and higher levels of gender identity development. She also reported ascending positive correlations between stages of feminist identity and positive attitudes toward working women. Rickard states that there was a statistically significant relationship between androgyny scores and feminist identity in predicted directions as well, i.e. high androgyny correlated with low passive-acceptance and low androgyny correlated with high passive-acceptance. Information provided about the second study by Rickard (as cited in McNamara & Rickard, 1989) did not contain enough detail to substantiate any results obtained.

Helms proposed a similar model of identity development for women, but without the feminist and activist stance of the Downing and Roush model. Helms's (as cited in Ossana, Helms & Leonard, 1992) model of womanist identity development, although never published separately, has been briefly described and utilized in several different studies (Carter & Parks, 1996; Ossana et al., 1992; Parks et al., 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997). This model focuses on the within-group differences among women in their experience of womanhood. Helms's stages of womanist identity (four) parallel her stages of Black racial identity development and share designations with the stages in that model (Preencounter, Encounter, Immersion/Emersion, and Internalization). The attitudes exhibited at each stage level are similar within the two models.

In the Preencounter stage, women conform to societal expectations. Individuals in this stage tend to be unaware of the effect of societally entrenched sexism on themselves and on other women. They also tend to idealize men and the masculine ideology that permeates the society. Many even incorporate beliefs that
devalue women and women's roles in the society. Movement from this stage occurs when a woman experiences an event or series of events that brings the differential treatment of men and women in society to her attention. The stage the woman enters from Preencounter is labeled Encounter. In this stage the woman begins questioning the gender status quo. She may also begin searching for a positive gender identity rather than settle for the one placed upon her by society. As a woman deepens her search for a personally relevant and positive gender identity, she enters the Immersion-Emersion stage. To accomplish the task of developing a positive womanist gender identity (i.e. internally defined positive female identity), the woman may associate only or primarily with other women, reject masculine viewpoints, disassociate herself from men, and idealize female points of view. Women in the Immersion-Emersion stage often use female group norms to define their personal gender identity. After the woman develops her own personal womanist identity, she can move on to the final stage, Internalization. In the Internalization stage, the woman has achieved a personal gender identity that no longer relies upon external gender role norms. This woman begins to renew her associations with men and feels comfortable interacting with both women and men.

Helms's womanist identity development model has been used in four studies to assess correlation of stages of womanist identity with various other factors. The factors that have been correlated with womanist identity stages are mental health symptoms (Carter & Parks, 1996), measures of self esteem (Ossana et al., 1992), and racial identity measures (Parks et al., 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997). Two studies found that mental health symptoms related differently to higher
and lower stages of identity development (Carter & Parks, 1996; Ossana et al., 1992).

In the study by Ossana, Helms and Leonard (1992) surveying 659 undergraduate women (76.5% White, 12.9% Black, 7.7% Asian American, 2% Hispanic, .8% American Indian), they found that Preencounter, Encounter and Immersion-Emersion scores were significantly inversely related to self-esteem scores and Internalization scores were positively related to self-esteem scores. These results support Helms’s model of Womanist identity development in the following ways: (a) high scores for the Preencounter scale which measures attitudes that reflect conformity to the dominant (White male) view of women are inversely related to self esteem, (b) high scores for Encounter and Immersion/Emersion scales which measure attitudes that involve an identity-in-flux are inversely related to self esteem, and (c) high scores for the Internalization scale which measures attitudes that reflect a fully formed, positive womanist identity are positively related to self esteem.

In the study by Carter and Parks (1996) surveying 218 undergraduate women (147 White, 67 Black, 4 Asian, Latina or Native American), they found differences in the results obtained for Black and White women. For Black women there was no relationship between scores on the Womanist Identity Attitude Scale and scores on a measure of psychopathological symptomatology. For White women they found that stage of womanist identity was related to psychological functioning. They reported that higher scores on Preencounter, Encounter and Immersion-Emersion subscales were related to higher levels of psychopathological
symptomatology, while higher scores on the Internalization subscale were related to lower levels of psychopathological symptomatology. The results from Carter and Parks (1996) support Helms's theory in a similar fashion as that demonstrated by the results of the study by Ossana et al. (1992). The first way that this study supports Helms's theory is demonstrated through the relationship between the subscale that measures attitudes of conformity to dominant culture expectations (Preencounter) and higher levels of psychopathological symptomatology. The second way the results from this study support Helms's theory is evidenced through the relationship between attitudes representing transition between conformity with dominant culture expectations to a pro-woman stance (Encounter, Immersion/Emersion) and higher levels of psychopathological symptomatology. And the third relationship found by these researchers to support Helms's theory, is between the subscale that assesses attitudes that reflect integrated positive attitudes toward women and being a woman (Internalization) and lower levels of psychopathological symptomatology. The results of the two studies (Carter & Parks, 1996; Ossana et al., 1992) provide support for Helms's premise that gender identity is a proactive developmental process, although the results from the study by Carter & Parks (1996) only confirm this result for White Women. The lack of findings for Black Women in the Carter and Parks study (1996) may be a function of low power as the numbers of Black Women surveyed was much less than the number of White Women surveyed. Results from these two studies suggest that achievement of the highest level of gender identity development is a desirable goal.
The studies by Parks and colleagues (1996) and Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson (1997) found correlations between womanist identity stages and racial identity statuses for Black women (for more details see section on racial identity and gender identity later in this chapter). The results from both of these studies (Parks et al., 1996 and Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997) suggest that these two types of identity development (racial and gender) may be parallel processes. This relationship supports the developmental and identity aspects of the Womanist Identity Model. These results are similar to those obtained by Rickard (as cited in McNamara, & Rickard, 1989) in her exploration of the Downing and Roush (1985) feminist identity development model.

The results of the five studies detailed here (four on Helms model and one on Downing and Roush’s model) demonstrate the importance of considering within-group differences, like that of gender identity development stage, rather than a more global measure like androgyny. Several researchers have noted the importance of training counselors to consider these within-group differences in working with women (Carter & Parks, 1996; Cook, 1990; Good et al., 1990; McBride, 1990; McNamara & Rickard, 1989, Scher & Good, 1990).

Men's Gender Identity

In identity development literature, the trend seems to be in recognizing such development for minority individuals before majority individuals. Therefore, just as white racial identity development followed minority racial identity development, so male gender identity development followed female gender identity development. For
men, research shifted from the construct of androgyny, to a consideration of the impact of conforming to or deviating from traditional male gender role norms (Good & Mintz, 1990; Good et al., 1995; Good & Wood, 1995; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991; Thoreson, Shaughnessy, Cook & Moore, 1993). Pleck (1981), expanding on the treatise of Garnets and Pleck (1979), elucidated a sex-role stress paradigm to explain the negative effects of socialized gender roles. This paradigm enumerates several propositions indicating that gender roles produce conflict and strain for both sexes. Pleck's paradigm indicates that: (a) violation of gender roles can lead to negative psychological consequences, (b) certain gender-role characteristics are psychologically dysfunctional, (c) both sexes experience strain and conflict because of gender roles. These assumptions are based on two theories of sex role strain, self-role discrepancy theory and socialized dysfunctional characteristics theory. Self-role discrepancy theory suggests that individuals suffer negative consequences when they fail to live up to sex roles. Socialized dysfunctional characteristics theory suggests that because of sex roles, individuals are socialized to have personality characteristics that are dysfunctional (O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986). Pleck's sex role strain paradigm provided a theoretical base to study gender-role conflict in men's and women's lives.

O'Neil and his colleagues (O'Neil, 1981a, 1981b, O'Neil et al., 1986) expanded on Pleck's (1981) approach to studying the traditional male gender role by focusing on a particular gender construct, which O'Neil (1981b) labeled gender-role conflict. He defined gender-role conflict as a psychological state in which gender roles have negative consequences for the individual or others. In essence, O'Neil
postulated that the traditional male-role socialization provides contradictory and unrealistic messages, resulting in considerable internal conflict. Subsequently, O'Neil et al. (1986) developed the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS) to assess men's thoughts and feelings about gender-role conflict. The scale consists of four factors: (1) Success, Power, and Competition; (2) Restrictive Emotionality; (3) Restrictive Affectionate Behavior Between Men; and (4) Conflicts Between Work and Family Relations. Several studies empirically examined the relationship between gender-role conflict as measured by the GRCS and psychological well-being (Coumoyer & Mahalik, 1995; Good & Mintz, 1990; Good et al., 1995; Sharpe & Heppner, 1991). Findings from these studies indicated that gender-role conflict was significantly negatively correlated with psychological well-being.

The studies of gender-role strain (AKA sex-role strain), by assuming that individual males could have different adaptations to the same societal gender-role norms, moved the study of male gender roles into the area of within-group differences. In response to the stress on within-group differences and the proliferation of cultural identity development models, Wade (1998) proposed a theory that incorporated a developmental paradigm to explain male gender role acquisition. Wade (1998) stated that he developed his theory by incorporating ego identity theory, reference group theory, and the theoretical formulations of Habermas (as cited in Wade 1998) and Garnets and Pleck (1979). In doing so, he formulated two propositions to provide the theoretical foundation for his theory of male reference group identity dependence. The first proposition suggests that "a man's gender role self-concept is related to his level of ego identity development and subsequently will
be either unintegrated, externally defined and conforming, or internally defined and integrated" (p. 363). Wade defines an unintegrated identity as undifferentiated and reliant upon external validation. He defines an integrated identity as one where the individual relies upon his own judgment of appropriate behaviors and does not need outside validation for his self concept. The second proposition posits that "a man's gender role self-concept is related to the extent to which he uses a particular reference group and hence either unformed or conflicted due to no reference group, dependent on a particular reference group, or not dependent on a reference group" (p. 363). These two propositions provide a 3X3 model of male gender role self-concept formation. In this 3X3 model, each level of ego-identity (e.g. unintegrated) combines with the extent and style of reference group use (e.g. reference group dependent) in describing masculine identity.

Wade (1998) defines a male reference group as "an internal representation of males like oneself and/or of male peers with whom one identifies." (p. 363) He then defines male reference group identity dependence as the extent to which a male is dependent on a male reference group for his gender role self-concept. As the basis for his theory, he gives four postulates: (1) "Males identify with other males to the extent that they feel a psychological relatedness to a particular group of males or to all males" (p. 364), (2) "three levels of ego identity are associated with three levels of psychological relatedness to other males" (p. 366), (3) "feelings of psychological relatedness to other males are associated with how males use reference groups for their gender role self-concept" (p. 366), (4) "how males use
reference groups for their gender role self-concept is related to their gender-related attitudes and the quality of their gender role experiences" (p. 367).

Wade and Gelso (1998) developed an instrument, the Reference Group Identity Dependence Scale (RGIDS), to measure males' dependence on other males for their gender role definitions. This instrument assesses men's connection to other men and their reliance upon these others for their personal definition of masculinity. It measures pieces of a developmental process that moves from a man having no connection to other men and an unformed masculine concept through the man feeling connection to some men and relying upon these males for his masculine concept to the man feeling connection to all males and creating his own personal masculine identity. It is this masculine identity creation process and the statuses within that are being considered in this study.

The theory proposed by Wade shares many aspects with Helms's theories of racial and gender identity. It also differs from the theories formulated by Helms in some significant ways. Similarities between Helms's and Wade's theories include the following: Both are developmental processes, both ensue from the ego-identity development theories of Erikson, both focus on interaction with others to influence identity development, and both theories focus on gender related attitudes as markers of developmental level. Additionally, Wade's theory, like Helms's theory of White racial identity does not consider oppression a motivator in male gender identity. Differences between Helms's and Wade's theories of identity development are also fairly significant. Helms and Wade propose different motivations for their majority culture models. Helms suggests that a sense of fairness and justice impel
White racial identity development. Wade suggests that a man's need for affiliation propels men's gender identity development. All of Helms's models rely on comparisons between the group in question and a contrast group (i.e. Whites and Blacks, Women and Men). While Wade's theory relies on comparisons within the same group (i.e. compares men with men). At this time, Wade has proposed the only available model of masculine gender identity development. Helms has in progress a model of masculine identity that is similar to her models of womanist and racial identity. But this model is not available at this time (Maria Thurkson, June 3, 1999 personal correspondence). Additionally, this model has many similarities to Helms models which are being used in this study. These two factors make Wade's model the only viable choice for inclusion in this study.

Multicultural Counseling Training and Competencies

In this section the literature on the proposed study's third area of exploration, multicultural training and competencies, is covered. The section begins with a subsection that gives a brief overview of the issues involved in multicultural training. This is followed by a subsection that provides an overview of training models specifically designed to aid in the development of multicultural competencies. Then, in the next subsection, research on multicultural competencies is briefly covered. After which, a subsection covering cultural awareness, the understanding of cultural differences, and the import of one's own culture is explored. A final subsection brings together the areas of cultural identity development, particularly racial and gender
identity, and multicultural competencies. This area stresses the importance of cultural identity in multicultural competency.

Overview of Multicultural Training

Following the position papers of the Association of Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES: 1979) and Sue and colleagues (1982) that stressed the importance of multicultural competence for working with a multicultural population, many theorists and researchers struggled with the issue of how to convey the recommended competencies to practitioners in the field (Arredondo, 1999; Arredondo-Dowd & Gonsalves, 1980; Arredondo et al., 1996; Atkinson et al., 1983; Carney & Kahn, 1984). As research in the area of diversity counseling expanded, knowledge about specific minority groups became more widely available (Atkinson, 1987; Gim, Atkinson & Kim, 1991; Helms, 1979; Lopez, Lopez & Fong, 1991; Maykovich, 1973; Robinson, 1989) and training programs were encouraged to implement multicultural components that focused on knowledge acquisition (Ibrahim & Arredondo, 1986; Mio & Morris, 1990). Several researchers specializing in multicultural issues criticized counseling and psychology training programs for not doing enough to address multicultural issues (Burn, 1992; Casas, Ponterotto & Gutierrez, 1986; Das, 1995). Educators specializing in multicultural issues stressed that knowledge alone was insufficient to prepare effective multicultural counselors and therapists (Arredondo-Dowd & Gonsalves, 1980; LaFromboise & Foster, 1992; Nwachuku & Ivey, 1991; Pedersen, 1978, 1988; Pedersen & Ivey, 1993; Ponterotto, 1988; Ponterotto & Casas, 1987; Sabnani et al., 1991). Some of these educators
proposed training models designed to raise trainee consciousness with regard to intrapersonal and interpersonal individual cultural differences (LaFromboise & Foster, 1992; Locke & Kiselica, 1999; Nwachuku & Ivey, 1991; Pedersen, 1978, 1988; Pedersen & Ivey, 1993; Ponterotto, 1988; Sabnani et al., 1991). Among the theorists advocating for training beyond the acquisition of culture-specific knowledge, were some (Pack-Brown, 1999; Ponterotto, 1988; Richardson & Molinaro, 1996; Sabnani et al., 1991) who stressed personal cultural identity development as a step in becoming a culturally competent practitioner.

In the next four subsections, greater detail about multicultural training is provided. This detail includes: Current multicultural training models, research on the effectiveness of multicultural training and the development of multicultural competencies, cultural awareness as a precursor to the development of multicultural competency, and cultural identity development, especially racial identity development and its importance to the development of multicultural competencies.

Training Models for Developing Multicultural Competencies

Several authors (Arredondo, 1999; Arredondo et al., 1996; Sue, Arredondo & McDavis, 1992) have expanded on the overview of recommended multicultural competencies covering the three dimensions of (1) beliefs and attitudes, (2) knowledge, and (3) skills proposed by Sue et al. (1982). Sue and Sue (1990) suggested three goals to address in multicultural instruction: (1) developing cultural self-awareness, (2) learning and accepting others' worldviews, and (3) developing and practicing appropriate intervention strategies and skills. Sue and colleagues
(1992) provided a framework for what they believe to be necessary cross-cultural competencies by combining the goals proposed by Sue and Sue (1990) with the dimensions of multicultural competency outlined by Sue and colleagues (1982).

In their framework, Sue et al. (1992) combined the dimensions of Sue et al. (1982) with the goals suggested by Sue and Sue (1990) into a 3X3 design with each of the dimensions subsumed under each of the goals. The 3X3 design yields nine separate competency areas, one for each dimension and goal intersection. In this model, each goal has three specific competency areas for beliefs, knowledge, and skills respectively. For example, the goal of developing cultural self-awareness applies differently (i.e. has different specific competencies) for its intersection with each of the separate dimensions (i.e. beliefs and attitudes, knowledge and skills).

Examples of specific competencies for the goal of developing cultural self-awareness under the different competency dimensions defined by Sue and colleagues (1982) follows. For the dimension of beliefs and attitudes, “Culturally skilled counselors have moved from being culturally unaware to being aware and sensitive to their own cultural heritage and to valuing and respecting differences” (p. 482). For the dimension of knowledge, “Culturally skilled counselors have specific knowledge about their own racial and cultural heritage and how it personally and professionally affects their definitions and biases of normality-abnormality and the process of counseling” (p. 482). For the dimension of skills, “Culturally skilled counselors are constantly seeking to understand themselves as racial and cultural beings and are actively seeking a nonracist identity” (p. 482). Sue et al. (1992)
provided several general competencies within each of the nine areas generated by the model.

Arredondo et al. (1996) also expanded on the works of Sue et al. (1982) and Sue et al. (1992) by providing a dimensional model of personal identity over which to apply the multicultural competencies. They proposed three dimensions of personal identity. The first dimension, which they label the "A" dimension, is a listing of relatively fixed characteristics that most individuals are born with or into, examples include ethnicity, gender, and age. The second, or "B" dimension contains items that are influenced by the other two dimensions, A and C. Examples of "B" dimension items include educational background, income, and work experience. The final dimension, "C", covers universal phenomena or the context for individual identity development. The aspects covered by the "C" dimension include all of the cultural and historical milieu. Using these personal identity dimensions, they provided details of specific ways to apply multicultural training to increase multicultural competency. All of these models were intended to inform training designed to improve counselor abilities to work with multicultural populations.

**Multicultural Competency Research**

Most of the research on multicultural competencies has attempted to discern which variables most account for multicultural competence (Allison, Echemendia, Crawford & Robinson, 1996; McEwen & Roper, 1994; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994; Pope-Davis, Reynolds, Dings, & Nielson. 1995; Sodowsky et al., 1998; Talbot, 1996; Talbot & Kocarek, 1997). Several of these researchers evaluated self-perceived
multicultural competencies in student affairs and higher education graduate programs (McEwen & Roper, 1994; Talbot, 1996; Talbot & Kocarek, 1997), while others considered self-perceived multicultural competencies with counselors and counselors-in-training (Allison et al., 1996; Ottavi et al., 1994; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994; Sodowsky et al., 1998). The studies done in higher education and student affairs programs utilized one-time data collection procedures and self-report instruments designed by the authors to assess multicultural competencies.

In the first of the studies done in higher education and student affairs (McEwen & Roper, 1994), researchers polled 453 master's level students (400 White, 33 Black, 6 Hispanic, 5 Asian, 9 other 311 women, 141 men) from 28 student affairs preparation programs. Using analysis of variance statistical procedures they compared overall multicultural knowledge for Whites and Blacks with both race and gender as variables. They found a statistically significant main effect for race but not for gender (i.e. Blacks endorsed having higher levels of overall multicultural knowledge than did Whites). These authors did not identify any interaction effects for race and gender.

In the second of the studies done in higher education and student affairs (Talbot, 1996), the researcher polled 321 master's students (263 White, 58 racial/ethnic minority, 257 women, 64 men) in one of eight student affairs or higher education graduate programs. Using multiple regression analysis, the researcher evaluated the extent that demographic variables accounted for variability in the subjects comfort level with diversity. Only sexual orientation, i.e. identifying as gay, lesbian, or bisexual was identified as a useful predictor of multicultural comfort.
In the third of the studies from higher education and student affairs (Talbot & Kocarek, 1997), the researchers polled 137 full- and part-time graduate faculty (119 White, 18 racial/ethnic minority, 79 men, 58 women, 125 heterosexual, 12 lesbian/gay/bisexual) in two different years (49 in 1991 and 88 in 1993). These faculty were teaching in college student affairs programs. Using analysis of variance to identify differences in multicultural knowledge, multicultural skills and multicultural comfort, these researchers found statistically significant differences for multicultural knowledge for gender only. Women reported higher levels of multicultural knowledge than men for both years (1991 and 1993).

The majority of the studies done with counselors and counseling and psychology trainees used the Multicultural Counseling Inventory, a self-report instrument designed to specifically assess multicultural therapy competencies. In one study, however, the authors designed an instrument specifically for that study (Allison et al., 1996). In these studies, surveying counselors, psychologists and counseling and psychology trainees, researchers found that race, i.e. belonging to a minority race (Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994), taking a multicultural course (Ottavi et al., 1994; Pope-Davis, Reynolds, Dings & Nielson, 1995; Sodowsky et al., 1998), conducting multicultural research (Sodowsky et al., 1998), attending multicultural workshops (Ottavi et al., 1994; Pope-Davis et al., 1995), completing clinical practicas (Ottavi et al., 1994; Pope-Davis et al., 1995), being involved in multicultural supervision (Pope-Davis et al., 1995) and seeing greater numbers of minority clients (Allison et al., 1996; Ottavi et al., 1994; Pope-Davis et al., 1995; Sodowsky et al., 1998) predicted multicultural competencies.
Pope-Davis and Ottavi (1994) in a survey of 220 counselors (136 women, 84 men, 15 Asian-American, 26 African American, 10 Hispanic, 169 White) found some specific differences in reported multicultural competency based on the race of the respondent. In general, racial minorities reported greater multicultural competence in all areas except multicultural skills when compared to Whites. But only Asian American and Hispanic counselors reported higher competencies than White counselors in knowledge.

Ottavi and colleagues (1994) surveyed 128 White counseling graduate students (88 women, 40 men). They reported that greater endorsement of some racial identity variables and some training variables predicted certain multicultural competency scores. Racial identity attitudes predicted multicultural competence in all areas of multicultural competency. Three of the training variables they considered, number of minority clients seen, number of multicultural workshops attended, and number of practica completed predicted the multicultural awareness competency. These three training variables did not predict multicultural knowledge, skills or relationship competencies.

Allison et al. (1996) surveyed 292 doctoral psychologists who were members of the American Psychological Association (APA) (164 women, 128 men, 260 White, 10 African American, 7 Asian American, 5 Hispanic, 1 Native American). Racial/ethnic minority groups were underrepresented in the sample despite attempts to over sample this population. These researchers explored the relationship between various experiences with specific minority groups and reported multicultural competency in working with members of these groups. Using regression analysis,
Allison et al. (1996) found that the number of current cases with various minority group members, the number of training cases with various minority group members, and the quality of supervision predicted reported multicultural competency in working with some minority groups. The number of current cases with members of specific minority groups, was statistically significant in predicting multicultural competency for the following groups: African Americans, Hispanics, Gays, Lesbians and Motor Impaired individuals. The number of training cases with members of specific minority groups was predictive of competency across a wider range of client demographics (African American, Asian American, American Indians, Black Hispanics, Gays, Lesbians, Bisexuals, Sensory Impaired, Motor Impaired and Economically Disadvantaged). The quality of supervision predicted reported competency in working with sensory impaired and motor impaired clients as well as economically disadvantaged clients. These researchers also found that the respondents gender and race predicted certain multicultural competencies. Women reported greater competence in working with women. While racial/ethnic minority psychologists reported greater competence in working with Whites and with the economically disadvantaged than White psychologists did.

Pope-Davis et al. (1995) examined the multicultural competencies of 344 counseling and clinical psychology graduate students (46% counseling psychology, 54% clinical psychology, 244 women, 100 men, 264 White, 34 African American, 18 Asian American, 18 Hispanic, 4 American Indian, 6 Other). They found that the following training variables predicted multicultural competence, multicultural coursework, multicultural workshops, diverse client caseload, multicultural
supervision. They reported that these training variables predicted specific multicultural competencies. Thus, having taken a multicultural course predicted greater multicultural Knowledge and Awareness competencies for Clinical Psychology students. Having participated in multicultural workshops predicted multicultural awareness competency for both clinical and counseling psychology students. Having worked with clients from racial/ethnically diverse backgrounds predicted multicultural Knowledge and Awareness competencies for counseling psychology students. Participating in greater numbers of hours of multicultural supervision predicted multicultural Knowledge and Awareness competencies for Clinical Psychology students. And, having completed clinical practica predicted multicultural awareness for counseling psychology students. Pope-Davis et al. (1995) also found that of the demographic variables investigated (age, gender, ethnicity) only ethnicity predicted multicultural competence and only for the specific multicultural competency areas of Knowledge and Awareness.

Sodowsky et al. (1998) assessed multicultural competencies in 176 university counseling center staff ranging from bachelor’s level counselors (n = 4) to doctoral psychologists (n = 87) (123 White, 25 Asian, 15 Black, 13 Hispanic). The survey used a demographic sheet, the MCI, a multicultural social desirability scale, a measure of social inadequacy and a measure of locus of control race ideology (assesses whether the individual believes control of racial issues is the responsibility of the individual or the group). These researchers used a four-step, forced-entry multiple regression analysis in which the multicultural social desirability scale variable was entered first followed by racial demographic variables. They then entered the
variables of social inadequacy and locus of control race ideology. The final step was to enter the multicultural training and experience variables. They found that even after factoring out multicultural social desirability (statistically significant at p < .01) and race (Latino statistically significant at p < .05) the other variables still added to the prediction of multicultural competence. Specifically, social inadequacy, locus of control race ideology, numbers of minority clients, participation in multicultural research, and completion of multicultural coursework all predicted multicultural competence. These researchers reported that with increased multicultural training multicultural social desirability scores and feelings of social inadequacy scores decreased, while locus of control race ideology scores tended toward externality. They also reported differences in multicultural competency scores based on race of respondent with Blacks having the highest mean multicultural Relationship score and Whites the lowest. Additionally, Blacks, Asians and Hispanics each had higher scores than Whites in multicultural Awareness with the latter two groups also having higher scores in Multicultural Knowledge than Whites as well. The minority groups also had lower scores than Whites on feelings of social inadequacy and scores that reflect a more external focus of locus of control race ideology.

Based on the findings summarized above, it appears that three types of variables have a significant effect on multicultural competency, minority group status, counseling and therapy experience, and experience interacting and working with minority individuals. In several of the studies cited minority group status predicted higher levels of self reported multicultural competencies. Specifically, minority race (McEwen & Roper, 1994, Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994; Sodowsky et al., 1998).
minority sexual orientation (Talbot, 1996), and minority gender (Talbot & Kocarek, 1997) all predicted higher levels of self-reported multicultural competencies. Experience was also a significant predictor of multicultural competence, both clinical experience and multiculturally specific experience. Two types of experience were found to predict higher levels of multicultural competence in more than one study: Completing a multicultural course and seeing minority clients (Ottavi et al., 1994; Sodowsky et al., 1998). Of the many variables associated with multicultural competencies (minority group status, working with minority individuals, clinical and multicultural experience), this study focuses primarily on variables that can change or be influenced by either students or instructors (i.e. multicultural coursework, multicultural conference attendance, multicultural workshop attendance, minority client contact, supervision hours addressing multicultural issues, numbers of supervisors/instructors representing minority cultures, and number of students in program representing minority cultures). Information about these variables that can be affected through consciously chosen actions by psychology and counselor trainees and educators may inform curricula within counselor training programs.

Cultural Awareness

The issue of cultural awareness will be addressed here in greater detail because this competency area has proved particularly difficult for educators to conceptualize and explain. Many authors, several predating the ACES (1979) and Sue et al. (1982) papers on the need for multicultural competence, have called for counselors and therapists to become aware of their own attitudes, beliefs, and

For White counselors, understanding their own culture is particularly difficult both within the wider cultural milieu and within the counseling-related professions. Within the society at large, White culture is the dominant culture and as such is pervasive, permeating every aspect of the society. This pervasiveness creates difficulty in pinpointing and identifying its components, aspects, and effects separate from ethnic cultures and other non-dominant racial cultures. Within the counseling-related fields, White culture is also difficult to recognize. This is because most of the theories of personality and helping that counselors and therapists are using to understand themselves and others are embedded in dominant culture counseling theories (Christensen, 1989; Katz, 1985; Ponterotto & Casas, 1987). These theories based on the dominant culture support the dominant culture view already held by the White counselor. Therefore, White counselors are likely to interpret the other's behavior based on their own cultural expectations and the theories they have been taught rather than considering cultural differences. If they do consider cultural differences they are still likely to position the problem in the other culture rather than recognize the impact of both cultures on the current situation.
Katz (1985) calls for the profession to recognize the influence of its own culture on practitioners and make efforts to move beyond this cultural embeddedness to a greater understanding and explication of this culture and its interaction with other cultures. Ponterotto and Casas (1987) agreed with Katz's assessment and noted that traditional counseling theories, research, and practicum courses taught in most programs were enmeshed in a core set of cultural values and norms that were explicitly "White" middle class. They stated that these cultural values are so inherent and so taken-for-granted that most counseling students and faculty members were not even aware of the culturally biased values they held. Several professionals described this cultural encapsulation which they encountered in counseling training programs (Durodoye, 1999; Parrilla de Kokal, 1999; Thomas, 1999; Williams, 1999). Many professionals (Durodoye, 1999; Parrilla de Kokal, 1999; Ponterotto & Casas, 1987; Thomas, 1999; Williams, 1999) agree that more than knowledge of the client's culture is necessary, it is also important to consider how this cultural background interacts with the power-dominant host society's cultural patterns, especially as they are enacted by the White therapist. The first step to understanding the interaction of cultures is to begin to understand one's own culture. Without this understanding, the impact of one's culture as part of the interaction between cultures is overlooked. Overlooking the impact of the dominant culture on other cultures impedes the acquisition of multicultural competence. Focus on racial identity development is one way to increase trainees' awareness of their own culture.
Cultural Identity Development and Multicultural Competencies

This section considers the relevance of personal cultural identity development as part of the process of developing multicultural competence. Several researchers have stressed the value of including strategies to help individuals develop their personal cultural identity in any training program designed to increase multicultural competence (Carney & Kahn, 1984; Helms, 1979; Ponterotto, 1988; Sabnani et al. 1991). Helms (1979, 1984, 1986) provides multiple examples of this type of approach. In an article on working with Black Women, Helms (1979) suggested incorporating these attitudes, (a) awareness of one's own personal attitudes towards Blacks, (b) belief that racially different is not necessarily disadvantaged, and (c) willingness to abandon middle-class values and moralistic judgments. Helms (1984, 1986) also expanded her racial identity attitude development theory to apply to the counseling process and to provide a model for working with clients around the issue of race. Based on the racial identity stage of counselor and client, she describes three types of relationships that can occur: Parallel, in which the counselor and client are at the same level of racial identity development; progressive, in which the counselor is at a higher level of racial identity development than the client; and regressive, in which the client is at a higher level of racial identity development than the counselor. She then hypothesized different issues, counselor strategies and counseling outcomes likely to occur in Black dyads, White dyads, and mixed race dyads for each of these types of relationships. As the optimum development, for the client, is usually achieved when they are in a progressive relationship, the importance of the counselor developing their own racial
identity becomes clear. Finally, Ponterotto (1988) and Sabnani et al. (1991) applied racial identity development strategies to multicultural training (see previous section: expansion of Helms's model for counselor and therapist trainees). While Ponterotto (1988) recommended including racial identity in multicultural training research.

Convergence of Racial Identity, Gender Identity, Multicultural Training, and Multicultural Competencies

Researchers have begun to explore how each of the variables covered in the previous sections (i.e. racial identity development, gender identity development, multicultural training and multicultural competencies) relate to each other. Several studies have been done exploring how two of these variables relate (Brown et al., 1996; Parks et al., 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997) while others have been done exploring the relationships between three of these four variables (Neville et al., 1996; Ottavi et al., 1994; Parker et al., 1998). In accord with this researcher's intent to incorporate racial identity, gender identity, multicultural training and multicultural competencies into a single study, this section describes the results of the studies which included two or more of these variables. The first topic area explored was racial identity and its convergence with gender identity. The next and final area for which literature exists covers the incorporation of racial identity, multicultural training and multicultural competencies. Currently no studies exist that include all four variables, nor do any studies exist that combine gender identity with either multicultural training or multicultural competencies. Following the overview of convergence literature within each area of convergence, the researcher will explain how these studies relate to the proposed study.
Racial Identity and Gender Identity

Racial and gender identity have been compared in two studies (Parks et al., 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997). The relationship between racial identity and gender identity was considered in a study by Parks et al. (1996). In a survey of 214 undergraduate Black and White women, the authors reported a statistically significant relation between racial identity and womanist identity attitudes for Black women but not for Whites. Parks and colleagues (1996) found no relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes for White women despite the fact that White women outnumbered Black women in the study by more than two to one. Since the number of subjects strongly impacts on the likelihood of achieving statistically significant results, the lack of a statistically significant relationship for White women when their numbers were twice that of the Black women suggests that no such relationship exists for White women. In a second study (Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997) comparing racial identity attitudes, gender identity attitudes and self-esteem, researchers surveyed 84 undergraduate Black women. They found correlations between all three of these constructs. Self-esteem was correlated, in theoretically anticipated directions with gender identity attitudes and with Preencounter and Internalization racial identity attitudes. Gender identity attitudes and racial identity attitudes also showed statistically significant correlations partially confirming the authors' hypothesis that racial identity attitude statuses would be positively related to comparable stages of womanist identity.
Both the study by Parks and colleagues (1996) and the study by Poindexter-Cameron and Robinson (1997) demonstrated a correlation between some gender identity stages with some racial identity statuses for Black women, supporting Helms's womanist and Black racial identity development models. These models, based on a response to oppression, require that similar tasks be accomplished in order to progress in identity attitudes. The study by Parks, et al. (1996) found no correlation between gender identity attitudes and racial identity attitudes for White women. However, since the theory of womanist identity is grounded in oppression, but the theory of White racial identity is not, this lack of correlation also fit with Helms's theoretical formulations.

In the current study, the relationship between racial and gender identity will be explored for Women of Color, White women, Men of Color, and White men. Results of the studies by Parks and colleagues (1996) and Poindexter-Cameron and Robinson (1997) suggest that the relationship between racial and gender identity development differs for Black and White women. Results from these studies suggest that Black women's racial and gender development is related (i.e. lower levels of one identity correspond with lower levels of the other identity and higher levels of one identity correspond with higher levels of the other identity) but that White women's racial and gender identity is not. No studies have been done comparing gender identity and racial identity for men.
Racial identity and multicultural training and competencies converge in four studies. In the first, racial identity attitudes were used to predict multicultural competencies (Ottavi et al., 1994). In the remaining three studies, change in racial identity attitude statuses was evaluated over the duration of a multicultural training course (Brown et al., 1996; Neville et al., 1996; Parker et al., 1998). The study by Neville et al. (1996) also assessed change in multicultural competencies in addition to evaluating change in racial identity attitude statuses over the duration of a multicultural training course.

In the first study (Ottavi et al., 1994), researchers found that for 128 White counseling graduate students (88 women, 48 men), racial identity attitudes explained variation in multicultural competencies beyond that accounted for by demographic variables. Using regression analysis, they block-entered all variables in the study beginning with demographic data (age and gender), then entering educational and clinical variables (multicultural coursework, multicultural workshop hours, multicultural clinical hours, multicultural supervision hours, and number of practicum) and finally entering WRIAS subscale scores. In this study the researchers used four of the subscales from the WRIAS, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy. Using a level of statistical significance of \( p = .01 \) they found that WRIAS subscale scores as a block contributed significantly to variance in multicultural competency subscale scores. Specific subscales contributed to this variance in different ways. The Pseudo-Independence subscale (.40) and the Autonomy subscale (.23) contributed to the Multicultural Skills subscale. The
Disintegration (.29), Pseudo-Independence (.44) and Autonomy (.40) subscales contributed to the amount of variance for the Multicultural Knowledge subscale. All racial identity subscales contributed to the variance found for the Multicultural Awareness subscale (-.41 Disintegration, -.25 Reintegration, .49 Pseudo-Independence, .29 Autonomy). Finally, only the Disintegration (-.28) and Pseudo-Independence (.45) racial identity subscales contributed to the amount of variance for the Multicultural Relationship subscale. The authors state “these results suggest that the development of White racial identity attitudes should be considered in the conceptualization and planning of interventions to improve White students’ multicultural counseling competencies.” (p. 151)

In the second study (Brown et al., 1996), the authors assessed change in White racial identity attitudes of 35 White counseling graduate students (25 women, 10 men) across a multicultural training course. They reported that Men’s scores in autonomy increased statistically significantly, while women’s scores in Pseudo-Independence did so. These results suggest that multicultural training affects racial identity attitude development for Whites. This study (Brown et al., 1996), also provides evidence that multicultural training has a different effect on racial identity for White males than for White females.

In the third study (Neville et al., 1996), researchers evaluated change in multicultural competency and racial identity attitude status in 38 counseling graduate students (28 Women, 10 Men; 29 White, 4 Black, 2 Asian American, 1 Latino/Hispanic, 1 American Indian, 1 Other) across the duration of a multicultural course. They also considered the relationship between racial identity attitude status
and multicultural competencies. In analyzing the effects of training on racial identity attitude statuses, Neville et al. (1996) found statistical significance for increases in only Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy statuses. They reported that no statistically significant changes occurred in the other three racial identity statuses: Contact, Disintegration and Reintegration. In their evaluation of the effect of multicultural training on multicultural competencies they found statistically significant increases in the three competency areas of Awareness, Knowledge and Skills. In considering the relationship between racial identity attitude status and multicultural competencies, Neville et al. (1996) found that higher levels of Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy racial identity attitudes were associated with stronger endorsements of multicultural competencies with one exception, higher Autonomy racial identity attitudes were not statistically significantly related to the multicultural Skills competency. They also found that higher levels of Contact and Disintegration racial identity attitudes were statistically significantly related to lower levels of reported multicultural competencies. The specific statistically significant relationships were as follows: Higher Contact attitudes were related to lower Awareness and Skills multicultural competencies and higher Disintegration attitudes were associated with lower Knowledge multicultural competency.

In the fourth study, Parker et al. (1998) assessed racial identity attitude change and interracial comfort in 116 White counselor education graduate students (85 women, 31 men) over the duration of a 15-week multicultural training course. The researchers noted an increase in the racial identity attitudes from three statuses: Contact, Pseudo-Independence, and Autonomy. They reported no change for the
other racial identity attitude statuses. Based on these results, they reported that multicultural training enhanced the awareness of the participants of themselves as racial beings.

In the current study, this researcher explored the extent that multicultural training predicts racial identity, gender identity and multicultural competency, as well as the extent that racial identity and gender identity predict multicultural competency. The overall trend within the studies described above suggested that multicultural training would predict racial identity (Brown et al., 1996; Neville et al., 1996; Parker et al., 1998) and multicultural competencies (Neville et al., 1996) and that racial identity would predict multicultural competency, at least for Whites (Neville et al., 1996; Ottavi et al., 1994). Additionally, the study by Brown et al. (1996) suggested that gender could be related to how multicultural training impacts on racial identity development status. Other than the information about how gender as a demographic variable impacted on change in racial identity development status, none of the above studies provided data to predict how multicultural training would affect gender identity attitudes nor how gender identity attitudes would affect multicultural competencies. Although the relationship between gender identity attitudes and racial identity attitudes described in the previous section suggested that for some groups gender identity attitudes might operate similarly to racial identity attitudes.

Rationale for the Present Study

Previous research in the areas of multicultural training, racial identity, gender identity, and multicultural competency has tended to focus on one or two of these
variables. However, no study has attempted to explore all these variables or how they may be related to one another. As mentioned in the converging studies above, multicultural training has been shown to predict racial identity status (Brown et al. 1996; Neville et al., 1996; Parker et al., 1998), racial identity status has been shown to predict multicultural competency (Neville et al. 1996; Ottavi, 1994), racial identity statuses and gender identity statuses have been shown to be related to one another in varying degrees across different racial designations (Parks et al., 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997), and finally, multicultural training has had a demonstrated effect on multicultural competency (Neville et al., 1996; Ottavi et al., 1994; Sodowsky et al., 1998). Taking into account these results, this researcher proposed a model to describe the interrelation of all of these variables. This model begins with Multicultural Training as the initial predictor and incorporates the other variables as either predicted and predictor variables (identity attitude variables) or simply the predicted variable (multicultural competency). As the initial variable, multicultural training is hypothesized to predict all three other variables (racial identity, gender identity, and multicultural competency). The two identity variables of gender and race are both predicted and predictor variables, they are predicted by Multicultural Training and predict Multicultural Competency. Additionally, the two identity variables are proposed to be correlated but not predictive of each other. The model incorporates direct predictive effects (all of those described above) and indirect predictive effects. The indirect effects are manifest in the predictive relationship between multicultural training and multicultural competency through the two identity variables of race and gender.
Research Questions and Design

There were two types of research questions asked for the current study. The first was concerned with the non-causal (i.e. non-directional) relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes. This question is addressed in the subsection labeled: Relationship between gender identity and racial identity. This question is an adjunct to the second question being asked in this study. The second was concerned with the predictive (i.e. directional) relationships among all four variables (multicultural training, gender identity attitudes, racial identity attitudes, and multicultural competencies) considered within a single interrelated model. This question is addressed in the section labeled: Relationship among multicultural training, racial identity, gender identity and multicultural competencies: A structural model. This model was the primary focus of this study.

Relationship Between Gender Identity and Racial Identity

One main area of exploration within the current study was the relationship between gender identity attitude statuses and racial identity attitude statuses. The research question for this area asked whether there was a relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes and if there was a relationship which variates (i.e. subscales) within the two variables were responsible for this relationship. The potential existence of this relationship between the two variables of gender identity attitudes and racial identity attitudes was explored by correlating all of the variates (i.e. subscale scores) of each identity collapsed into a single value with all of the variates of the other identity also collapsed into a single value. This type of
analysis, comparing two multi-variate sets is called Canonical Correlation Analysis. This analysis does not make comparisons within either group. Therefore subscales (i.e. variates) of racial identity attitude development are only compared with subscales of gender identity attitude development, not with other racial identity attitude development subscales. If the overall relationship between the two groups is statistically significant, further analysis will identify which pairings of variates are most responsible for the statistically significant results. This analysis procedure pairs each variate in one set with a variate in the other set, beginning with the pair that demonstrates the largest correspondence and continuing until all variates in the smaller set are paired with a variate from the larger set.

The theoretical bases for the racial and gender identity models included in this paper as well as the results of the studies comparing racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes suggested some hypotheses about these forms of identity development. First, the processes were proposed to be independent, although parallel types of processes. Second, members from oppressed groups were expected to exhibit higher levels of identity attitude development than members of the dominant culture. The hypotheses above suggested specific relationships between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes.

Combining the first hypothesis (that the processes are parallel) with the second hypothesis (that oppressed identity development will show higher levels of development than dominant culture identity development) generated two predictions for the relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes. The first of these was that the identity attitudes of individuals whose racial and gender
identity processes shared similar oppression effects (oppression/oppression or dominant culture/dominant culture) were likely to correlate across equivalent identity levels or statuses. The second of these was that the identity attitudes of individuals whose racial and gender identity processes reflect differing oppression effects (oppression/dominant culture) were not likely to correlate across equivalent identity levels or statuses.

Identity theory suggests that progression in various identity attitudes depends on the identity attitude status level involved. This is because progressive change at lower levels of identity development is presumed to be propelled by different factors for members of dominant and minority groups (Helms, 1990b). For dominant groups, change is theorized to be propelled by a sense of fairness and a curiosity about and interest in others (Helms, 1990b, 1992). For minority groups, change is theorized to be propelled by the psychological necessity to create a personally acceptable self-identity in an oppressive environment (Cross, 1971, 1978, 1995; Thomas, 1970). Therefore the lack of relationship between the two processes for those whose racial and gender identities represent different types of group membership (majority or dominant vs. minority or oppressed) is more likely at the lower levels of identity development. However, at higher levels of identity development, both dominant and minority theories propose that progressive change is propelled by similar goals. Two examples of these types of goals are: (1) to improve personal relationships across racial and cultural differences, and (2) to increase the consistency between one's ethics and one's actions. This difference in motivations mitigates the prediction that the identity attitudes of individuals whose
racial and gender identity processes reflect differing oppression effects (oppression/dominant culture) are not likely to correlate across equivalent identity levels or statuses. Thus the following prediction was arrived at: For individuals whose racial and gender identity processes reflect differing oppression effects (oppression/dominant culture) there was not likely to be relationships between equivalent lower level identity statuses, however, there might be relationships between equivalent higher level identity statuses.

In considering the relationship between gender identity attitudes and racial identity attitudes, some general predictions were described above. These predictions are brought together here. The first of these is that identity attitudes of individuals whose racial and gender identity processes share similar oppression effects (oppression/oppression or dominant culture/dominant culture) are likely to correlate across equivalent identity levels or statuses. The second prediction is that identity attitudes of individuals whose racial and gender identity processes reflect differing oppression effects (oppression/dominant culture) are not likely to correlate between equivalent lower level identity statuses, however, they may correlate between equivalent higher level identity statuses. The third and final prediction is that oppressed groups will endorse higher levels of identity development attitudes than dominant groups.

In applying these general predictions to the four racial/gender groups (White Men, White Women, Men of Color, Women of Color) several specific predictions were generated. The first prediction is based on the hypothesis of parallel processes. This prediction states that for both White Men and Women of Color there were likely
to be relationships between equivalent level statuses of racial and gender identity attitudes. The hypothesis that identity development differs for dominant and oppressed identities mediates this result for individuals who have identities from both types of cultures. The theory that identity development is propelled by different motives at lower levels and similar motives at higher levels for dominant/oppressed groups also mediates the first prediction and suggests the following prediction: For White women and Men of Color, there were not likely to be relationships between the lower level statuses of these variables but there might be positive relationships between the higher levels of these variables. Finally, including the hypothesis that identity development requires cross-cultural contact yielded the following predictions: Higher levels of Womanist identity attitude statuses would be endorsed than racial identity attitude statuses by White women; higher levels of racial identity (i.e. Black, Asian) attitude statuses would be endorsed than male gender identity attitude statuses by Men of Color; higher levels of male gender identity attitude statuses would be endorsed than racial identity attitude statuses by White men; and the relationship between racial identity development and gender identity development for Women of Color would tend to vary based on the level of oppression experienced for each identity aspect.

Relationships Among Multicultural Training, Racial Identity, Gender Identity and Multicultural Competencies: A Structural Model

The second research question is concerned with the relationship among the variables of multicultural training, gender identity attitudes, racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies. In order to explore the relationship between these
variables the researcher proposed a model that contains each of them using a structural equation modeling approach (SEM). Structural equation modeling is an approach that tests a complete model, rather than individual relationships among variables. This model is tested against either an alternative model or against an ideal model. For this study, the research model will be tested against a more limited model that includes only the variables of Multicultural Training, Racial Identity Attitudes and Multicultural Competency. This more limited model is visible in the results of the studies by Neville et al. (1996) and Ottavi et al. (1994), although these authors did not utilize a structural equation model approach in the analysis of their data. Additionally, this study will test the equivalence of this model for different racial and gender groups (i.e. Men of Color, Women of Color, White Men, and White Women).

Although SEM analysis cannot determine causality from correlational data, the ability of the model and the elements contained within it to explain the data can be evaluated through assessing the goodness of fit of the model (Asher, 1983; Fassinger, 1987). Determination of the model and the direction of causality was based upon theory and developed prior to model testing.

The model (see Figure 1) for the proposed study suggests that multicultural training predicts both identity attitude statuses (gender and race) and multicultural competency. Both racial and gender identity attitude statuses predict multicultural competency. Multicultural training is also indirectly predictive of multicultural competency through its relationship with the identity attitude statuses of gender and race. The constructs of gender identity and racial identity may be correlated with
Figure 1. The Conceptual Model of the Relationships Among Multicultural Training, Racial Identity Attitudes, Gender Identity Attitudes and Multicultural Competencies.

In this model, in accordance with the principles of structural equation modeling, the researcher defines the direction of causality/prediction a priori. Since direction has been assigned, relationships are assumed to be predictive. A predictive relationship is one where change in the first variable is presumed to effect or cause change in the other variable. Most relationships within the model are unidirectional. Relationships in which causality is presumed to flow back and forth are labeled reciprocal. Additionally, relationships can be considered non-causal but interrelated. These relationships are also considered reciprocal, however they are non-predictive.
A relationship between two variables is usually referred to as a path. Each variable may contain separate units (e.g. subscales of a measure) these units are labeled variates. To provide greater clarity, a relationship between two variates is referred to as a connection rather than a path. In SEM a unidirectional predictive relationship is termed recursive. The pre-defined predictive relationships for this model were arrived at based upon the available theory and research providing information about the relationships between these variables. This particular model contains several recursive paths between the variables and one non-predictive reciprocal relationship path.

The model (See Figure 1) begins with Multicultural training which, for the purposes of this model, is defined as an exogenous variable. An exogenous variable is a variable with a causal effect on other variables but for whom no other variable has a causal effect (Fassinger, 1987). Structural equation modeling (SEM) requires an exogenous variable for every causal path. Multicultural training is the exogenous variable of choice for this model because it is the variable that can be most directly acted upon by practitioners and psychology and counselor educators. Because it is the variable that can be directly influenced, knowledge of its effects are more useful than knowledge of the effects of unchangeable demographic variables (e.g. race, gender). The next two variables in the model are racial identity and gender identity. The final or terminal variable in the model is multicultural competencies. Multicultural training according to this model has three direct recursive paths to other variables. These paths are with racial identity, gender identity and multicultural competencies. Racial identity has two direct paths, one which is recursive the other which is non-
predictive and reciprocal. The path between racial identity and gender identity is non-predictive and reciprocal whereas the relationship between racial identity and multicultural competencies is recursive. Gender identity, like racial identity has two direct paths, one recursive and the other non-predictive and reciprocal. The linkage between gender identity and racial identity is non-predictive and reciprocal whereas the relationship between gender identity and multicultural competencies is recursive. Finally, multicultural training has two indirect unidirectional paths. These indirect paths are between multicultural training and multicultural competencies through each of the identity variables (gender and race). Analysis of the model was done using several measures to represent the separate variables in the model. This analyses was used to determine if this model fit the available data or if another model provided a better explanation for the relationships between these variables.

The researcher acknowledges that this model is not be the only model that explains the relationship between these variables. For example, reciprocal relationships could exist between several, and possibly all of the variables in the model. In particular, the variable of multicultural training and the two identity variables respectively (gender and racial) could be reciprocal in nature as could be the two identity variables with each other. However, due to limitations in time and money, and a need to limit items in an already fairly lengthy response packet, models requiring the incorporation of additional variables were not considered.

In the remaining portion of this section, subsections on each of the paths in the above model are explored beginning with the direct path between multicultural training and the two identity variables (i.e. race and gender). Following the
exploration of the paths between multicultural training and racial and gender identity, the identity variables' paths with multicultural competency are considered. The final two subsections explore the direct and indirect paths between multicultural training and multicultural competency beginning with the direct path and then considering the indirect paths through the identity variables. Within each subsection the rationale for choosing to include in the model the specific paths covered in that subsection will be explained. Additionally, the specific connections between variates within the variables that are likely to support each path are outlined.

**Multicultural Training Effects on Racial and Gender Identity**

This subsection covers two paths in the proposed model: The path between multicultural training and racial identity attitudes and the path between multicultural training and gender identity attitudes. Within each of these paths, there are several connections that form that path. A connection exists between each variate in one variable to each variate in the other variable. The variates in the multicultural training variable for this study are formal multicultural training and informal multicultural training. Each identity variable (White racial, People of Color racial, Womanist, Men's) has several variates corresponding to the levels of identity development within the particular identity theory involved. An example of the multiple connections that exist within a path can be seen in the path between multicultural training and gender identity for men. This path contains connections between the multicultural training variate of formal multicultural training and each of the four gender identity variates also known as gender identity statuses. It also contains connections
between the multicultural training variate of informal multicultural training and each of the four gender identity variates as well.

The path between multicultural training and racial identity attitude status was chosen for inclusion in the model because of the numerous suggestions by psychology and counseling educators that multicultural training should focus on racial identity development (Christensen, 1989; Das, 1995; Mio & Morris, 1990; Pack-Brown, 1999). Theorists have even proposed models of racial identity development that apply directly to multicultural training situations (Ponterotto, 1988; Sabnani et al., 1991). The direction of causality from multicultural training to racial identity was chosen based on several research studies which demonstrated that multicultural training produced change in racial identity attitudes for Whites (Brown et al., 1996; Ottavi et al., 1994; Neville et al., 1996; Parker et al., 1998). In these research studies, specific relationships were found between multicultural training and White racial identity attitude statuses. These specific relationships suggest specific connections within the path between multicultural training and racial identity attitudes that were expected to contribute most strongly to the statistical significance of the path. The connection between formal multicultural training and Pseudo-Independence attitudes is suggested by the results from four studies (Brown et al., 1996; Ottavi et al., 1994; Neville et al., 1996; Parker et al., 1998). The connection between formal multicultural training and Autonomy attitudes is supported by the findings of three studies (Brown et al., 1996; Neville et al., 1996; Parker et al., 1998). The connection between formal multicultural training and Contact attitudes is endorsed by the results from one study (Parker et al., 1998). Some differences in
these connections exist between men and women. In the study by Brown and colleagues (1996) multicultural training effected change in Autonomy attitudes for men and Pseudo-Independence attitudes for women. This path in the proposed model is supported for Whites. There is no prior research to support this path for People of Color.

Gender identity has never been studied in conjunction with multicultural training. Therefore inclusion of gender identity in this model was based upon the relationship between racial identity and gender identity. Given the results of studies correlating gender identity and racial identity for White women and Black women (Parks et al., 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997), it was anticipated that multicultural training would cause change in gender identity statuses as well as racial identity statuses.

The Effects of Racial and Gender Identity on Multicultural Competency

As with the previous subsection, this subsection also covers two paths, that between racial identity and multicultural competency and between gender identity and multicultural competency. Each of these paths also contains multiple connections. The number of these connections varies depending on the number of statuses within the specific racial or gender identity theory as applied to a particular reference group (White men, Men of Color, White women, Women of Color).

The path between racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies was chosen for inclusion in the model because a fairly large body of literature suggests that individual cultural awareness provides a mediating effect between multicultural
training and multicultural competency (Christensen, 1989; Das, 1995; Katz & Ivey, 1977; Ponterotto, 1988; Sabnani et al., 1991; Richardson & Molinaro, 1996). Studies have also been done that outline the effect of White racial identity on multicultural competence (Neville et al., 1996; Ottavi et al., 1994). The study by Neville and colleagues (1996) demonstrated connections between several White racial identity attitude statuses and multicultural competencies. They reported a relationship between high Contact attitudes and low endorsement of Awareness and Skills multicultural competencies. They found another inverse relationship between high Disintegration attitudes and low endorsement of multicultural Knowledge competency. They found positive relationships between Pseudo-Independence attitudes and Autonomy attitudes and Awareness and Knowledge multicultural competencies. Additionally they also found a positive connection between Pseudo-Independence attitudes and multicultural Skills competency. Results from the study by Ottavi and colleagues (1994) also support the positive connection between Pseudo-Independence attitudes and all multicultural competencies, and between Autonomy attitudes and multicultural Knowledge competency. The results from these studies suggested that the connections of Pseudo-Independent attitudes and Autonomy attitudes to multicultural competencies would provide the strongest support for this path. Additional support was expected to be provided by the connections between Contact attitudes and Disintegration attitudes and multicultural competencies.

The path between gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies was suggested by the work of McNamara and Rickard (1989). There have been no
research studies exploring the relationship between gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies. The research to support this path is drawn from the relationship between gender identity attitudes and racial identity attitudes reported by Parks and colleagues (1996) and Poindexter-Cameron and Robinson (1997). Given the results of the studies by Parks and colleagues (1996) and Poindexter-Cameron and Robinson (1997) correlating gender identity and racial identity for White women and Black women, it was expected that gender identity attitudes would cause change in multicultural competencies similar to the findings related to racial identity attitudes (Neville et al., 1996; Ottavi et al., 1994).

The Direct Effects of Multicultural Training on Multicultural Competency

The path between multicultural training and multicultural competency was chosen because the goal of all multicultural training is to improve multicultural competencies (Corvin & Wiggins, 1989; D’Andrea, Daniels & Heck, 1991; Pedersen, 1978; Pedersen & Ivey, 1993; Ponterotto & Casas, 1987; Sue & Sue 1990). The goal of multicultural training, to produce change in multicultural competencies, also provides the direction of causality for this path in the model, from multicultural training to multicultural competencies. The path between these two variables contains eight connections, one from each of the two multicultural training variates (formal and informal multicultural training) to each of the four multicultural competency variates. Two studies provide evidence to suggest that all of the connections in this path would contribute to the statistical significance of this path in the model. A study by Sodowsky et al. (1998) supports the connections between
both formal and informal multicultural training and all four multicultural competencies. In a poll of 176 university counseling center staff (111 women, 65 men; 125 White, 19 Asian, 12 Black, 11 Hispanic, 9 other) they reported that having taken a multicultural course, being involved in research, and seeing more minority clients significantly predicted all types of multicultural competencies. In a study by Ottavi et al. (1994) in which counseling students were polled (see the section on the effects of racial identity and gender identity on multicultural counseling competencies), they found that educational and clinical experience variables accounted for a significant increase in variance in multicultural competency scores. In particular, multicultural course work accounted for significant variance for each type of multicultural competency, while client contact hours with racial-ethnic diverse clients, workshop hours, and number of practicum accounted for significant variance in only the multicultural Awareness competency.

The Indirect Effects of Multicultural Training on Multicultural Competency

This subsection also contains information on two different compound paths. A compound path is a path that incorporates two paths into itself. The first compound path is that between multicultural training and multicultural competency through racial identity. This compound path is composed of the path between multicultural training and racial identity and the path between racial identity and multicultural competency. The second compound path is that between multicultural training and multicultural competency through gender identity. This compound path is composed of the path between multicultural training and gender identity and the path between...
gender identity and multicultural competency. These compound paths provide a measure of the indirect effects of multicultural training on multicultural competency. The literature supporting the separate paths within the compound paths (e.g. between multicultural training and racial identity) supports these indirect effects. As with the individual direct effects, each path contains multiple connections. The connections that support these compound paths are limited by the need for the identity variates (racial and gender identity attitude statuses) to connect both with multicultural training and with multicultural competencies. Any identity variate that only connects with one of the other variables will not support the compound path.

Prior studies provide data to support the compound path containing racial identity attitudes. However these studies only support the connections from formal multicultural training to the Awareness, Knowledge and Skills multicultural competencies. There are several specific compound connections supporting the connection from formal multicultural training. The first of these is through Autonomy attitudes to Awareness and Knowledge multicultural competencies. The studies by Brown and colleagues (1996), Neville and colleagues (1996) and Parker and colleagues (1998) support the first half of this connection and the study by Neville and colleagues (1996) supports the second half. The second compound connection is through Pseudo-Independence attitudes to Awareness, Knowledge and Skills multicultural competencies. The first half of this compound connection is supported by several studies (Brown et al., 1996; Neville et al., 1996; Ottavi et al., 1994; Parker et al, 1998). The second half is supported by results from a study by Neville and colleagues (1996). The third and final compound connection supporting this path is
through Contact attitudes to Awareness and Skills multicultural competencies. The second leg of this latter connection is an inverse connection (i.e. high endorsement of contact attitudes correlated with low endorsement of multicultural competencies). This first half of this final connection is supported by the results from a study by Parker and colleagues (1998) and the second half is supported by results from the study by Neville and colleagues (1996).

The compound path between multicultural training and multicultural competencies through gender identity attitudes is supported only through the relationship between gender identity attitudes and racial identity attitudes. Given the results of studies correlating gender identity and racial identity for White women and Black women (Parks et al., 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997), it is likely that the compound connections between multicultural training and multicultural competencies through gender identity attitudes will operate similar to those of the compound connection through racial identity attitude statuses.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

Overview of the Chapter

This chapter is divided into four major subsections: instruments, participants, procedures, and research questions/statistical model. This format differs from the standard practice of describing participants first in order to provide greater coherence for the reader. Because of the length of the instrument subsection, the juxtaposition of the participants and procedures subsections will provide greater continuity and clarity in understanding this study's methodology. The instrument subsection contains four subcategories corresponding to each of the variables being measured. In each of these subcategories, a brief overview of the conceptual variable (i.e. multicultural training, racial identity, gender identity, multicultural competency) is provided. The remainder of each subcategory is dedicated to providing descriptions of the specific instruments chosen for the study and their psychometric properties. In the participants subsection the demographic composition of the participants is described. The procedures subsection contains separate areas on the approval by the institutional review board regarding human subjects, recruitment of participants, and actual data collection operations. Finally, the subsection on research questions and statistical model is divided into two major parts. The first part of this subsection addresses analysis of the question of the non-
causal (i.e. non-directional) relationship between racial identity attitudes as measured by the Person Of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (POCRIAS) or the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS) and gender identity attitudes as measured by the Womanist Identity Attitude Scale (WIAS) or the Reference Group Identity Dependence Scale (RGIDS). The second part of this subsection addresses the primary focus of this research project, analysis of the proposed structural equation model. In this structural equation model, the researcher proposes that multicultural training (as measured by items on the Personal Questionnaire), racial identity attitudes (as measured by the POCRIAS or the WRIAS), and gender identity attitudes (as measured by the WIAS or RGIDS) all help to predict multicultural competency (as measured by the Multicultural Counseling Inventory, AKA MCI). In this part, the researcher outlines the model in operational terms, setting up the measurement model and analysis procedures for testing goodness-of-fit of the theoretical model.

Instruments

The instruments used in this study were a Personal Questionnaire (See Appendix C) designed by the researcher, two measures of racial identity attitude development (POCRIAS, Helms 1995b; and WRIAS, Helms 1990a), two measures of gender identity attitude development (WIAS, Ossana, Helms, & Leonard, 1992; and RGIDS, Wade & Gelso, 1998) and one measure of multicultural competencies (MCI, Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin, & Wise, 1994). Letters granting permission to use those instruments belonging to other researchers are included in appendix D. The
instruments will be covered in the aforementioned order within this section. Each will be briefly described, including examples of instrument items. Finally, psychometric data will be provided, as well as justification for instrument selection.

**Personal Questionnaire**

This questionnaire (See Appendix C) was created by the researcher for this particular study. It contains two sections. The first section consists of seven items. In these items, respondents were asked to provide basic demographic information about their race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic level, degree level and year in program, age, and what percentage of respondent's last work (or school) environment was of the same ethnicity as the respondent. The second section, containing a total of nine items, consists of questions to explore the participant's amount of prior clinical and multicultural experience. General clinical experience (i.e. experience that does not specifically address multicultural issues) is assessed through two questions. Multicultural training and experience is further divided into two categories: Formal and informal. Formal multicultural training involves participation in classes, conferences, workshops, and supervision where the topic being covered is multicultural issues. On this instrument, there are four questions designed to assess formal multicultural training experiences. A formal multicultural training score is generated by taking the mean of the scores from the four questions designed to measure aspects of formal multicultural training. Informal multicultural training and experience involves interaction with clients, supervisors or colleagues who represent cultures different from that of the respondent. The
Personal Questionnaire contains three questions that were designed to provide information about informal multicultural training and experience. An informal multicultural training score is generated by taking the mean of the three questions designed to measure aspects of informal multicultural training. Each item included on this instrument was written either to generate information descriptive of the sample population or to provide quantifiable measures of the constructs of general clinical training, formal multicultural training, and informal multicultural training and experience.

Of the demographic variables, racial/ethnic identification (Personal Questionnaire, item 1: Appendix C) was chosen for inclusion because the study itself pooled the responses by all respondents into one of two racial categories, Persons of Color or Whites. Because the data was pooled for all respondents into one of two racial categories (Persons of Color, White) for most analysis purposes, it may be useful to consider the actual numbers of subjects from any given racial or ethnic background that provided the responses within that pooled data sample. Additionally, this item was required for inclusion by Dr. Helms as part of the agreement for using her instruments in this study.

Gender (Personal Questionnaire, Item 2: Appendix C) was chosen for inclusion for several reasons. The primary reason for requesting that respondents provide a gender identification is that gender identity is an integral component of this research. The second reason for requiring information about this demographic variable is that gender membership has been shown to have differential effects on a wide variety of research variables, including racial identity attitudes (Brown et al.,...
1996) and multicultural competencies (Talbot, 1996; Talbot & Kocarek, 1997) both of which are included in this study. A final reason to include a question that asks respondents to provide their gender is that Dr. Helms requires this information as part of the agreement for using her instruments.

Sexual orientation (Personal Questionnaire, item 3: Appendix C) was chosen for inclusion because, some researchers have found statistically significant differences between those individuals identifying as lesbian, gay, or bisexual and those identifying as heterosexual on measures of multicultural comfort and competency (Talbot, 1996).

Three other items exploring individual demographics were included to help more completely describe the sample population. The first of these requested a report of the individual's perceived socio-economic status (Personal Questionnaire, item 4: Appendix C). The second item (Personal Questionnaire, item 5: Appendix C) asked respondents to report their degree program and year in program. The third item (Personal Questionnaire, question 6: Appendix C) asked respondents to report their age.

A final question (Personal Questionnaire, item 7: Appendix C) requested that respondents provide a percentage estimate of those individuals not matching the respondent's own ethnicity in their last or most recent work or school environment. This question along with several others was included as part of the requirement for using Dr. Helms's measures in this research study. The questions included as part of this agreement include: Racial/Ethnic designation (Personal Questionnaire, item 1), gender (Personal Questionnaire, item 2), socio-economic scale (Personal
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Questionnaire, item 4), age (Personal Questionnaire, item 6), and percentage of last work or school environment that matched that of the respondent (Personal Questionnaire, item 7).

The remaining items on the personal questionnaire were chosen for their ability to provide quantifiable measures of the constructs of general clinical training, formal multicultural training, and informal multicultural training and experience. Each of these items request that the respondents provide information about the extent of their involvement in a given activity related to their clinical or multicultural training experiences. These items are arranged on a six-point scale, from zero to five, with 0 being equal to no experience with that particular activity and 5 being equal to the highest amount of participation with that same activity. The numbers for each question were designed to reflect a typical amount of experience for specific year-in-program status (e.g. beginning Master's student, 2nd year doctoral student). For each question, the range of numbers in any point in the 6-point scale varies, for example, in question eight, the third point on the scale is designated 3, while for question thirteen, the third point on the scale is designated 15-28. This variability, from question to question, provides a range of scores for each question that is designed to reflect several different specific levels of training (e.g. one practicum, internship, etc.). Thus, the numbers of experiences for any given point on the scale were designed to represent similar levels of experience across all questions.

The first three items (Personal Questionnaire, Items 8-10: Appendix C), and the seventh item (Personal Questionnaire, Item 14) ask the respondent to detail the number of instructional formal multicultural training experiences (e.g. classes,
seminars) in which they have participated. Item eight contains one question: "How many college courses have you taken that were designed to address multicultural topics?" The scale for this item ranges from zero to five or more. Item nine asks: "How many conferences have you attended where the principal focus was multicultural issues?". The scale for this question is as follows: 0 = 0, 1 = 1, 2 = 2, 3 = 3-4, 4 = 5-7, and 5 = 8 or more. The scale for this item is designed to reflect the importance of some experience over no experience and the reduction in incremental change with higher amounts of experience. Item ten is closely related to item nine and asks "How many hours have you spent in workshops that focused on multicultural issues?". As individuals may attend several workshops at only one conference, the scale for this question reflects these higher numbers. The scale for this question is: 0 = 0, 1 = 1-2, 2 = 3-5, 3 = 6-10, 4 = 11-25, and 5 = 26 or more. In Question 14, the respondent is asked to estimate the number of supervision sessions where they addressed cultural issues. This question, "Please indicate from the choices below, the one that most closely represents the number of individual supervision sessions where some aspect of culture and its impact on the therapy session was addressed." is answered on the following scale: 0 = 0, 1 = 1-3, 2 = 4-7, 3 = 8-14, 4 = 15-21, and 5 = 22 or more. The range of scores for this question is designed to cover a range that reflects the experience of having no practicum experience through the experience of having completed three or more practica. These questions, which elicit information about formal multicultural training experiences, are similar to others that have been found to predict multicultural competency. For example, Ottavi, Pope-Davis and Dings (1994) found statistical
significance for the presence of multicultural course work and for the number of multicultural workshops attended on multicultural competencies.

General clinical experiences (i.e. those not specifically addressing multicultural issues) are explored through two questions (Personal Questionnaire, Item 11 and Item 13). These questions ask the respondent to estimate the total number of clients they have worked with and the total number of individual clinical supervision sessions they have attended. Item 11 on the Personal Questionnaire asks the respondent to “Please indicate from the choices below, the one that most closely represents the total number of clients you have worked with as a counselor or therapist in practicum or work settings.” This question is answered on the following six-point scale: 0 = 0, 1 = 1-3, 2 = 4-7, 3 = 8-14, 4 = 15-25, 5 = 26 or more. Item 13, “Please indicate from the choices below, the one that most closely represents the total number of individual supervision sessions you participated in while you were engaged in working with clients.” is answered on the following scale: 0 = 0, 1 = 1-7, 2 = 8-14, 3 = 15-28, 4 = 29-42, 5 = 43 or more.

The final three items (Personal Questionnaire, Items 12, 15, and 16: Appendix C) ask the respondent to provide answers designed to assess their informal multicultural training experiences. The first of these items (Personal Questionnaire, Item 12) is as follows: “Please indicate from the choices below, the one that most closely represents the total number of clients you have worked with as a counselor or therapist in practicum or work settings, who were members of a non-majority culture.” The scale for this item ranges from 0 to 16 or more and is as follows: 0 = 0, 1 = 1, 2 = 2-4, 3 = 5-9, 4 = 10-15, and 5 = 16 or more. The second
item designed to explore informal multicultural experiences (Personal Questionnaire, Item 15) asks the respondent to "Please indicate how many instructors and supervisors who were members of non-majority cultures you have had teaching your courses or supervising you in your degree program." This item is answered on a one-to-one scale with 0 = 0 and 5 = 5 or more. The third of the items assessing informal multicultural experiences (Personal Questionnaire, Item 16) asks "How many of the graduate students with whom you currently take classes represent non-majority cultures?" This question is answered on the following six-point scale: 0 = 0, 1 = 1, 2 = 2-3, 3 = 4-6, 4 = 7-10, and 5 = 11 or more. For the first of the questions above, a related question by Ottavi et al. (1994) found statistical significance for the number of client contact hours with persons of color for predicting multicultural competency scores. Additionally, other researchers have stressed the importance of informal multicultural training experiences in predicting multicultural competency (McEwen & Roper, 1994; Talbot, 1996; and Talbot & Kocarek, 1997).

Racial Identity Measures

Participants' racial identity was assessed through the use of one of two measures, The Person of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (POCRIAS: Helms, 1995b) or the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS: Helms, 1990a). See Appendix D for authors' permission to use these instruments in this study. The POCRIAS was administered to participants who identified as Persons of Color and the WRIAS was administered to White participants. The necessity for two measures of racial identity is explained by the theoretical basis for identity development in
Persons of Color and Whites (see Chapter II). Within this theory, it is proposed that identity development differs for members of racial minority groups and Whites because of two interrelated factors, dominance and oppression. The dominant position held by Whites allows them greater access to society's resources and permits the social oppression experienced by many members of racial minority groups. This limited access and oppression is usually not experienced by Whites (Helms, 1990b).

The reason these two instruments were chosen for this particular study is threefold. First, this research considers the impact of variation in attitudes about racial identity on multicultural competencies, which these instruments were designed to measure. Second, of the instruments that attempt to measure racial identity attitude variations, one of these instruments (WRIAS) is considered the best researched and most psychometrically sound (Sabnani & Ponterotto, 1992), and the other (POCRIAS) is the only available instrument to measure this construct with the study's racially inclusive sample population. The sample population for this study included all Persons of Color not just a subgroup of that population like Blacks or Hispanics. Third, using these particular instruments provided alternate instrumentation for both Whites and People of Color based on conceptually interrelated theoretical constructs (Helms, 1990a, 1995a).

In the two subsections that follow, each of these racial identity instruments is covered in greater detail, beginning with the People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (POCRIAS) and concluding with the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS). In each subsection the designated instrument is described and sample
items from the measure are provided. Scoring procedures are then reported. Finally, the psychometric properties of each instrument are covered.

**People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (POCRIAS)**

The POCRIAS (Helms, 1995b; See Appendix D for permission to use instrument in this study) consists of 50 items. The scale was designed to assess “five information-processing strategies hypothesized to result from the shared racial socialization experiences of People of Color” (Helms, 1995b). However, it currently measures only four of the statuses of racial identity attitude development suggested by Helms’s (1984, 1995a) Black and People of Color racial identity development theory: Conformity/Preencounter, Dissonance, Immersion/Resistance, and Internalization. The following details about the POCRIAS, in this and the next paragraph, are taken from the Preliminary Scoring Key for The People of Color (POC) Racial Identity Attitude Scale (Helms, 1995b). The scale’s 50 items are distributed among the subscales as follows: Conformity/Preencounter, 11 items; Dissonance, 15 items; Immersion/Resistance, 14 items; and Internalization, 10 items. The measure requires subjects to respond to items using a 5-point Likert-type scale (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). All questions are scored in the same direction. Higher scores indicate higher levels of the racial identity attitude status being measured. Raw scores are arrived at by adding scores for all of the items in a particular scale. Raw scale scores range from 10 to 75 and vary among the various subscales as follows: Conformity/Preencounter scores range from 10 to 50, Dissonance scores range from 15 to 75, Immersion/Resistance
scores range from 13 to 65, and Internalization scores range from 10 to 50. Comparisons between subscales are made by using the average scores for each subscale.

The Conformity/Preencounter subscale measures acceptance of societally imposed racial characteristics and rules for dispensing societal resources. In particular, there is a devaluation of one's own group and an idealization of Whites and White standards. Individuals whose attitudes fit into this status tend to use strategies like denial, distancing, own group blaming, and individualism. An example of an item from this scale is "I feel more comfortable being around Anglo-Americans (Whites) than I do being around people of my own race". Another example of a question from this scale is "In general, people of my race have not contributed very much to American society".

The Dissonance subscale measures confusion about one's racial group commitment and ambivalent racial self-definition. Individuals strongly associating with these status attitudes may experience disorientation, repression and a vacillation between the beliefs and attitudes of one's own racial group and the White group. A sample item from the Dissonance scale is "I don't know whether being the race I am is an asset or a deficit". Another example of an item from the Dissonance subscale is "Thinking about my values and beliefs takes up a lot of my time".

The Immersion/Resistance subscale measures attitudes that demonstrate a "physical and psychological withdrawing into one's own racial/ethnic group" (Helms, 1995b). Individuals exhibiting these attitudes tend to idealize their own racial group and denigrate anything perceived as White. An example of an item from this
subscale is “I feel unable to involve myself in Anglo-Americans' (Whites') experience, and am increasing my involvement in experiences involving people of my race”. A second example of an Immersion/Resistance subscale item is “The way Anglos (Whites) treat people of my race makes me angry”.

Finally, attitudes measured by the Internalization subscale involve resolving personal intrapsychic conflict around one's issues with the contrast racial group and internalizing a positive own-group racial identification. Individuals exhibiting high Internalization scores are capable of objectively assessing and responding to members of the White group and utilize an internal criteria for self-definition. Sample items from this subscale are, “I think people of my culture and the White culture differ from each other in some ways, but neither group is superior” and “I am comfortable being the race I am”.

The instrument does not measure the fifth status (Integrative Awareness) in Helms's Black and People of Color Racial Identity Model (1995a). The Integrative Awareness status shares many attitudes with the Internalization status. The primary difference between the Internalization status and the Integrative Awareness status is in the inclusion of beliefs in own race advocacy in the Integrative Awareness status. This suggests that the most pertinent difference is in a willingness to act on one's beliefs. As there are minimal attitudinal changes involved, the absence of a scale to measure this status is unlikely to limit the results of this study.

No psychometric information about the POCRIAS scales has been published (Helms, 1995b). The scale is based on similar theoretical constructs and item types as the Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS) and the Racial Identity Attitude Scale -
form B (RIAS-B). Reliability and validity of these instruments, RIAS and RIAS-B, have been reported in several studies. Based on the shared common structure and item content of these measures, reliability and validity are likely to be associated. Therefore, reliability and validity data from studies using the RIAS and RIAS-B are included here in discussing the POCRIAS.

The reliability and validity data for the RIAS and RIAS-B suggest that the instruments are only fair measures of their underlying constructs, especially if they are evaluated using standard measurement criteria. In the following paragraphs the reliability and validity of each of these instruments is covered. First the reliability and validity of the RIAS will be covered then the reliability and validity of the RIAS-B.

Parham and Helms (1981) in a survey of 92 (52 female, 40 male) Black undergraduate college students using the RIAS reported internal consistency reliabilities (alpha coefficients) for the Preencounter subscale at .67, for the Encounter subscale at .72, for the Immersion/Emersion subscale at .66 and for the Internalization subscale .71. Based on standard measurement evaluation criteria, only the two highest of these reliabilities, for the Encounter and Internalization subscales would be considered good enough for basic research (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 1989). In a survey of 54 Black undergraduate students (43 men and 11 women), Pomeas, Claiborn and LaFromboise (1986) used only the RIAS Encounter and Internalization subscales. They reported internal consistency reliabilities of .45 and .35 for the Encounter and Internalization subscales respectively. These numbers were even lower than those obtained by Parham and Helms (1981). The small sample population likely contributed to the low reliability estimates generated.
by the Pomales et al. (1986) study data. Finally, Ponterotto and Wise (1987) in a survey of 205 (90 male, 115 female) Black college students obtained the following alpha coefficients: .63 for Preencounter, .37 for Encounter, .72 for Immersion/Emersion, and .37 for Internalization. The results obtained by Ponterotto and Wise (1987) were closer to those originally reported by Parham and Helms (1981). But in this study, only one subscale reached the .70 cutoff level for research adequacy. Sabnani and Ponterotto (1992) reviewed previous results for several instruments and provided evaluations of the utility and psychometric properties. In their evaluation of the RIAS, they stress that reports of internal consistency reliabilities have provided mixed results. It must be noted that all reports of reliability for this instrument are alpha coefficients (i.e. measures of internal consistency among items within a subscale). Yet, at least one of the subscales measures two different types of attitudes. The Immersion/Emersion scale measures attitudes that relate to immersing oneself into one's own racial culture and also measures attitudes that stress emerging from this intense focus to a broader multi-racial focus. Given that two different types of attitudes are contained within this single status it is unlikely that all of the items would be internally consistent for a single factor.

The validity data available for the RIAS is mixed. The construct validity, demonstrated through factor analysis and interscale comparisons, provides better support for some subscales than for others. Ponterotto and Wise (1987) examined the construct validity of the RIAS (Parham & Helms, 1981) using Black students (n = 186) from two predominantly white university campuses as subjects. Using oblique factor analytic methods and examining alternative factor solutions, they found strong
support for the constructs underlying three of the subscales: Preencounter, Immersion-Emersion, and Internalization stages. They found little statistical support for the construct underlying the Encounter stage as represented in the RIAS items. They suggested that the underlying theoretical construct for the Encounter stage presented a measurement problem. The problem involved is the difficulty of creating attitude items that adequately describe the encounter stage, especially because this particular status tends to be brief. The validity results reported above, mesh with the previously cited reliability results, in that the subscale with the weakest reliability and greatest interscale correlation relationships with other subscales is also the subscale with the lowest validity. Additionally, Ponterotto and Wise (1987) found low to moderate subscale intercorrelations between RIAS subscales. They reported the following relationships: -.01 for Preencounter and Encounter, -.03 for Preencounter and Immersion/Emersion, .03 for Preencounter and Internalization, .49 for Encounter and Immersion/Emersion, -.15 for Encounter and Internalization, and .10 for Immersion/Emersion and Internalization. Most of their reported interscale correlations were low enough to suggest that the individual scales were sufficiently different from one another to be measuring separate constructs. The relationship (.49) between the Encounter and Immersion/Emersion subscales suggests that these subscales may be measuring a similar factor which may also explain the lack of support in their factor analysis for the Encounter subscale. Sabnani and Ponterotto (1992) reviewed previous results for several instruments and provided evaluations of the utility and psychometric properties. In their evaluation of the RIAS,
they stress that reports have provided mixed results regarding the construct-related validity of the instrument.

Predictive validity for the RIAS is demonstrated in several studies. Carter and Helms (1987) in a survey of 174 Black undergraduate students (66 men, 108 women) found that higher scores on the highest level of racial identity attitudes predicted Afro-centric values (harmony with nature, doing orientation, collateral social relations orientation). Parham and Helms (1981) in a survey of 92 Black undergraduate students (52 women, 40 men) found that racial identity attitudes were related to preferences for either Black or White counselors in theoretically anticipated directions. Although all racial identity statuses related in theoretically anticipated directions, only three relationships reached statistical significance. Higher scores on the Preencounter subscale related to a lower preference for a Black counselor and a higher preference for a White counselor. Higher scores on the Encounter subscale related to a higher preference for a Black counselor.

The RIAS-B shares its predecessor's problems with reliability. Lemon and Waehler (1996), in a study designed to assess the test-retest reliability of this instrument (N = 77, 55 women and 22 men), found that the stability coefficients, over a month period, for the RIAS-B demonstrated statistical significance at the .01 level. However, the range for these scores that they reported was between .52 and .66. The following correlations were found from pre- to post-test for the RIAS-B subscales: Preencounter .61, Encounter .60, Immersion/Emersion .66, and Internalization .52. In evaluating these results, Lemon and Waehler (1996) suggested that the constructs measured by the RIAS-B should not be considered
stable personality traits as the test-retest reliabilities of the measure were below the .70 minimum for temporal stability. However, as the constructs measured by the RIAS-B are statuses in a developmental process they should not be considered stable personality traits.

Validation of the RIAS-B is shown through a study (Lemon & Waehler, 1996) polling 77 black men and women (22 men, 55 women). Comparisons were done between RIAS-B subscales and three other measures. These measures assessed self-derogation, self-esteem, and ethnic identity. The comparisons produced statistically significant correlations in ways predicted by racial identity theory. RIAS-B Preencounter scores correlated positively with self-derogation scores. Scores on a self-esteem measure positively correlated with Internalization scores and negatively with Preencounter and Immersion/Emersion subscale scores. Finally, ethnic identity scores were positively correlated with RIAS-B Encounter, Immersion/Emersion and Internalization scores.

Despite the mixed results of studies assessing the psychometric properties of the RIAS and RIAS-B, the reliability and validity data generated support continued use of these instruments for research. These instruments demonstrate factorial structure supportive of Helms's model of racial identity (Helms, 1990a; Ponterotto & Wise, 1987). Even critics (Lemon & Waehler, 1996) of the various forms of the RIAS have provided reliability coefficients to support an instrument that fits Helms's model (1990b), albeit at slightly less than the .70 recommended by measurement experts (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 1989). Helms (1996) has argued that the reliability and validity results obtained for her racial identity scales using group data are high when
compared with other measures of identity constructs. She further suggests that
classic measurement theory, on which previous validation results are based, may be
insufficient to explain RIAS variations. She points out that classical measurement
theory may not adequately explain RIAS results, since the instrument was designed
to describe how people process racial information at an individual level. Helms
(1996) stresses that classical measurement theory is only used effectively to obtain
descriptive statistics for groups. Her argument is that because these instruments
were designed to measure individual differences in processing racial interaction
information and individual racial attitudes, classical measurement theory cannot be
used effectively as it cannot determine true and error scores for individuals. She
says this is because the individual differences which the instrument was designed to
assess would be considered error under classical measurement theory. Additionally,
she also states that individual reactions to racial identity items are not proposed to be
linear and therefore a linear model, like that used in classical measurement theory,
might underestimate the relationship among variables. Helms (1996) also notes that
because the population of Blacks sampled is most probably skewed toward higher
levels of racial identity development, the sample populations are not normal nor
symmetrical. This lack of normality and symmetricality affects the ability of the
measure to differentiate at the tail end of the data pool (i.e. Preencounter and
Encounter statuses). Other researchers have agreed that the reliability and validity
scores for the RIAS scales although insufficient for individual clinical use are
acceptable for further research (Carter, 1996; Carter & Helms, 1990, 1992;
Ponterotto & Wise, 1987). Helms (1996), citing the work of Thorndike and Hagen
argues that the reliability of the RIAS-B subscales are sufficient for use with groups of 100 or more. She states that the lowest subscale internal consistency reliability coefficient is higher than .50 and that a reliability coefficient of .50 would only result in inconsistent descriptions of 100-person groups 1 in 2,500 (.04%) times.

The POCRIAS is closely related, both theoretically and in item content to both the RIAS and the RIAS-B. Each instrument contains four subscales, purporting to measure similar constructs. These subscales are Preencounter, Encounter, Immersion/Emersion, and Internalization for the RIAS and RIAS B, and Conformity/Preencounter, Dissonance, Immersion/Resistance, and Internalization for the POCRIAS. Currently there is no reliability and validity data specific to the POCRIAS, however, given the close theoretical and structural similarities it is likely that the reliability and validity of the POCRIAS will be similar. Currently the POCRIAS is the only instrument measuring racial identity attitudes across the demographic category of People of Color, rather than measuring the attitudes of a specific race of people within this category (e.g. Hispanics, Blacks). Because this study pools responses by all Persons of Color, the POCRIAS was chosen.

**White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS)**

The WRIAS (Helms, 1990a; See Appendix D for letter of permission to use the instrument) consists of 50 items designed to assess the five attitudes of White racial identity development suggested by Helms (1984): Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, and Autonomy. Descriptive information about the WRIAS and sample items provided in this and the next paragraph are taken from
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Helms's Black and white racial identity attitudes: Theory, research, and practice (1990a). The measure requires subjects to respond to items using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Each of the five subscales consists of 10 items. All items are scored in the same direction. Scores are obtained by summing responses across the items for each scale. Raw scores range from 10 to 50 for each subscale. Comparisons between subscales are made by using the average scores for each subscale.

The Contact subscale measures the extent that an individual goes along with, either consciously or unconsciously, the societally created rules for interaction across racial demographics and for dispensing societal resources (Helms, 1990a). In particular, there is satisfaction with racial status as it exists in the society as well as an obliviousness to racism including one's own participation in it. Helms (1995a) states that individuals whose attitudes fit into this status tend to use strategies like denial, obliviousness, and naiveté. An example of an item from this scale is "I wish I had a Black friend". A second example of a contact item is "I hardly think about what race I am".

The Disintegration subscale measures attitudes that reflect confusion about one's racial group commitment and ambivalent racial self-definition. Disintegration attitudes also evidence inconsistent awareness of the impact of race on others. Individuals strongly associating with these status attitudes may experience racial disorientation, not understanding what race means as part of a personal identity. One method of coping with this disorientation is to suppress any uncomfortable thoughts generated by cross-racial contact episodes. Sample items from the
Disintegration subscale are (1) “I do not feel that I have the social skills to interact with Black people effectively” and (2) “I used to believe in racial integration but now I have my doubts”.

Reintegration subscale items measure attitudes that demonstrate the “idealization of one’s group and the use of external standards to define oneself and other groups” (Helms, 1992). Individuals exhibiting these attitudes tend to idealize their own racial group and denigrate anything perceived as other. These individuals are often champions of own-group entitlement. Many use minimization of the other’s point of view, selective perception, and outgroup distortion (Helms, 1995a). An example of an item from the Reintegration subscale is “I get angry when I think about how Whites have been treated by Blacks”. A second example from the Reintegration subscale is “There is nothing that I want to learn from Blacks”.

The Pseudo-Independence subscale involves a “rationalized commitment to one’s own racial group” (Helms, 1990b) and purported liberalism toward other groups. This includes a tendency to non-consciously apply one’s own group’s standards as a condition of acceptance for other group members. Personal processing strategies include the continued use of selective perception and the use of rationalization (Helms, 1995a). Sample items from this subscale are (1) “I feel as comfortable around Blacks as I do around Whites” and (2) “I enjoy watching the different ways that Blacks and Whites approach life”.

The Autonomy subscale measures attitudes that reflect the “individual’s self-affirming commitment to one’s societally assigned racial group and the utilization of flexible standards for perceiving other racial group members” (Helms, 1990). These
individuals use internal standards for self-definition and have the capacity to relinquish the privileges of racism. An example of an Autonomy subscale item is “When a Black person holds an opinion with which I disagree, I am not afraid to express my viewpoint”. Another example of an Autonomy subscale item is “I am comfortable wherever I am”.

The instrument does not measure a sixth status (Immersion/Emersion) which fits between the Pseudo-Independence status and the Autonomy status in Helms’s White Racial Identity Model (1995a). Unlike the missing Integrative Awareness status in the Black and People of Color model, the missing Immersion/Emersion status has implications for understanding White racial identity. The Immersion/Emersion status in this theory provides a bridge between the Pseudo-Independence status where the individual is almost solely intellectually involved in racial issues and the Autonomy status where the individual is firmly engaged in an egalitarian fashion both intellectually and emotionally in these issues. The lack of a scale to measure the status in which the individual moves from only intellectual engagement to a more complete involvement creates difficulty in understanding the development in higher levels of racial identity. Additionally, the missing scale also creates difficulties in comparing results across racial groups as the Immersion/Emersion status is one of the two higher level statuses in the People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale.

As with the previously detailed RIAS and RIAS-B, the WRIAS also demonstrates a mixture of adequate and questionable reliability results. Reliability of the WRIAS has been reported in a number of studies (Helms & Carter, 1990; Ottavi
et al., 1994; Reagan as cited in Helms, 1996; Swanson, Tokar & Davis, 1994; Tokar & Swanson, 1991). Helms and Carter (1991) polled 506 White undergraduate college students. Cronbach's alphas for this sample were .55 for the Contact subscale, .77 for the Disintegration subscale, .80 for the Reintegration subscale, .71 for the Pseudo-Independence subscale and .67 for the Autonomy subscale. Based on standard measurement evaluation criteria, the following scales demonstrated sufficient reliability in Helms and Carter's (1991) study to warrant use in research: Disintegration, Reintegration, and Pseudo-Independence. The remaining two scales, Contact and Autonomy did not exhibit sufficient reliability for research use, although the Autonomy scale was close to the .70 cut off (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 1989). Ottavi et al. (1994) surveyed 128 counseling graduate students (88 women, 40 men). They reported alpha coefficients of .18, .65, .62, .75, and .59 for the Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy subscales respectively. Again, the Contact and Autonomy subscales demonstrated the weakest reliability. In the Ottavi et al. (1994) study, the reliability of the Contact subscale was especially problematic, at .18 it was way below any acceptable usage level. The problematic reliability reported by Ottavi et al. (1994) for the Contact scale may be due to inadequate representation of Contact attitudes in the counseling graduate student population polled. Tokar and Swanson (1991) also reported alpha coefficients for their sample of 308 White undergraduate college students. They related the following coefficients: .61 for Contact, .78 for Disintegration, .84 for Reintegration, .65 for Pseudo-Independence, and .71 for Autonomy. In this study by Tokar and Swanson (1991), the reliability of the Autonomy scale reached an
acceptable cutoff, however, the reliability for the Pseudo-Independence scale fell below that same cut off point. Again, the Contact subscale is below the .70 cut off point, although these researchers reported the best reliability of any study for that subscale. Additionally, the following range for WRIAS alpha reliabilities was reported in an unpublished Master’s thesis: .43 to .85 (Reagan as cited in Helms, 1996).

Tokar and Swanson, (1991) and Swanson et al. (1994), using the same sample for analysis, criticized the WRIAS because of the low values for alpha coefficients obtained from their sample. Additionally, Lemon and Waehler (1996) in a study polling 100 White participants (74 women and 26 men) reported the following test-retest reliability coefficients across a one-month period of time: .64 for Contact, .80 for Disintegration, .86 for Reintegration, .69 for Pseudo-Independence, and .74 for Autonomy. Three of these subscale scores reached the recommended .70 cutoff (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 1989). Lemon and Waehler (1996) suggest that two of the constructs measured by the WRIAS (Contact and Pseudo Independence), like those measured by the RIAS, should not be considered stable personality traits as the test-retest reliabilities for these subscales on this measure were also below the .70 minimum for temporal stability.

Helms (1996) suggests several reasons for the results generated by Swanson et al. (1994). The first is that the reason for the variability of the alpha coefficients among the various scales could be related to insufficient sampling, creating skewed distributions of racial identity statuses. She posits that as racial identity development is a voluntary act for Whites, individuals will tend to remain at the lower levels of racial identity development. Because of this, the normal
population of Whites will be skewed toward the lower racial identity statuses. In order to achieve a non-skewed sample she suggests that efforts may have to be made to include individuals who represent the higher statuses. The second reason Helms suggests to counter the criticisms of Swanson et al. (1994) is that it is likely that racial identity development measurement does not fit a linear model. Green, Lissitz, and Mulaik (as cited in Helms, 1996) state that "alpha coefficients may underestimate the interrelatedness of items if true scores are related to one another in nonlinear ways that cannot be revealed by a correlation matrix and/or items are negatively related to one another" (p. 171). Helms (1996), in agreement with them, argues that the tenants of classical measurement theory are not directly applicable to the measurement of racial identity attitudes and the related latent "schemas," and therefore studies using these theoretical constructs to evaluate racial identity instruments do not provide an accurate view of their psychometric properties. In particular, she states that racial identity theory is a description of how people process racial information at an individual level. Classical measurement assumptions can obtain descriptive statistics only for groups, not for individuals. Therefore, using classical measurement theory to evaluate racial identity measures will tend to overestimate error. This is because individual variance due to differences in development or idiosyncratic personality aspects will be figured as error. Additionally, she proposes that individual reactions to racial identity items are not expected to be linear and consequently, it is likely that relationships among items will be underestimated using unadjusted linear methodologies. As a third argument, Helms (1996) stresses that the reliability of the WRIAS, although low compared with
cognitive ability tests as the standard, is better when compared with other psychosocial identity measures. For example, Phinney (1990) reported that reliability of racial and ethnic identity measures is typically not reported or "low enough to raise questions about conclusions based on the measure" (p. 506). Phinney (1990) noted that Cronbach's alphas were the reliability coefficients usually reported in the studies she reviewed and indicated that the coefficients ranged from .35 to .90 in these studies. Helms (1996) also points out that the subscale correlations reported by Swanson et al. (1994) were all in directions predicted by racial identity theory. Finally, to counter the criticism of Lemon and Waehler (1996), Helms (1996) cites two unpublished doctoral dissertation studies (Corbett as cited in Helms, 1996; Meijer, as cited in Helms, 1996) to illustrate that the WRIAS has good test-retest reliability. She also argues that the statuses on the WRIAS were not intended to represent stable personality traits (Helms, 1996).

Validity of the WRIAS has also been explored in a number of studies (Helms & Carter, 1991; Lemon & Waehler, 1996; Swanson et al., 1994). Helms (1996) reported that the WRIAS "has face validity as an attitudinal measure". She also asserted that the WRIAS demonstrates acceptable psychometrics for use as a research instrument. Swanson et al. (1994) disagreed with Helms assessment that the WRIAS is an acceptable research instrument. They argued that the WRIAS was not psychometrically adequate as the result of two studies they conducted.

In the first study Swanson et al. (1994) submitted the WRIAS data, (n = 308), reported by Tokar & Swanson (1991) to item and factor analysis to examine the psychometric characteristics and factorial structure of the instrument. They found
evidence to support several different factor interpretations, with the five-factor solution accounting for the most amount of variance, 37%. Within this factor solution, 45 of 50 items loaded at .35 or higher on at least one factor, 6 items had multiple loadings, and 5 items did not load on any factor. They argued that the amount of variance accounted for by the five-factor solution was not significantly higher than that accounted for by other factor solutions, specifically the three- and four-factor solutions. They also criticized the WRIAS because several items loaded on multiple factors, while others loaded on no factors. Swanson et al. (1994) reported that 12 of the 50 items on the WRIAS, did not yield factor loadings on their own factor equal to or greater than .30. They also noted that only 18, of the 50 total, loaded more highly on their assigned subscale than on other subscales. However, in the results generated by these researchers (Swanson et al., 1994; Tokar & Swanson, 1991), the subscale intercorrelations which they identified were in directions supported by Helms (1990b, 1995a) theory. For example, they reported the highest positive correlations between the Disintegration and Reintegration subscales and the Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy subscales. Each of these pairs of subscales according to theory has more in common with each other than with any other subscale (Helms, 1990b; 1995a). They also recorded the highest negative correlations between the Disintegration and Autonomy subscales and the Reintegration and Autonomy subscales. These negatively correlated pairs of subscales, according to theory (Helms, 1990b; 1995a) are the most dissimilar of all possible subscale pairs. Because over one fifth (12) of all WRIAS items did not load above .30 on their assigned subscales and because items exhibited correlations with
other subscales, Swanson et al. (1994) suggested that the WRIAS was an inadequate measure of its intended construct.

In the second study described by Swanson et al. (1994), trained judges examined the content of each WRIAS item and rationally assigned the items to appropriate subscales based on Helm’s (1984) theory. The hit rate percentages for the individual judges ranged from 42% to 50% with the average hit rate at 47.6%. With respect to individual subscales, hit rate varied from 16% to 90%. Reintegration items (90%) were classified correctly most frequently followed in descending order by Autonomy (64%), Contact (40%), Disintegration (28%), and Pseudo-Independence (16%). Swanson et al. (1994) noted that there were patterns to the incorrect assignment by the judges. These following misses were most typically being made: Contact items were being assigned to Pseudo-Independence, Disintegration items were being assigned to Reintegration, and Pseudo-Independence items were being assigned to Autonomy. They argued that the overall hit rate and subscale hit rates were not high enough to warrant support of the WRIAS. However, the high percentage hit rates reported for the Reintegration and Autonomy subscales and the overall hit rate coupled with a pattern of errors that matches theoretical error predictions suggests the WRIAS, although not a perfect measure, is fairly consistently measuring recognizable constructs. Although Swanson et al. (1994) argued against the use of the WRIAS based on these studies, their results provide mixed support and criticism for Helms’s model. Additionally, Helms (1989, 1996) suggests some statuses are more likely to exist in a given sample population which may account for the lower reliability and factor structure obtained for some
subscales. Lemon and Waehler (1996), in their comparison of the RIAS-B and WRIAS subscales to measures of self-derogation, self-esteem, and ethnic identity produced significant correlations in ways predicted by racial identity theory. For example, they found that self-derogation scores correlated with the WRIAS Disintegration subscale scores. They also found that scores obtained on a self-esteem measure correlated positively with Pseudo-independence and Autonomy scores and negatively with Contact and Disintegration scores.

The above overview suggests that the WRIAS has sufficient reliability and validity for use as a research measure. Two of the subscales consistently demonstrate sufficient reliability for use as a research measure (Disintegration and Reintegration). Two other subscales have demonstrated sufficient reliability, albeit less consistently (Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy). To address the problem with these two subscales, Helms (unpublished working paper) has revised the WRIAS Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy subscales by moving 6 former Autonomy subscale items to the Pseudo-Independence subscale and 6 former Pseudo-Independence subscale items to the Autonomy subscale. That leaves one subscale (Contact) unadjusted and problematic in reliability. This subscale has generated reliability coefficients ranging from .18 to .64 with none of them reaching the .70 cutoff for psychometric stability for research purposes (Kaplan & Saccuzzo, 1989). However, as the WRIAS is one of only a few measures of White racial identity attitudes and or White racial consciousness (Choney & Behrens, 1996; Choney & Rowe, 1994; Claney & Parker, 1989; Helms & Carter, 1990) and each of the available measures has similar psychometric problems, the inadequacies of the
instrument were determined to be insufficient to prohibit its use. Additionally, of the available instruments, it is considered the best researched (Carter, 1996; Choney & Rowe, 1994; Helms, 1996). For these reasons, combined with the shared interconnected theoretical base between the WRIAS and the POCRIAS, the WRIAS was chosen for this study.

**Gender Identity Measures**

Participants' gender identity was assessed through the use of one of two measures, the Womanist Identity Attitude Scale (WIAS: Ossana et al., 1992; See Appendix D for letter of permission to use the instrument) or the Reference Group Identity Dependence Scale (RGIDS: Wade & Gelso, 1998; See Appendix D for letter of permission to use the instrument). Female participants were administered the WIAS and male participants were administered the RGIDS. The necessity for two measures of gender identity is explained by the theoretical basis for identity development in males and females (see Chapter II) in which it is proposed that identity development differs for members of the minority gender group (women) and the dominant gender group (men) because of the position of power held by males in the society and the oppression experienced by women which is not experienced by men (Carter & Parks, 1996; Helms, 1979).

The instruments chosen to measure gender identity were picked because of their theoretical similarity to the other identity measures chosen for the proposed study. The WIAS was chosen because the theoretical basis closely parallels that of both racial identity instruments, having been developed to correspond to Helms...
conceptions of identity development and the corresponding attitudes exhibited by individuals operating under certain beliefs. The RGIDS was chosen because it more closely measured a construct comparable to that measured by the WIAS than other measures of masculinity and masculine attitudes.

The following two subsections will describe the Womanist Identity Attitude Scale (WIAS) and the Reference Group Identity Dependence Scale (RGIDS). In these subsections, the researcher provides an overview description of each instrument, including sample items. Scoring procedures are reported. Finally, psychometric properties of each instrument are covered.

**Womanist Identity Attitude Scale (WIAS).**

The Womanist Identity Attitude Scale (WIAS; Ossana et al., 1992; See Appendix D for letter of permission to use the instrument) was developed by Helms, in a work that was never published (cited in Ossana et al., 1992 & Carter & Parks, 1996), to assess women's attitudes toward their own gender identities. This scale (Helms, 1990c) is a 55-item self-report scale that uses a Likert-type format (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). All of the following information about this scale is taken from the WIAS and its accompanying documentation provided by Helms (1990c). The WIAS contains five subscales that provide information about four gender identity statuses. Helms (1990c) has divided the Preencounter status into two subscales. One of these subscales is designed to measure attitudes that conform to society's expectations for women (Preencounter/Feminine). The other
Preencounter subscale is designed to measure attitudes that reflect greater respect for men and masculine traits than for women and feminine traits (Preencounter/Masculine). Items are unequally distributed among the subscales as follows: Preencounter - Masculine (9 items), Preencounter - Feminine (11 items), Encounter (13 items), Immersion/Emersion (11 items), and Internalization (11 items). All items are scored in the same direction. Raw scores are arrived at by adding scores for all of the items in a particular scale. Raw scale scores range from 9 to 65 and vary among the various subscales as follows: Preencounter - Masculine scores range from 9 to 45, Preencounter - Feminine scores range from 11 to 55, Encounter scores range from 13 to 65, Immersion/Emersion scores range from 11 to 55, and Internalization scores range from 11 to 55. Comparisons between subscales are made by using the average scores for each subscale.

In the following section, all sample items are taken from the WIAS (Helms, 1990c). Preencounter - Masculine items measure attitudes that demonstrate a "preference for masculine and instrumental values over feminine and expressive values" (Helms, 1990c). The following are Preencounter - Masculine items: "In general, I believe that men are superior to women" and "I feel more comfortable being around men than I do being around women". Preencounter - Feminine items measure attitudes that are defined by a "constrained external definition of women and the female sex role" (Helms, 1990c). An example of a Preencounter - Feminine item is "In general women have not contributed much to American society". A second example of a Preencounter - Feminine item is "a woman's appearance is her most important asset". Encounter items measure attitudes that reflect "conflicted
perspectives with regard to what is appropriate for oneself as a woman” (Ossana et al., 1992). Sample Encounter items are “I don’t know whether being a woman is an asset or a deficit” and “Sometimes I am proud of belonging to the female sex and sometimes I am ashamed of it”. Immersion/Emersion items measure attitudes that involve “rejecting masculine cultural views and endorsing feminine viewpoints” (Helms, 1990c) and attitudes that encompass the “conflict between being loyal to women and responsible to them as a group while working to define an autonomous personal identity” (Helms, 1990c). Examples of Immersion/Emersion items include: “American society would be better off if it were based on the cultural values of women” and “I find myself replacing old friends with new ones who share my beliefs about women”. Internalization items measure attitudes that express the “development of personally meaningful internal standards of womanhood” (Ossana et al., 1992). Two examples of Internalization items are (1) “I believe that being a woman has caused me to have many strengths” and (2) “I am comfortable wherever I am”.

Ossana et al. (1992) in a study polling a sample of 659 undergraduate female volunteers, reported internal consistency reliabilities of an earlier 43-item, four-subscale version at .55, .43, .82, and .77 for the Preencounter, Encounter, Immersion/Emersion and Internalization subscales respectively. Carter and Parks (1996), in a study that surveyed 218 female college students using the same version used by Ossana et al. (1992), reported Cronbach’s alphas for the four subscales of .50 for Preencounter, .34 for Encounter, .71 for Immersion/Emersion, and .66 for Internalization. One possible reason for the poor reliability demonstrated by the
Preencounter and Encounter subscales is a likely skew toward higher levels of Womanist identity attitudes in college women. Such a skew creates a non normal distribution and likely is accompanied by a smaller range of scores for these two subscales. Both of these effects could impact on the analysis of reliability for these subscales.

Construct validity of the WIAS was considered in these studies as well. Ossana et al., 1992 found some small to moderate amounts of interscale correlation. These relationships were as follows: Preencounter and Encounter (r = .22); Preencounter and Immersion/Emersion (r = .35); Preencounter and Internalization (r = -.28); Encounter and Immersion/Emersion (r = .53); Encounter and Internalization (r = .14); Immersion/Emersion and Internalization (r = -.28). These interscale correlations tend to support the Womanist Identity theory proposed by Helms (cited in Ossana et al., 1992) in several ways. The first is that the scale that represents the most confusion about personal gender identity does not correlate highly with the scale that represents the most integrated positive gender identity (e.g. Encounter does not correlate highly with Internalization). The second is that the only scale that represents an integrated positive identity (internalization) does not correlate strongly with any other scale and of the scales with which it correlates the most strongly, the correlations are negative (Preencounter and Immersion/Emersion). Third, the statuses that include heightened awareness of gender-related issues (Encounter and Immersion/Emersion) have the strongest correlation. Carter and Parks (1996) in their study, reported interscale correlations in the same direction as that reported by Ossana et al (1992).
Although the reliability data on the WIAS is only strongly supportive of the two higher level attitude statuses, Immersion/Emersion and Internalization, revisions to the WIAS have expanded it to five subscales (Preencounter has been divided into an idealization of men subscale and a traditional woman subscale) thus separating items reflecting somewhat disparate views within this subscale. Additionally, the measure has been expanded to 55 items and several items have been assigned to different subscales. These changes to a longer instrument with two subscale Preencounter statuses (Masculine and Feminine) together with the data provided in the above overview suggest that the WIAS has sufficient reliability and validity for use as a research measure. Additionally, the WIAS is one of only a few measures of female gender identity development (Carter & Parks, 1996; McNamara & Rickard, 1989; Ossana et al., 1992). Of these instruments it is the most available and has been used in several published studies (Carter & Parks, 1996; Ossana et al., 1992; Parks et al., 1996; Poindexter-Cameron & Robinson, 1997). Combined with the shared interconnected theoretical base between the WIAS and the racial identity measures of the WRIAS and the RIAS-B, these reasons resulted in choosing the WIAS for this study.

Reference Group Identity Dependence Scale (RGIDS)

The Reference Group Identity Dependence Scale (RGIDS; Wade & Gelso, 1998) is a 30 item measure composed of four subscales which describe three statuses (See Appendix D for letter of permission to use the instrument). All information about this instrument is taken from one article by Wade and Gelso.
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(1998). The statuses are labeled No Reference Group, Reference Group Dependent, and Reference Group Non-Dependent. The subscale names correspond to the status labels but the Reference Group Non-Dependent status breaks into two subscales, a diversity subscale and a similarity subscale. Items are spread throughout the four subscales as follows: No Reference Group - 10 items, Reference Group Dependent - 7 items, Reference Group Non-Dependent Diversity - 7 items, and Reference Group Non-Dependent Similarity - 6 items.

In completing the instrument, respondents are asked to report the degree to which they agree or disagree with statements representing feelings and beliefs about themselves as a male, about other males, and about their relationship with other males. Individuals respond on a six-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Items keyed to a particular subscale are summed to provide a total subscale score. Items are scored in the same direction with one exception, item 24, in the Reference Group Non-Dependent subscale, is reverse scored. Scale scores range from 6 to 60 and vary among the various subscales as follows: No Reference Group scores range from 10 to 60, Reference Group Dependent scores range from 7 to 42, Reference Group Non-Dependent Diversity scores range from 7 to 42, and Reference Group Non-Dependent Similarity scores range from 6 to 36. To facilitate comparison among subscales, average scores are computed for each subscale.

Items in the No Reference Group status measure a “lack of psychological relatedness to other males and relate to a male’s feelings of disconnectedness from, and confusion about, other males”. Items reflect the feeling that there are no males
like oneself or with whom one identifies or feels connected. Some examples of No Reference Group items are: "I find it difficult to describe who I am as a man" and "I don't feel connected with any group of males". The Reference Group Dependent status measures "feelings of psychological relatedness to some males and not to others". Items reflect a "male's feelings and beliefs that there are similar males like oneself with whom there is a connection, identification, sense of commonality, and/or association while not so with other males perceived as dissimilar to oneself". The following items are examples of Reference Group Dependent items: "Most of my social activities are centered around a particular group of male friends" and "I feel a common bond with my male friends, but not so much with other males". The Reference Group Non-Dependent status measures "feelings of psychological relatedness to all males". Items reflect "a male's feelings and beliefs that although there are differences among males, there is a connection, identification, sense of commonality, and/or association with all or various types of males". There are two dimensions to this status, Diversity and Similarity. The Diversity subscale measures feelings of psychological relatedness to different types of males and appreciation for differences among males. Sample Diversity items include: "It does not matter to me whether my friends are all alike" and "I find differences in men interesting". The Similarity subscale measures feelings of psychological relatedness to all males based on feelings of similarity and a sense of commonality. Examples of Similarity items are "I am similar in many ways to all males" and "Although I feel most similar to some males, I am also similar to all males".
The Reference Group Identity Dependence Scale (RGIDS) was introduced in a study by Wade and Gelso, (1998) which provided a preliminary assessment of the instrument. In this study, researchers polled 344 undergraduate men using the Reference Group Identity Dependence Scale, several measures of psychological functioning, and the Gender Role Conflict Scale (GRCS; O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David & Wrightsman, 1986). Scores on the RGIDS were factor analyzed using cross-validation by splitting the sample. Scores on the RGIDS were also correlated with scores on the other measures. The reliability, convergent content validity and concurrent validity of the RGIDS were supported based on the results from this study.

Wade and Gelso reported the following internal consistency reliabilities for their instrument subscales: No Reference Group .78, Reference Group Dependent .70, Reference Group Non Dependent - Similarity .73, and Reference Group Non Dependent - Diversity .70. All of the subscales for this instrument demonstrated sufficient internal consistency reliability for use as a research measure based on the .70 cutoff recommended by Kaplan and Sacuzzo (1989). At the current time there exist no other studies to verify the results generated by Wade and Gelso's (1998) exploratory study. Although the results acquired by them suggest that this instrument is the most reliable identity instrument (gender or race) included in the proposed study.

In initial development of the measure, Wade and Gelso (1998) did a pilot study (n = 55) surveying undergraduate men and an expert rater study (3rd year doctoral student judges, n = 7). Based on the results of these pilot studies, they
arrived at a 47-item measure with interrater reliability of .95. They subjected this measure to further analysis using a pool of 344 subjects. They began by splitting the pool of subjects and using a cross-validation technique. The first half of the sample was used to run a principle factors exploratory factor analysis using a varimax rotation. When coupled with a scree plot analysis, three-factor and four-factor solutions were identified. They decided to utilize the four-factor extraction “because it accounted for more (32.8% as opposed to 27.9%) of the variance in the items and because it indicated that the Reference Group Non Dependent status consisted of two related but separate factor dimensions” (p. 394). Using the four-factor solution they analyzed the factor loadings for each item and deleted items that did not load at least .30 on any factor and those that loaded greater than .30 on more than one factor. In the confirmatory factor analysis of this revision of the instrument, using the second half of the sample, the four-factor solution accounted for 42.2% of the total variance. The specific contributions to the total variance of the subscales and the item factor loadings for these subscales are reported below. No Reference Group accounted for 16.7% of the total variance and had item-factor loadings ranging from .37 to .62. Reference Group Dependent accounted for 11.6% of the total variance and had item-factor loadings ranging from .41 to .65. Reference Group Non Dependent - Similarity accounted for 7.9% of the total variance and had item-factor loadings ranging from .39 to .64. Finally, Reference Group Non Dependent - Diversity accounted for 6% of the total variance and had item factor loadings ranging from .39 to .60.
Wade and Gelso (1998) compared the RGIDS to a measure of ego identity (i.e. internalized sense of self). They hypothesized that since both measures were based on individual psychological identity development, higher levels of male reference group identity dependence would be positively related to higher levels of ego identity development and lower levels of male reference group identity dependence would be positively related to lower levels of ego identity development. They also suggested the possibility that negative relationships would be found between high levels on either the RGIDS or the measure of ego identity and low levels on the other. The hypothesized relationships were based on the similarity of developmental complexity and progression for various aspects of male reference group identity and ego identity. These hypotheses were supported by several correlations between the RGIDS and the measure of ego identity. A positive relationship was found between both of the lower developmental level subscales, No Reference Group subscale scores on the RGIDS and scores measuring identity diffusion on the ego identity measure. A positive relationship was found between Reference Group Dependent subscale scores and scores measuring identity foreclosure on the ego identity measure. Reference Group Non-Dependent Similarity scores were positively related to scores measuring identity achievement. And Reference Group Non-Dependent Diversity scores related negatively to scores measuring identity foreclosure. However, contrary to their hypotheses, they also found that Reference Group Dependent scores related positively to scores measuring identity achievement.
Wade and Gelso (1998) suggested that as a person develops identity (ego, masculine, etc.) they develop better coping skills. They therefore hypothesized, that higher levels of masculine identity development as measured by the RGIDS would relate to more effective psychological functioning and less identified difficulties in said functioning. This hypothesis was supported by several relationships between subscales on the RGIDS and various measures of psychological functioning. These relationships include: A positive correlation between No Reference Group scores and scores measuring social anxiety, and anxiety and depression symptomatology; a negative correlation between No Reference Group scores and self-esteem scores; a positive relationship between the Reference Group Dependent scores and scores measuring social anxiety, and anxiety and depression symptomatology; and a positive relationship between the Reference Group Non-Dependent scores and self-esteem scores. Other specific predicted relationships were not statistically significant. These included: A relationship between Reference Group Dependence scores and measures of psychological functioning other than that of social anxiety, and anxiety and depression symptomatology; and a positive relationship between Reference Group Dependence scores and self-esteem.

The relationship between reference group identity dependence status and gender role conflict as measured by the GRCS (O'Neil et al. 1986) was used to provide a measure of the RGIDS ability to measure masculine related constructs. Results of the correlations between the RGIDS and the GRCS provided some support for Wade's theory, although not all relations were supported as predicted. Contrary to prediction, the relation between No Reference Group status and gender
role conflict, as measured by the GRCS total score, was not supported. But some subscales did correlate in the predicted directions. No Reference Group scores positively correlated with restrictive emotionality and conflict between work and family relations subscales and negatively correlated with the success, power, and competition subscale scores in agreement with hypothesized results. Reference Group Dependent scores were positively related to gender role conflict, as measured by the GRCS total score, as predicted. Additionally, the Reference Group Dependent scores were related to subscale scores in predicted directions. They were statistically significantly positively correlated with the success, power, and competition, restrictive emotionality, and restrictive affectionate behavior between men subscale scores. The hypothesis that Reference Group Non-Dependent status would be negatively related to gender role conflict was only partially supported. Reference Group Non-Dependent Diversity scores correlated in the predicted directions, negatively to total GRCS score, the success, power, and competition score, the restrictive affectionate behavior between men score and the restrictive emotionality scores. However, no significant relationships were found between Reference Group Non-Dependent Similarity scores and gender role conflict.

The results of the comparison of the RGIDS to these other measures support the use of the RGIDS as a developmental measure of masculine identity. The relationship between the RGIDS statuses and the GRCS subscales suggests that the instrument is measuring a construct which is strongly related to masculine gender identity and different from the gender role conflict measured by the GRCS. The correlations between reference group identity statuses and ego identity statuses
support the developmental nature of the RGIDS. The relationship between RGIDS statuses and psychological functioning also tends to support the developmental nature of the instrument with developmentally lower statuses being related to lower levels of psychological functioning and developmentally higher statuses being associated with higher levels of psychological functioning. Finally, the RGIDS fits the criteria developed by Thompson, Pleck and Ferrera (1992) for an effective measure of masculine gender ideology. They argued that any measure designed to evaluate masculine gender ideology must address gender beliefs (roles, norms, etc.) rather than gender orientation, must stress attitudes toward men rather than towards women and gender relations, and must encompass a broad definition of masculinity. Of the available instruments for assessing male gender, only two (GRCS and RGIDS) effectively address these issues, and only the RGIDS closely adheres to the developmental approach which provides the theoretical basis for the other measures to be used in this study. The issues suggested by Thompson et al. (1992) coupled with the initial reliability and validity results provided by Wade and Gelso (1998) support the choice of the RGIDS to measure masculine identity for this study.

Measure of Multicultural Competence

There are currently four instruments intended to measure multicultural competencies, the Cross-Cultural Competency Inventory - Revised (CCCI-R; LaFromboise, Coleman & Hernandez, 1991), the Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge-Skills Survey (MAKSS; D'Andrea, Daniels & Heck, 1991), the Multicultural Counseling Awareness Scale - Form B (MCAS - Form B; Ponterotto,
Sanchez & Magids, as cited in Pope-Davis & Dings, 1995), and the Multicultural Counseling Inventory (MCI; Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin & Wise, 1994). Of these instruments, three (MAKSS, MCAS-Form B, and MCI) are self-report measures (Pope-Davis & Dings, 1995). The other instrument (CCCI-R) is an observer rating form. As this study intends to poll students using a packet of self-report instruments, the three self-report measures qualify for inclusion in this study. The MCI was chosen from among these three for several reasons: Length, psychometrics, and the presence of a unique subscale addressing the counseling relationship. Given the number of instruments utilized in this study, another lengthy instrument might have deterred participants from completing the instrument packet, the MCI at only 40 items, is the shortest of the measures. Despite its shorter length, however, psychometric properties for the instrument are good. Ponterotto, Rieger, Barrett and Sparks (1994) evaluation of the MCI is that it is an efficient and carefully constructed instrument. Internal consistency is satisfactory, and initial studies of criterion related validity are promising. Finally, it contains a scale for measuring the multicultural counseling relationship as well as knowledge, skills, and awareness. This relationship subscale assesses the counselor's stereotypes of minorities, and comfort level working with minority clients. Ponterotto et al. (1994) state that "a strength of the MCI is that unlike the other multicultural competency instruments, it has defined and put into practice a multicultural counseling relationship scale". This scale is of particular interest for the proposed study as it is anticipated that identity attitudes should relate to the multicultural Relationship subscale more strongly than they relate to the Knowledge, Skills, and Awareness subscales. This is because
different levels of attitudes are more likely to have a direct effect on relationship building behaviors while the behavioral criteria of the other three scales, Knowledge, Skills and Awareness require additional learning and/or skills practice to more completely absorb the information and behaviors into an individual’s repertoire.

Multicultural Counseling Inventory (MCI)

The Multicultural Counseling Inventory was developed by Sodowsky et al. (1994) to measure multicultural counseling competencies (No copy of instrument included at author’s request, for letter of permission to use instrument See Appendix D). The following description of the MCI is taken from Sodowsky et al. (1994), sample items are taken directly from the Multicultural Counseling Inventory (MCI: Sodowsky, 1993). It is a 40-item measure in which participants rate their own competency by responding to each item on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = very inaccurate to 4 = very accurate. Scale scores are obtained by adding the items specific to each scale; higher subscale scores indicate greater self-perceived multicultural competence in the respective areas. The subscales are labeled Skills, Knowledge, Awareness, and Relationship. The Skills subscale contains 11 items measuring general counseling and specific multicultural counseling skills. Sample items include “When working with all clients, I am able to be concise and to the point when reflecting, clarifying, and probing” and “When working with minority clients, I monitor and correct my defensiveness.” The Knowledge subscale is comprised of 11 items measuring treatment planning, case conceptualization, and multicultural counseling research. Sample items for this subscale include “When working with
minority clients, I keep in mind research findings about minority clients' preferences in counseling" and "When working with minority clients, I apply the sociopolitical history of the clients' respective minority group to understand them better". The Awareness subscale consists of 10 items measuring multicultural sensitivity, interactions, and advocacy in general life experiences and professional activities. Some Awareness sample items are "I am involved in advocacy efforts against institutional barriers in mental health services for minority clients" and "When working with international students or immigrants, I understand the importance of legalities of visa, passport, green card and naturalization". Finally, the Relationship subscale is made up of 8 items measuring the "counselor's interaction process with minority clients" (e.g., comfort level, worldview, counselor's trustworthiness). Sample items for this subscale include "When working with minority individuals, I am confident that my conceptualization of individual problems do not consist of stereotypes and biases" and "When working with minority clients, I perceive that my race causes the client to mistrust me."

Initial reliability and validity for the MCI (Sodowsky et al., 1994) was derived from a study surveying a large midwestern sample of counseling, school, and clinical psychology graduate students (N=165) and counseling professionals (N=771). "Factors were chosen on the basis of both a scree plot of the eigenvalues and the factor interpretability" (Sodowsky, 1994). This analysis resulted in four subscales—Multicultural Skills, Knowledge, Awareness, and Relationship—with internal consistency reliabilities of .83, .79, .83, and .71. There were low to moderate intersubscale correlations ranging from $r = .52$ to $r = .23$. The authors suggest that
these intercorrelations demonstrate that the subscales are measuring different aspects of the overall construct of multicultural competence.

Additional research has also shown construct or predictive validity evidence for the MCI. The MCI revealed statistically significant self-reported multicultural competency change, as measured by total multicultural competency scores, in counseling graduate students (N=42) from the beginning to the end of multicultural counseling courses in three separate semesters (Sodowsky et al., 1994). In a sample of counseling professionals, statistically significant MCI subscale and total score differences were found between counselors who did less than 50% of their work in multicultural counseling (N=82) and those who did more than 50% of their work in multicultural counseling (N=82). This provided support for the predictive and concurrent validity of the instrument (Sodowsky et al., 1994).

Pope-Davis and Ottavi (1994b) in a survey of 220 university counseling center counselors, reported alpha coefficients and intercorrelations for the MCI subscales for this population at .81 for skills, .80 for knowledge, .80 for awareness, and .67 for relationship, supporting reliabilities reported by Sodowsky et al. (1994). Subscale intercorrelations showed a reasonable level of internal consistency for use with a national sample of university counselors. Moderate to low correlations were found between the four subscales ranging from $r = .56$ to $r = .27$. Pope-Davis and Ottavi state that "these correlations approximate MCI subscale correlations found during instrument development and suggest that the inventory is measuring related, but different, constructs".
Participants

Participants were students in master's and doctoral level programs in counseling or counseling psychology at a midwestern university, and/or master's or doctoral student members of the Association of Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD). Graduate counseling and psychology students were chosen because the model to be evaluated is expected to inform multicultural counseling and psychology education and therefore potentially to effect changes in curricula that would be implemented with a graduate counseling and psychology student population. The researcher reached 205 students in the midwestern university's programs of which 163 of those expressed willingness to participate in this study. Of those expressing interest, 110 chose to return packets (54%). The AMCD mailing list comprised 1135 names. Thirty-two packets sent to the mailing list names were returned undeliverable. A total of 1103 packets were delivered to AMCD student members. Of the AMCD individuals reached through the mailings (initial and follow-up) 505 chose to return completed packets. This represents a return rate of 46% for AMCD student members. The total return rate was 47%. The researcher had hoped to recruit 400 participants with at least 100 individuals from each of four demographic groups (Women of Color, White Women, Men of Color and White Men). Although the total number of participants exceeded the minimal expectation of 400 participants, unequal representation was garnered for the various demographic groups (Women of Color = 192, Men of Color = 58, White women = 294, and White men = 62).
Procedures

This section covers the acquisition of human subjects review board approval in order to complete the study using human subjects. It then goes on to describe in detail the recruitment of subjects and data collection procedures.

Human Subjects Review Board Approval

Prior to beginning recruitment of participants, Human Subjects Review Board approval was obtained from the university where data collection took place. Documentation of HSIRB approval is provided in Appendix F.

Data Collection

The recruitment of participants accessed two different groups of people. Because the recruitment of participants involved two different strategies (national and local) it utilized two separate procedures with parts of each procedure being similar. The first procedure described below is for those individuals who were recruited through brief presentations in the counselor education and counseling psychology classrooms at a midwestern university. The second procedure described is for student members of the Association of Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD) whose names were acquired in a mailing list from the American Counseling Association (ACA).

In the recruitment of participants from the practitioner training program, permission to recruit subjects was acquired from the Chairperson of the department and from the instructors in whose classrooms recruitment occurred. The chairperson
was contacted by e-mail, provided a description of the study's purpose and procedures and asked to provide permission to contact instructors. The letter of permission from the departmental chairperson can be found in Appendix A. Once permission had been obtained from the department chairperson, course instructors were contacted to request their permission to speak with students in their classrooms.

Following acquisition of permission to recruit participants, the recruitment was done by the researcher in the classrooms of professors who agreed to participate (for script of recruitment speech see Appendix A). This recruitment was completed during the fall semester of 1999. Following a description of the data collection procedures involved in the study (see section on data collection below), each student in the classroom was handed a card (See Appendix A) which contained two printed questions, and space to print their name, current mailing address, race and gender. All students were asked to answer the first question on the card. This question asked whether they had been previously approached to participate in this study. All students were asked to answer this question so that the researcher could compile an accurate count of the total number of students from the training program approached to participate in the study. Students who were not interested in receiving more information about participating in the study were asked to stop at this point and leave the remainder of the card blank. The remaining students were then asked to reply to the second question on the card, whether they were a member of AMCD. In order to eliminate duplicate mailings the researcher needed to know if a student recruited through the university program was also a member of AMCD. However,
because students may request that ACA and or AMCD not include their names on mailing lists, those interested in participating were asked to fill out the remaining information regardless of AMCD affiliation. The researcher cross checked the AMCD mailing list for the presence of a respondents name if they claimed AMCD membership and desired to receive a packet. To facilitate student's recognition of AMCD membership, the researcher showed the students a copy of the Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development. The researcher mentioned that if they were a member of AMCD they would be receiving this particular journal. Those students who were interested in receiving more information and who had not been previously asked to participate, were then asked to record their race, gender, name and mailing address on the card. After allowing time for all individuals to complete the relevant portions of the card, the researcher collected all cards (blank and completed). Having each person receive and return a card, helped insure the anonymity of participants' decisions regarding interest in participation. A tally of the total number of individuals asked to participate in the study was compiled by counting the total number of cards handed out and subtracting the total number of cards on which respondents reported having already been asked to participate.

Students from the training program who agreed to participate and whose names were not on the AMCD mailing list were mailed packets using the information contained on the recruitment cards for names and addresses. Each packet contained instruments that corresponded to their identified racial and gender identities. Packets were color coded (i.e. printed on gold paper) to correspond to the training program. Each packet contained a letter with informed consent information.
(See Appendix B), the Personal Questionnaire (See Appendix C), one measure of racial identity (POCRIAS or WRIAS), one measure of gender identity (WIAS or RGIDS), the Multicultural Counseling Inventory (MCI), an incentive sticker saying "Promote Multiculturalism", and a self addressed stamped envelope. Subjects completed the instruments in the packet and return mailed the packet to the researcher in the Self Addressed Stamped Envelope.

The nationwide recruitment strategy included acquiring a mailing list for student members of the AMCD from ACA (letter of permission to use that mailing list is included in Appendix A). The recruitment of subjects from this 1135 member mailing list was done by mailing each individual on the mailing list a packet containing a letter of introduction explaining the procedures for the study, the informed consent information and a request for their participation (See Appendix B). The packet also contained the Personal Questionnaire, racial identity measures, gender identity measures, the MCI, an incentive sticker saying "Promote Multiculturalism", and a Self Addressed Stamped Envelope (SASE). These packets were color coded for the AMCD mailing list (printed on white paper). Individuals whose names were acquired from the AMCD mailing list did not report their race or gender to the researcher prior to the mailing. As the researcher had no way of conclusively knowing any given individual's race or gender from their name and mailing address alone, these individuals were sent all measures of racial and gender identity attitudes that were used for this study. They were asked to complete only those measures of racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes that applied to the race and gender with which they identified. Following completion of the
appropriate instruments, these participants were requested to return the survey
packet in the self addressed stamped envelope provided by the researcher. The
mailing to individuals on the AMCD mailing list preceded classroom recruitment.
Thus individuals who are members of AMCD received their packets earlier and had
somewhat earlier deadlines for inclusion in the raffle (detailed later in this section)
than individuals recruited from the training program.

Forty-eight participants completed both measures of racial identity attitude
development. For these returns, each packet was assessed to determine the
appropriateness of removing the inapplicable instrument or totally excluding it from
analysis. The decision to exclude an instrument, rather than exclude the entire
packet was based upon each participants response to the question asking them to
identify their race/ethnicity (Personal Questionnaire, item 1) coupled with responses
to the two racial identity instruments. Several individuals who filled out both racial
instruments wrote comments on the WRIAS that indicated a racial identity
preference (e.g. "I am not White"). Other individuals responded to specific
questions in ways that indicated a racial identity preference (e.g. "NA" to the
questions on the WRIAS that identify the respondent as White). This analysis
resulted in removing one racial identity instrument from 38 packets and in excluding
10 packets from all analyses.

In addition to the color coding system of printing instruments on different
colored paper to identify recruitment source, the packets from the university and the
AMCD mailing list were coded individually. Individual coding numbers were placed in
the upper right hand corners of the Personal Questionnaires. A master list of names
associated with numbers was created. These numbers were used to track returned packets to identify participants for follow-up. When completed packets were received, the coding numbers were removed by an individual hired by the researcher who had no contact with the master list. The completed packets were then no longer traceable to the participant who completed it. The individual assisting the researcher then gave the separated coding numbers to the researcher, the only individual with access to the master list. The researcher checked the numbers against the master list to eliminate those names from the list for the follow-up mailing. After the coding number was used to eliminate names from the follow-up mailing list, it was placed in the container for the $100 raffle (see the next paragraph for details). Approximately two weeks after the initial mailing was sent, a follow-up letter (see Appendix E) and packet were mailed to students who had not yet returned a packet, reminding them about the study and the deadline date (one month from the initial mailing) to be included in the raffle. The same code number and procedures were used for the follow-up mailing as for the initial mailing.

As an incentive to encourage participation in the study, the researcher provided one hundred dollars for a raffle awarded in a random drawing to one participant. Each participant who returned a completed packet within one month from the date of the initial mailing that was sent to them, was entered into the raffle. The four week deadline date was included in the information provided in the original mailing and the shortened deadline time-frame, about two weeks, was included in the follow up mailing. The individual coding numbers cut from the upper right hand corner of the Personal Questionnaire that corresponded to names on the mailing
lists was placed into a container and one name was drawn to receive the hundred dollars. This recipient was mailed a check for $100 by first class mail.

Research Questions and Statistical Analyses

This study was designed to explore several related questions about multicultural competencies, multicultural training, racial identity, and gender identity. In order to provide an overview of the study data, basic descriptive statistics including means and standard deviations are provided within the results section for each measured variable. The reliability and factorial structure information, for the sample population, for each multicultural training, racial identity, gender identity and multicultural competency instrument is also provided. Internal consistency reliabilities are reported for the subscales of each instrument. Separate factor analyses using data from the sample population were run for each of these instruments to determine the ability of the instruments to provide adequate measures of the underlying constructs for the sample population. Comparisons of the measured variables across source group were performed to provide an external validity check for the instruments, in particular the multicultural training assessment portion of the Personal Questionnaire and the Multicultural Counseling Inventory. Following the assessment of the psychometric properties of the instruments used with the sample population, the analyses chosen to answer the research questions were performed. The principal methods of analysis were canonical correlation analysis and structural equation model analysis. Canonical correlations were run to determine the relationship between gender identity statuses and racial identity statuses. Separate
structural equation models were analyzed to explore the relationship among (1) multicultural training, racial identity, gender identity and multicultural competency for the following demographic groups, Women of Color, White Women, and Men. Results obtained through these analyses were expected to provide evidence to suggest answers to questions in the following areas: The effects of multicultural training on racial identity, the effects of multicultural training on gender identity, the relationship between racial identity and gender identity, the effects of gender identity on multicultural competency, the effects of racial identity on multicultural competency, the effects of multicultural training on multicultural competency and the indirect effects of multicultural training through each of the identity variables on multicultural competency.

Details regarding the research hypotheses for these questions and the statistical analyses designed to provide answers are provided below. The first section provides information about the generation of psychometric data for the instruments with the sample population. The second section provides descriptive data. The third section discusses the comparison between AMCD and University recruited groups. The fourth section details the hypotheses and canonical correlation statistical analyses designed to answer questions about the relationship between racial identity and gender identity. The fifth section details the hypotheses and structural equation model statistical analyses used to examine the proposed relationships among multicultural training, racial identity, gender identity, and multicultural competency. The sixth section describes the statistical analyses that were used to further analyze the relationships among multicultural training, racial
identity attitudes, and multicultural competencies for the two male demographic
groups due to insufficient number of subjects from these two groups to perform the
full Structural Equation Model (SEM) analysis.

Assessment of Instruments

Prior to running the SEM analysis for any demographic group, the internal
consistency reliability and factor validity of the multicultural training (from the
Personal Questionnaire), racial identity (POCRIAS, WRIAS), gender identity (WIAS,
RGIDS) and multicultural competency (MCI) measures was assessed. Since the
power of the SEM analysis is influenced by measurement error as well as by sample
size, this was done to provide an evaluation of measurement error upon the other
analyses. Due to the results of these analyses, SEM analyses were run with all
applicable subscales and without the subscales that demonstrated extremely
problematic reliability or poor factor structure. In order to run the SEM analysis, at
least two subscales needed to be retained and used for each variable. This did not
pose a problem, since at least two subscales from each instrument demonstrated
acceptable reliability and factor structure.

Descriptive Data

Means and standard deviations are provided in the results section for all
measured variables (e.g. subscale scores). Table 4 provides this data as well as
minimum and maximum scores for the total number that completed each instrument.
Table 5 provides the means and standard deviations of the measured variables for
the two racial demographic groups (Women of Color and White Women) of Women.

Table 6 provides the means and standard deviations of the measured variables for the two racial demographic groups (Men of Color and White Men) of Men.

**Comparison of AMCD and University Recruited Groups**

Results from the Personal Questionnaire formal and informal multicultural training questions were compared across recruitment source groups (i.e. scores from AMCD students were compared with scores from University classroom recruited students). These comparisons were done using Independent Samples T tests and ANOVA's. Results from this analysis was expected to provide an external validity check for the measure of multicultural training and multicultural competency as individuals heavily invested in multicultural issues (i.e. AMCD student members) were expected to score higher on both of these variables than individuals who are not as heavily invested in these issues (i.e. students recruited from an entire program). Additionally, the differences between these two groups improved the range of scores reported on the various instruments.

**Relationship Between Gender Identity and Racial Identity**

In this section, the researcher describes how she explored questions about the relationship between racial identity attitude statuses and gender identity attitude statuses for each of the racial-gender groups, Women of Color, Men of Color, White Women, and White Men. To accomplish this, information is provided in three subsections. The first subsection details how the needed number of subjects (i.e.
power) for the canonical correlation analyses for each of the population groups was determined. The second subsection explains the canonical correlation statistic and its use in analyzing the data for this study. The third subsection contains the research hypotheses for each of the racial-gender groups and the specific correlational results that would support these hypotheses for each of the racial-gender groups. In this subsection, discussion of hypotheses and predicted results will be covered by population group, in the following order: Women of Color, White Women, Men of Color, and White Men.

**Determination of Necessary Numbers of Subjects**

To determine the number of subjects needed for each analysis, Kleinbaum, Kupper and Muller (1988) suggest that the minimum number of observations for each group requires approximately 10 error degrees of freedom. Thompson (1984) suggests that this minimum number of subjects is insufficient since least squares methods, like the canonical correlation methods to be used in this study, tend to overestimate relationships with small sample sizes. In order to achieve more robust analyses, Kleinbaum et al. (1988) recommend that these numbers be determined using a rule of thumb calling for a number of observations equal to five times, or for a more robust analysis, ten times the number of variables. The number of variables under consideration in the present study differs among the racial/gender groups. For White men, the number of variables under consideration is 9 (4 gender identity attitude subscales, 5 racial identity attitude subscales). For White women, the number of variables under consideration is 10 (5 gender identity attitude subscales,
5 racial identity attitude subscales). For Men of Color, the number of variables under consideration is 8 (4 gender identity attitude subscales, 4 racial identity attitude subscales). Finally, for Women of Color, the number of variables under consideration is 9 (5 gender identity attitude subscales, 4 racial identity attitude subscales). Using Kleinbaum et al.'s (1988) rules of thumb combined with the number of variables under consideration for each racial/gender group, the following numbers of participants was determined necessary for each of the analyses: 45 (5X) or 90 (10X) for White men, 50 (5X) or 100 (10X) for White women, 40 (5X) or 80 (10X) for Men of Color and 45 (5X) or 90 (10X) for Women of Color. The numbers needed to run the canonical correlations for each group were achieved at the 5X level. For Men of Color and White Men the more robust level of 10X was not achieved (N = 58 for Men of Color, N = 62 for White Men). Both women's groups had sufficient returns to surpass the 10X level (N = 192 for Women of Color, N = 294 for White Women). Power analyses was performed on the data used in the canonical correlation analyses to determine the actual obtained power level for each of the various demographic group analyses.

**Canonical Correlation Statistical Procedures**

For each set of research hypotheses detailed in this section, canonical correlation methods were used to analyze the data. Thompson (1984) suggests that canonical correlation is the method of choice when attempting to analyze the relationship between two variable sets, each set containing multiple variables. In this study the two variable sets are scores on the subscales of the racial identity attitude
scales and scores on the subscales of the gender identity attitude scales. Individual subscale scores are the variates within the two variable sets. Each racial and gender identity attitude measure contains either four, or five subscales. Canonical correlation analysis provides information about two types of relationships between the two different variable sets, an overall relationship and the relationship between variates from each variable set. The first statistic canonical correlation provides is a measure of the overall linear relationship between the variable sets based on a comparison between two composite scores. Thompson (1984) describes the process for arriving at composite scores as follows, “composite scores are generated by collapsing each person’s scores on the variates in each variable set into a single composite variable” (p. 14). Thompson (1984) states that these composite scores are derived to “maximize the relationship between the two variable sets they represent” (p. 14). He states that this is done by “weighting each person’s data and then summing the weighted scores in each variable set” (p. 14). The weights (i.e. function coefficients) are negative or positive numbers used as multipliers for each person’s scores. Thompson (1984) likens these weights to the beta weights used in linear regression models. The composite scores generated through this collapsing and weighting of the data are called variate scores. This weighting provides maximal likelihood of finding a relationship between the composites or variate scores for the two variable sets.

For this study, the analysis involved comparing the racial identity attitude scale subscale scores as a composite with the gender identity attitude scale subscale scores as a composite. Separate analyses were run for each racial/gender
subject group. In canonical correlation analysis, the optimization of the relationship between composite or variate scores through weighting means that "if there is no appreciable relationship between composites derived using the best possible weights, then no other weights can yield a higher correlation, and the variable sets are simply not related to an appreciable degree" (Thompson, 1984 p. 16). Therefore, the second set of canonical correlation statistics were generated only if there was a statistically significant relationship between the variate scores at a $p = .05$ level.

The second set of statistics that canonical correlation analysis generates are those that identify which variates from within a set of variables are most highly related in a linear way to the variates in the other set of variables. If statistical significance is found for the overall relationship, these additional analyses identify which pairings (between one variate from the first set of variables and one variate from the second set of variables) are responsible for the statistically significant relationship between the two variable sets. In this study, for Women of Color, White Women and White Men, this analysis identified pairs of variates in which one variate (i.e. subscale) came from the racial identity measure under consideration and the other came from the gender identity measure under consideration. The analysis paired subscales from the smaller data set (i.e. the measure containing the smallest number of subscales) with subscales from the larger data set (i.e. the measure containing the largest number of subscales) beginning with the pair that demonstrated the highest statistical significance. Within the results for each canonical variate a subscale can only pair with one other subscale. According to Thompson (1984), these pairs more clearly depict the specific relationships between
the variates in two multi-variable sets than that provided by correlation matrices. Canonical correlation analysis does not fully explore the relationships between the variates of two variable sets. This is because each variate (i.e. subscale) from one variable (i.e. measure) can only relate to one other subscale from the other measure in the canonical correlation analysis for any canonical variate. Since subscales from one measure may demonstrate relationships with more than one subscale within the other measure, to explore the full gamut of relationships between racial and gender identity measures, correlation matrices were utilized for groups that yielded statistically significant canonical correlation results. Relationships among variable subscales (e.g. relationship between two separate racial identity subscales) are not explored through canonical correlation analysis and are not reported in this study. Level of significance for all correlational analysis was held at the $p = .05$ level. Additionally, for analysis purposes, only those pairs whose correlations achieved at least a .30 relationship were considered practically significant regardless of statistical significance. The .30 cutoff has been cited as a defining criteria for practical significance (Parks, Carter & Gushue, 1996). The necessity for a level of practical significance is due to the least squares method utilized in canonical correlation analysis tendency to statistically support even trivial relationships.
Hypotheses

1. What is the relationship between racial identity attitude statuses and gender identity attitude statuses for Women of Color?

The research hypothesis for this question is composed of five predictions. The first prediction is that there would be a relationship between racial identity attitude status and gender identity attitude status for Women of Color. The remaining four predictions suggest specific relationships between specific statuses from the two measures. The first two predictions cover the positive relationships between racial identity attitude statuses and gender identity attitude statuses. The first of these is that there would be a positive relationship between the statuses representing higher levels of development of gender identity attitudes and those representing higher levels of development of racial identity attitudes for Women of Color. The second prediction involving positive correlations, is that there would be a positive relationship between the statuses representing lower levels of development of gender identity attitudes and those representing lower levels of development of racial identity attitudes for Women of Color. The second pair of predictions described expected negative correlations. The first of these is that there would be a negative relationship between the higher level statuses of gender identity attitude and the lower level statuses of racial identity attitude. The second hypothesis involving negative correlations predicted that there would be a negative relationship between lower level statuses of gender identity attitude and higher level statuses of racial identity attitude.
These hypotheses were tested using the scores obtained from Women of Color on the four Persons of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale subscales and correlating these scores with the scores obtained from Women of Color on the five Womanist Identity Attitude Scale subscales using canonical correlation and correlation matrix methods. Level of significance for the analyses was set at $p = .05$. However, due to the tendency of canonical methods to statistically support even trivial relationships, a minimum correlational relationship of .30 was used as the cutoff for considering a relationship as being of practical significance. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph, both positive and negative correlations were expected.

In order to determine if there is a statistically significant relationship between the two groups of variates, the correlation between the composite score for the POCRIAS and the composite scores for the WIAS was used. When this relationship was found to be statistically significant, pairs of relationships between the subscales of the POCRIAS and the subscales of the WIAS were generated. It was predicted that any positive correlations would be between higher level statuses from each measure (POCRIAS Immersion/Resistance, Internalization; WIAS Immersion/Emersion, or Internalization) or between lower level statuses form each measure (POCRIAS Preencounter/Conformity, Dissonance; WIAS Preencounter Masculine, Preencounter Feminine, or Encounter). Possible positive correlational pairs included: POCRIAS Preencounter/Conformity with WIAS Preencounter (Masculine or Feminine) or Encounter, POCRIAS Dissonance with WIAS Preencounter (Masculine or Feminine) or Encounter, POCRIAS Immersion/Resistance with WIAS Immersion/Emersion or Internalization, POCRIAS
Internalization with WIAS Immersion/Emersion or Internalization. Possible negative correlation predictions were closely related to the positive correlation predictions given above. In these relationships, the statuses that are related to each other are the opposites of those related in the aforestated positive correlation predictions. Therefore in any negatively correlated pairs, lower level statuses (WIAS Preencounter-Masculine or -Feminine, WIAS Encounter, POCRIAS Preencounter/Conformity, POCRIAS Dissonance) were expected to correlate negatively with higher level statuses from the other instrument (WIAS Immersion/Emersion, WIAS Integration, POCRIAS Immersion/Resistance, POCRIAS Integration).

2. What is the relationship between racial identity attitude statuses and gender identity attitude statuses for White women?

The research hypotheses for this question encompassed two possibilities. The first was that there would be no relationships between statuses representing various levels of development of gender identity and those representing various levels of development of racial identity for White women. The second was that progression in one type of identity attitudes would not be linearly related to progression in the other type of identity attitudes for White Women. Therefore if a relationship was found, it would not reflect parallel progression. This contrasts with the results expected for Women of Color, where development of the two different types of identity attitudes are expected to progress together.

This hypothesis was tested using the scores obtained from White women on the five White Racial Identity Attitude Scale subscales and correlating these scores.
with the scores obtained from White women on the five Womanist Identity Attitude Scale subscales using canonical correlation analysis and correlation matrix analysis. Predictions for this analysis suggested that the results would fit one of two possibilities. The first possibility is that there would be no statistical significance between the composite scores for either variable. The second possibility is that there might be a relationship between the composite scores of these variables. However, if a statistically significant relationship was found between the two variables, it was predicted that the pairs of variates responsible for this statistical significance would not consistently reflect similar levels of development in both identity attitude areas. This means that within the pairs of variates identified as contributing to the statistical significance between the groups, it is possible that pairs would be identified in which higher level statuses from one set of variates would correlate positively with lower level statuses from the other set of variates, i.e. WRIAS Pseudo Independence might pair with WIAS Preencounter (Masculine or Feminine) or Encounter, WRIAS Reintegration might pair with WIAS Internalization, and WRIAS Contact and/or Disintegration might pair with WIAS Immersion/Emersion. Additionally, pairs might be identified such that there would be negative correlations between one instruments higher level statuses and the other instruments lower level statuses. Thus pairs with negative correlations might be found between: WRIAS Contact and/or Encounter and WIAS Preencounter (Masculine or Feminine) and/or Encounter, WRIAS Pseudo Independence and WIAS Immersion/Emersion. One exception to these predictions was the prediction that any pair containing the very highest level status of either variable will have either a positive correlation with a higher level status on the other
variable or a negative correlation with a lower level status on the other measure. This was anticipated because of the similarity in the forces propelling development for both dominant and non-dominant identity development at the highest levels. Level of significance for this analysis was be held at the p .05 level. Additionally, for analysis purposes only those pairs whose correlations achieved at least a .30 relationship were considered of practical significance regardless of statistical significance.

3. What is the relationship between racial identity attitude statuses and gender reference group dependence statuses for Men of Color?

The research hypothesis for this question encompassed two possibilities. The first was that there would be no relationships between statuses representing various levels of development of gender identity and those representing various levels of development of racial identity for Men of Color. The second was that progression in one type of identity attitudes would not be linearly related to progression in the other type of identity attitudes for Men of Color. This contrasts with the results expected for Women of Color, where development of the two different types of identity attitudes were expected to progress together.

This question was analyzed using the scores obtained from Men of Color on the four Persons of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale subscales and correlating these scores with the scores obtained from Men of Color on the four Reference Group Identity Dependence Scale subscales using canonical correlation methods. Predictions for this analysis suggested that the results would fit one of two possibilities. The first possibility was that there would be no statistical significance between the composite scores for either variable. The second possibility was that
there might be a relationship between the composite scores of these variables. If a statistically significant relationship was found between the two variables, it was predicted that the pairs of variates responsible for this statistical significance would not consistently reflect similar levels of development in both identity attitude areas. This means that within the pairs of variates identified as contributing to the statistical significance between the groups, pairs could be identified in which higher level statuses from one set of variates would correlate positively with lower level statuses from the other set of variates, i.e. WRIAS Pseudo Independence might pair with RGIDS No Reference Group or Reference Group Dependent. WRIAS Reintegration might pair with RGIDS No Reference Group, and WRIAS Contact and/or Disintegration might pair with RGIDS Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity or Reference Group Non Dependent Diversity. Additionally, pairs might be identified that exhibit negative correlations between one instruments higher level statuses and the other instruments lower level statuses. Thus negative correlation pairs might be found between: WRIAS Contact and/or Encounter and RGIDS No Reference Group, WRIAS Pseudo Independence and RGIDS Reference Group Dependent or Non Dependent Similarity. One exception to these predictions was the prediction that any pair containing the very highest level status of either variable would have either a positive correlation with a higher level status on the other variable or a negative correlation with a lower level status on the other measure. This was anticipated because of the similarity in the forces propelling development for both dominant and non-dominant identity development at the highest levels. Level of significance for this analysis were held at the p .05 level. Additionally, for analysis purposes only those
pairs whose correlations achieved at least a .30 relationship were considered of practical significance regardless of statistical significance.

4. What is the relationship between racial identity attitude statuses and gender reference group dependence statuses for White Men?

The research hypothesis for this question is composed of five predictions. The first prediction is that there would be a relationship between racial identity attitude status and gender identity attitude status for White men. The remaining four predictions suggested specific relationships between specific statuses from the two measures. The first two predictions cover the positive relationships between racial identity attitude statuses and gender identity attitude statuses. The first of these is that there would be a positive relationship between the statuses representing higher levels of development of gender identity attitudes and those representing higher levels of development of racial identity attitudes for White Men. The second prediction involving positive correlations, is that there would be a positive relationship between the statuses representing lower levels of development of gender identity attitudes and those representing lower levels of development of racial identity attitudes for White Men. The second pair of predictions describe expected negative correlations. The first of these is that there would be a negative relationship between the higher level statuses of gender identity attitude and the lower level statuses of racial identity attitude. The second hypothesis involving negative correlations predicts that there would be a negative relationship between lower level statuses of gender identity attitude and higher level statuses of racial identity attitude.
These hypotheses were tested using the scores obtained from White Men on the five White Racial Identity Attitude Scale subscales and correlating these scores with the scores obtained from White Men on the four Reference Group Identity Dependence Scale subscales using canonical correlation and correlation matrix methods. Level of significance for the analyses was set at $p = .05$. However, due to the tendency of canonical methods to statistically support even trivial relationships, a minimum correlational relationship of .30 will be used as the cutoff for considering a relationship as being of practical significance. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph, both positive and negative correlations were expected.

To determine if there existed a statistically significant relationship between the two groups of variates, the correlation between the composite score for the WRIAS and the composite score for the RGIDS was run. Following the finding of statistical significance for this relationship, four pairs of relationships between the subscales of the WRIAS and the subscales of the RGIDS were generated. It was predicted that any positive correlations would be between higher level statuses from each measure (WRIAS Pseudo Independence, Autonomy; RGIDS Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity, Reference Group Non Dependent Diversity) or between lower level statuses from each measure (WRIAS Preencounter, Disintegration, Reintegration; RGIDS No Reference Group, Reference Group Dependent). Possible positive correlational pairs included: WRIAS Contact and Disintegration subscales with the RGIDS No Reference Group subscale, WRIAS Reintegration with RGIDS Reference Group Dependent, WRIAS Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy with RGIDS Reference Group Non Dependent Diversity and Reference Group Non
Dependent Similarity. One expected pair possibility that was an exception to the lower level status - higher level status split among these correlations was a positive correlational pairing between RGIDS Reference Group Dependent (lower level) and WRIAS Pseudo-Independence (upper level) subscales. This result was anticipated due to a tendency of items in the Pseudo-Independence scale to reflect a reference group dependent (White majority culture) viewpoint, albeit a more positive one than that found in the Reintegration scale items. Possible negative correlation predictions were closely related to the positive correlation predictions given above. In these relationships, the statuses that were expected to be related to each other are the opposites of those expected to be related in the aforesated positive correlation predictions. Therefore in any negatively correlated pairs, lower level statuses (RGIDS No Reference Group, RGIDS Reference Group Dependent, WRIAS Contact, WRIAS Disintegration) were expected to correlate negatively with higher level statuses from the other instrument (RGIDS Reference Group Non Dependent Diversity, RGIDS Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity, WRIAS Pseudo Independence, WRIAS Autonomy).

**Structural Equation Model of Multicultural Training, Racial Identity, Gender Identity, and Multicultural Competency**

**Structural Model**

In the structural equation model (SEM), in accordance with the assumptions of this particular statistical procedure, the researcher proposed a specific directional relationship model among the constructs of multicultural training, the two identity
variables of racial and gender identity, and multicultural competency (See Figure 1, Chapter II, page 180). In this model, multicultural training is an exogenous variable, that is a variable that has an effect on other variables in the model but no other variables in the model have an effect on it. Structural equation modeling requires that an exogenous variable be present for every directional path. Racial identity, gender identity and multicultural competency are endogenous variables, i.e. other variables in the model have an effect on these variables and they may or may not have a relationship with other variables in the model. In the model it is proposed that multicultural training (exogenous variable) has a direct effect on the three variables of gender identity development, racial identity development and multicultural competency (endogenous variables). It is also posited that gender identity and racial identity have a direct effect on multicultural competency. Finally, in this model, multicultural training is presumed to have an indirect effect on multicultural competency through the racial and gender identity variables.

**Measurement Model**

Within the structural equation model (SEM), each of the conceptual ideas of multicultural training, racial identity, gender identity and multicultural competency are represented by two or more measured variables (See Figure 2). Multicultural training is represented by two scores. The first score is a mean score generated from all questions related to the amount of formal multicultural training experienced by the respondents (Items 8-10 and 14 on the Personal Questionnaire, Appendix C). The
second score is also a mean score of several items designed to assess the amount of informal multicultural training experienced by the respondents. This score combines items 12, 15, and 16 on the Personal Questionnaire (Appendix C). Racial identity is measured by the subscale scores on one of two instruments, the WRIAS (5 subscales) or the POCRIAS (4 subscales). Gender identity is measured by the subscale scores on one of two measures as well, the WIAS (5 subscales representing four statuses) or the RGIDS (4 subscales representing three statuses). Multicultural competency is measured by the four subscale scores on the MCI.
Racial/Gender Group Models

For analysis purposes, the model was applied to scores for two of the racial/gender demographic groups (Women of Color and White Women) separately, because of the differences in measures and conceptual understandings of racial identity and gender identity for each population group (Women of Color, Men of Color, White women, and White men). The full structural equation model was unable to be run for the two men’s groups (Men of Color and White Men) due to insufficient numbers. Each racial/gender group model will include that specific group’s responses to the two scores measuring multicultural training and the four subscale scores for the MCI. For Women of Color, the structural equation model also contained the four subscale scores for the POCRIAS and the five subscale scores for the WIAS. For White women, the model encompassed the five subscale scores of the WRIAS and the five subscale scores of the WIAS.

Number of Subjects

In structural equation modeling, the model under consideration is identified as the null hypothesis. Therefore, if the null hypothesis is rejected the research hypothesis is also rejected (Fassinger, 1987). A problem related to this is that the power to reject the research hypothesis (model under investigation) is not known. Power is the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis when it is false. The implication of low power is that support may be found for an incorrect model (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Marsh, Balla & McDonald, 1988). Low power is usually
the result of one or a combination of two or more of the following: Small numbers of subjects, small effect sizes, greater variability of scores, and large amounts of measurement error (Huitema, Personal Communication, October 16, 1990). The implication of high power is that an acceptable model, one only minimally false, may be rejected (Fassinger, 1987). High power is usually the result of one or a combination of two or more of the following: Large numbers of subjects, large effect sizes, smaller variability of scores, and small amounts of measurement error (Huitema, Personal Communication, October 16, 1990). Because structural equation modeling equates the null hypothesis with the model under consideration, it may find support for an incorrect model with too few subjects and find no support for an acceptable model with too many subjects. Therefore, the number of subjects participating in the study is of crucial importance.

To determine the number of subjects needed for each population group, Kleinbaum et al. (1988) recommend that these numbers be determined using a rule of thumb calling for a number of observations (i.e. subjects) equal to five times the number of variables. Bentler (1985) also recommended using the 5 times rule of thumb when the population was expected to fit normal distribution assumptions. Using this rule of thumb, the following numbers of observations for each of the analyses was obtained: 80 for White men, 90 for White women, 75 for Men of Color and 85 for Women of Color. Bentler (1985) noted, however, that if the distribution of scores was arbitrary or not normal, then at least 10 observations per variable would be needed. This latter recommendation by Bentler (1985) requires the following numbers of observations for each of the analyses: 160 for White men, 180 for White
women, 150 for Men of Color and 170 for Women of Color. Consultation with an employee at Statistical Consulting (Western Michigan University) generated power charts at the .8 power level. Using these charts, the consultant recommended between 90 and 150 subjects for each population group analysis. These numbers fall within the range of numbers generated by Bentler's two suggested formulas. Sufficient numbers were only achieved for two racial/gender demographic groups (N = 192 for Women of Color and N = 294 for White Women). Due to insufficient numbers to perform the full SEM analysis for both groups of men (Men of Color and White Men), analyses of the data obtained for these groups was done using a more limited SEM containing only Multicultural Training, Gender Identity Attitudes and Multicultural Competencies. Additionally, multiple regression analysis were run for the components (Multicultural Training, Racial Identity Attitudes and Multicultural Competencies) that formed the racial identity legs of the proposed full SEM model.

Analysis Procedures

The proposed structural equation model (SEM) was analyzed using the EQS computer program (Bentler, 1995). Four indices were used to assess fit of the model (Newcomb, 1994): chi-square, chi-square/df, the nonnormed fit index (NNFI) Bentler's version of the generalized Tucker-Lewis index of fit (TLI), and Bentler's (1990) comparative fit index (CFI). The chi-square is an older measure of fit that is included because of its descriptive and historical importance in SEM research (McCreary, Newcomb & Sadava, 1999) and because of these fit indices, it is the only statistic (Hoyle, 1995). The other fit indices used in this study are transformations of
this statistic designed to compensate for specific problems (e.g. non-normal data
distribution). In SEM, the chi-square should not reach significance (Bentler, 1990;
Marsh et al., 1988). However, the chi-square statistic is one that is strongly
influenced by sample size, therefore additional fit statistics were used to correct for
this bias. The additional fit statistics used in this study, are the NNFI (also known as
the TLI), the ratio of chi-square to degrees of freedom (chi-square/df) and the CFI.
The NNFI is being used because it exhibits the least variability across conditions of
model complexity and sample size (Gerbing & Anderson, 1993; Marsh et al., 1988).
This index should be greater than or equal to .90 (Bentler, 1990; Marsh et al., 1988).
A chi-square/df ratio of 2.0 or less is considered optimal (Newcomb, 1994. And a CFI
of greater than .90 indicates a good fit (Byrne, 1994; Newcomb, 1994). These three
latter indices are the main indicators used to determine the fit of a model. In the
event that these indices provided support for the model, the specific contribution for
each element of the model could also be explored. The specific contributions of each
path within a given linkage in the model are described by the path coefficients
connecting those specific parts.

In addition to considering the absolute goodness of fit of the model, the
model was also compared to a more restricted model that is perceptible in the works
of Neville et al. (1996). The model suggested by the results of the study by Neville et
al. (1996) contained the variables of multicultural training, racial identity attitudes, and
multicultural competencies. This model posited the same directional relationships as
the model proposed in this study, without the gender identity attitude element.
Comparison of the present study’s model with the Neville et al. (1996) model
provides information to assess whether the gender identity variable adds to the explanatory power of the model.

**Hypotheses Contained Within the Model**

The structural equation model proposed in this study posits specific relationships between the factors of multicultural training, gender identity attitude status, racial identity attitude status and multicultural competency. The separate paths that make up this model are the relationships between pairs of these factors. In describing this model, I will first describe the paths between two factors, where one factor directly impacts on another. After describing these direct paths, I will describe the indirect or compound paths of the model, where one factor impacts on another factor through a third or intermediary factor. This model contains five paths involving direct effects. These five paths are: The path between multicultural training and racial identity attitude status, the path between multicultural training and gender identity attitude status, the path between racial identity attitude status and multicultural competencies, the path between gender identity attitude statuses and multicultural competencies, and the path between multicultural training and multicultural competencies. The model also contains two compound paths involving indirect effects, the path between multicultural training and multicultural competencies through gender identity attitude statuses and the path between multicultural training and multicultural competencies through racial identity attitude statuses. In the following paragraphs details about how each of these specific paths were expected to contribute to the overall model are explained in greater detail.
The path between multicultural training and racial identity attitude status was expected to demonstrate a linear relationship where multicultural training would positively relate to higher level statuses of racial identity attitude development and negatively relate to lower level statuses of racial identity attitude development. Specifically, the path coefficient between both formal and informal multicultural training and the higher levels of racial identity attitudes (POCRIAS Immersion/Resistance and Internalization; WRIAS Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy) would indicate a positive linear relationship. While the path coefficients between both types of multicultural training (formal and informal) and the lower levels of racial identity attitudes (POCRIAS Conformity/Preencounter and Dissonance; WRIAS Contact, Disintegration and Reintegration) would indicate a negative linear relationship.

The path between multicultural training and gender identity attitude status was expected to demonstrate a linear relationship where multicultural training would positively relate to higher level statuses of gender identity attitude development and negatively relate to lower level statuses of gender identity attitude development. Specifically, the path coefficient between both formal and informal multicultural training and the higher levels of gender identity attitudes (WIAS Immersion/Emersion and Internalization; RGIDS Reference Group Non-Dependent Diversity and Reference Group Non-Dependent Similarity) would indicate a positive linear relationship. While the path coefficients between both types of multicultural training (formal and informal) and the lower levels of gender identity attitudes (WIAS
Preencounter and Encounter; RGIDS No Reference Group and Reference Group Dependent) would indicate a negative linear relationship.

The path between racial identity attitude statuses and multicultural competencies was expected to encompass both positive and negative linear relationships between specific subscale components. A positive linear relationship was expected between higher levels of racial identity attitude status (WRIAS: Pseudo-Independence, Autonomy; POCRIAS: Immersion/Resistance, Internalization) and multicultural competencies. While a negative linear relationship was anticipated between lower levels of racial identity attitude status (WRIAS: Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration; POCRIAS: Conformity/Preencounter, Dissonance) and multicultural competencies. Relative differences in the magnitude of linear relationship between various racial identity attitude subscale scores and multicultural competency scores were also expected. See Table 1 for an overview of the expected direction and relative magnitude of effects.

Perusal of Table 1 suggests that path coefficients between WRIAS Pseudo-Independence and MCI knowledge and awareness subscale scores should indicate a stronger linear relationship than that between WRIAS Pseudo-Independence and the other two multicultural competency scores. This stronger relationship with Knowledge and Awareness multicultural competencies than with Relationship and Skills multicultural competencies was expected because the attitudes in the Pseudo-Independence status reflect an intellectualized involvement in multicultural issues rather than personal experience and emotional involvement. Another expected relationship was that there will be a greater magnitude in the positive linear
Table 1

Hypothesized Direction and Degree of Relationship Between Racial Identity
Attitudes and Multicultural Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Identity Subscale</th>
<th>MCI Subscale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POCRIAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity/Preencounter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion/Resistance</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WRIAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ indicates a positive relationship with more + indicating a greater positive relationship
- indicates a negative relationship with more - indicating a greater negative relationship

relationship between POCRIAS Immersion/Resistance scores and the Awareness and Relationship multicultural competency subscale scores than between that
subscale (POCRIAS Immersion/Resistance) and the other two MCI subscales. This stronger relationship with Awareness and Relationship multicultural competencies than with Knowledge and Skills multicultural competencies was expected because the attitudes in the Immersion/Resistance status reflect an immersion in one's own culture. This own culture immersion was expected to limit the individual's attention to the issues of other cultures and thereby limits any increase in knowledge of other cultures or increase in skills in working with members of other cultures. The path coefficients with the largest positive values were expected to be between the highest statuses of racial identity attitude development (WRIAS: Autonomy; POCRIAS: Internalization) and the multicultural competency subscale scores. This result was expected because the attitudes involved in the highest levels of racial identity development accompany involvement with members of other races and in activities that promote own and other culture understanding. The path coefficients with the largest negative values were expected to be found between the racial identity subscale scores considered to be at the lower end of racial identity development (i.e. WRIAS Contact and Encounter subscale scores and POCRIAS Conformity/Preencounter and Dissonance subscale scores) and all of the MCI subscale scores. This result was expected because the attitudes that exemplify the lower levels of racial identity development involve either distancing oneself from interracial encounters and information or confusion about racial issues.

The path between gender identity attitude statuses and multicultural competencies was expected to include both positive and negative linear relationships between specific subscale components. A positive linear relationship
was expected between higher levels of gender identity attitude status and multicultural competencies (WIAS Immersion/Emersion and Internalization; RGIDS Reference Group Non-Dependent Diversity and Reference Group Non-Dependent Similarity). A negative linear relationship was predicted between lower levels of gender identity attitude statuses and multicultural competencies (WIAS Preencounter and Encounter; RGIDS No Reference Group and Reference Group Dependent). Differences in the magnitude of linear relationship between the various gender identity attitude subscale scores and the multicultural competency scores were expected. See Table 2 for an overview of the expected direction and relative magnitude of effects.

Relationships between gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies were expected to reflect a higher status - lower status split where lower level gender identity statuses would relate negatively to multicultural competencies and higher level gender identity statuses would relate positively to multicultural competencies. Scores on the WIAS subscale of Immersion/Emersion were expected to have a stronger positive relationship with the multicultural competency Awareness subscale scores than with the other multicultural competency subscale scores. This stronger relationship with Awareness multicultural competencies than with Relationship, Knowledge and Skills multicultural competencies was expected because the attitudes in the Immersion/Resistance status reflect an immersion in one's own culture. This own culture immersion limits the individual's attention to the issues of other cultures and thereby limits any increase in knowledge of other cultures, skills in working with members of other
Table 2
Hypothesized Direction and Degree of Relationship Between Gender Identity Attitudes and Multicultural Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCI Subscale</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Identity Subscale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion/Emersion</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGIDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reference Group</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group Dependent</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group Non Dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ indicates a positive relationship with more + indicating a greater positive relationship
- indicates a negative relationship with more - indicating a greater negative relationship
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cultures, or the development of relationship with members of other cultures. In a similar fashion, higher scores on the WIAS Encounter subscale were expected to be more strongly associated with MCI Awareness subscale scores than with other MCI subscale scores. This is due to the focus on awareness of own culture issues evident in the attitudes of the Encounter status. The highest statuses of gender identity attitude development from either measure (WIAS: Internalization; RGIDS: Reference Group Non-Dependent Diversity and Reference Group Non-Dependent Similarity) was expected to have the strongest association with each of the MCI subscale scores when compared to other gender identity attitude statuses. This result was expected because the attitudes involved in the highest levels of gender identity development accompany involvement with members of other cultures and in activities that promote own and other culture understanding. While higher scores on the WIAS Preencounter and RGIDS No Reference Group subscale scores were considered likely to have the greatest negative associations with all MCI subscale scores than any other gender identity attitude scores. This result was expected because the attitudes that exemplify the lower levels of gender identity development involve either distancing oneself from intercultural encounters and information or confusion about gender issues.

The path between multicultural training and multicultural competencies was expected to demonstrate a positive linear relationship between multicultural training and multicultural competencies. The direct effect of multicultural training on multicultural competency was expected to be one of the most robust predictive relationships in the model (i.e. each of the two multicultural training factors were
expected to have greater positive linear relationships with multicultural competency scores than any of the identity attitude subscales did with the multicultural competency scores). In addition two specific relationships were expected between both formal and informal multicultural training and multicultural competency. Formal multicultural training was expected to have the greatest effect on multicultural competency Knowledge subscale scores. Informal multicultural training was expected to have a greater effect than formal multicultural training on multicultural competency Relationship, Skills, and Awareness subscale scores.

The compound path between multicultural training and multicultural competencies through racial identity attitude statuses was expected to demonstrate a linear relationship between multicultural training and racial identity attitude statuses which were then expected to relate linearly to multicultural competencies. Because the structural equation model proposed specific relationships between all of the variables in the model, analysis of the model could evaluate the indirect effects of variables on other variables by portioning out variances attributable to other causes (Asher, 1983). In this way, the results from the model analysis could provide information regarding indirect effects. Information about indirect effects is achieved by decomposing the correlation between any two variables into the sum of simple (direct effects) and compound (indirect effects) paths (Asher, 1983). Since multicultural training was expected to effect racial identity attitudes and racial identity attitudes were expected to effect multicultural competency, it stands to reason, that some part of the effect of racial identity attitudes on multicultural competency was also attributable to multicultural training. Therefore it was proposed that multicultural
training would have an indirect effect on multicultural competency, through the racial identity attitude variable, that would increase the explanatory power of the model. This indirect effect was expected to flow from multicultural training, through racial identity attitude statuses, and on to multicultural competency through specific subscale relationships. As described in the previous section on the direct effects of multicultural training on racial identity attitudes, scores on the measure of multicultural training were expected to relate in a positive linear relationship with scores on the subscales representing higher level statuses of racial identity attitudes and to relate in a negative linear manner with subscales representing lower levels of racial identity attitudes. As described in the previous section on the direct effects of racial identity attitudes on multicultural competencies, the association between racial identity attitude subscale scores and multicultural competency subscale scores was also expected to follow this pattern. Therefore, Higher level statuses of racial identity were expected to have the greatest positive association with multicultural competency scores and lower level statuses of racial identity attitude statuses were expected to have the greatest negative association with multicultural competency scores.

The compound path between multicultural training and multicultural competencies through gender identity attitude statuses was expected to demonstrate a linear relationship between multicultural training and gender identity attitude status which would then relate linearly to multicultural competencies. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, the structural equation model proposed specific relationships between all of the variables in the model and because of this,
analysis of the model could evaluate the indirect effects of variables on other variables by portioning out variances attributable to other causes. In this way, the results from the model analysis could provide information regarding indirect effects. Since multicultural training was hypothesized to effect gender identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes were hypothesized to effect multicultural competency, it stands to reason, that some part of the effect of gender identity attitudes on multicultural competency was also attributable to multicultural training. Therefore it was expected that there would be an indirect effect of multicultural training on multicultural competency, through this variable, that would increase the explanatory power of the model. This indirect effect was expected to flow from multicultural training, through gender identity attitude statuses, and on to multicultural competency through specific subscale relationships. As described in the previous section on the direct effects of multicultural training on gender identity attitudes, scores on the measure of multicultural training were expected to have a positive linear relationship with scores on the subscales representing higher level statuses of gender identity attitudes and a negative linear relationship with subscales representing lower levels of gender identity attitudes. As described in the previous section on the direct effects of gender identity attitudes on multicultural competencies, the association between gender identity attitude subscale scores and multicultural competency subscale scores was also expected to follow this pattern. Therefore, Higher level statuses of gender identity were expected to have the greatest positive association with multicultural competency scores and lower level
statuses of gender identity attitudes were expected to have the greatest negative association with multicultural competency scores.

The research hypothesis for this study pooled these separate paths into one overall model and then analyzed that model to determine if it effectively described the data. It also evaluated this model across two different groups (Women of Color and White Women) to determine if the model was equivalent for each group. The goodness of fit of the model was analyzed using four statistical indices. These four indices were explained previously in the section on analysis procedures. If these statistical indices supported the goodness of fit of the model, then the separate paths would be considered to be statistically significant in explaining the model. In SEM, if any linkage does not demonstrate a statistically significant relationship, the model as a whole is rejected. When a model does not demonstrate a good fit to the data, the variance represented in the separate path contributions becomes irrelevant. If the goodness of fit of the model is supported, then the individual contributions of the separate paths may be investigated using the path coefficients generated by the structural equation analysis.

Direct statistical comparison of the different demographic group models is precluded due to the differences in the measures used to assess racial and gender identity for each group. However, comparison of the goodness of fit statistics and the variance accounted for by each path in the model as described by the path coefficients may be accomplished by scrutinizing the results for each demographic group. Although differences were expected in some of the specific subpaths within the measurement model for each demographic group model, the model’s overall
pathways were expected to contribute to the goodness of fit for each demographic group. Additionally, the model was expected to add information about the acquisition of multicultural competencies above previously conceived models and it was expected to do so for each demographic group.

**Contingency Analysis Procedures**

Since insufficient numbers of Men of Color and White Men responded to the survey to enable the SEMs to be run for these population groups, a scaled down analysis was run for these two groups. The first part of this scaled down analysis involved pooling the men's data into a single group to run a three-factor (Multicultural Training, Gender Identity Attitudes, and Multicultural Competencies) structural equation model analysis. The second portion of this scaled down analysis involved running multiple regression analyses for each of the two men's groups (Men of Color and White Men) for the variables that comprised the racial leg in the structural equation model (Multicultural Training, Racial Identity Attitudes, and Multicultural Competencies). These analyses provided information about the "goodness of fit" for various paths in the model, however, they were insufficient to provide information about the model as a whole. Although, like in the Neville et al. (1996) study, the support of the paths may suggest the larger model.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Overview of the Chapter

This chapter contains the results from each statistical operation performed with the study data. The various statistical operations are covered within seven sections. The chapter begins with a section that contains a description of the sample population. To illustrate the demographics of the sample population, total numbers are provided for all demographic information (e.g. gender, SES) and, where appropriate, means and standard deviations are provided (e.g. age). This section is followed by a section covering the factor analysis and reliability assessment of the instruments used in the study. This information will enable the reader to evaluate for himself or herself the effect of measurement error on the results generated from the other analyses being performed in the study. The next section contains a brief overview of descriptive data for each variable in the study. This section is followed by a section comparing the data from the two recruitment source groups (AMCD, University Program). The next section contains the canonical correlation analysis of gender identity and racial identity variables for each of the demographic groups. This is followed by a section containing the separate structural equation model analysis of the four primary variables (Multicultural Training, Gender Identity Attitudes, Racial Identity Attitudes, and Multicultural Competencies) for two of the demographic
groups (White women, Women of Color) and a structural equation model analysis of three of the four primary variables (Multicultural Training, Gender Identity Attitudes, and Multicultural Competencies) for men combining the two racial groups (White Men and Men of Color). The full structural equation model analyses for the two groups of men (White, Persons of Color) were unable to be completed due to insufficient numbers of men for each demographic group. To provide information about various connections within the structural equation model for these men's groups, regression analyses were performed. The final section of Chapter IV contains regression analyses of the three variables whose connections were not contained within the men's structural equation model analyses (Multicultural Training, Racial Identity Attitudes, and Multicultural Competencies) for each of the two male groups (White Men and Men of Color).

Description of the Sample Population

The number of individuals who returned packets was 615. The total number of individuals who were contacted to participate in this study numbered 1308. The total return rate was 47%. The returns came from AMCD student members (39%, N = 505) and students in a counselor education/counseling psychology program at a midwestern university (8%, N = 110). The return rate for these two groups, based upon their respective total samples, was fairly close (46% for AMCD student members, 54% for program students). Of those who returned packets 495 (80%) were women and 120 (20%) were men. Female participants identified as European American/White/Caucasian (46%, N = 281), Black/African American (14%, N = 84),
Hispanic/Latin (6%, N = 37), Asian American/Pacific Islander (4%, N = 28), Multiracial (4%, N = 23), International (4%, N = 24), American Indian/Native American (2%, N = 10), and Other (1%, N = 7). Male participants identified as European American/White/Caucasian (10%, N = 59), Black/African American (4%, N = 25), Hispanic/Latin (2%, N = 15), Asian American/Pacific Islander (1%, N = 9), American Indian/Native American (<1%, N = 1), Multiracial (<1%, N = 4), International (<1%, N = 5), and Other (<1%, N = 2). Within the sample population individuals reported the following sexual orientations: 554 (90%) heterosexual, 43 (7%) gay/lesbian, 14 (2%) bisexual and 3 (1%) other. In identifying the socio-economic status of their family of origin, 7.3% reported lower economic, 21.7% reported lower-middle economic, 48.3% identified middle economic, 19.2% reported high middle economic, and 3.5% reported upper socio-economic backgrounds. Respondents ranged in age from 21 to 67 with the mean age being 36 and the most represented (modal) age being 25. Respondents reported being enrolled in master’s degree programs (N = 343, 57 1st year, 286 2nd year), having recently completed their master’s degree (N = 75), being enrolled in or having recently graduated from doctoral degree programs (N = 186, 41 first year, 29 second year, 29 third year, 27 fourth year, 60 fifth year or beyond) or being enrolled in a specialists degree program (N = 3). In response to the question asking respondents to assess the percentage of individuals in their last work or school environment that matched their own race, the majority of individuals who reported identifying as being from a minority race reported work or school environments where less than half of the others present shared their racial designation. In contrast the majority of individuals identifying as White reported
that over half of the other individuals in their last work or school environment shared
their racial designation. For specific response numbers and percentages by race see
Table 3.

For the analyses in the proposed study, racial identification was compressed
into two groups (White or Person of Color). Individuals were asked to fill out the racial
identity instrument which they felt best described their identity. Individuals were
assigned to a specific group (Women of Color, White Women, Men of Color, White
Men) based on the instrument that they filled out. If an individual filled out both
instruments and it could be clearly determined which identity was appropriate (e.g. "I
am not White" was written on completed WRIAS) the inappropriate instrument was
discarded. Packets for which this identification could not be made with certainty were
not used in further analyses. Since respondents determined their own group
identification based on which instrument they chose to complete, there were
individuals who identified as Asian American/Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Latin, and
Multiracial belonging to both racial identity groups. Racial demographics by racial
group are reported here to illuminate this point. Women of Color reported being
Black (84), Native American (10), Asian American (28), Hispanic (34), and Multiracial
(12). White Women reported being Hispanic (3), White (281), and Multiracial (2).
Men of Color reported being Black (24), Native American (1), Asian American (8),
Hispanic (14) and Multiracial (3). Finally, White Men reported being Asian American
(1), Hispanic (1), White (59) and Multiracial (1). Nine packets were not used for
further analysis as the individuals completed both the White and People of Color
racial identity instruments and/or a specific racial group designation could not be determined.

Table 3

Percentage of Co-Workers Who Share a Respondent's Race/Ethnicity in the Workplace as Reported by Different Racial Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race of participant</th>
<th>% of own race</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Multi</th>
<th>inter</th>
<th>other</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 12%</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-37%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-62%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63-75%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-87%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-99%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Co-Workers can also be fellow students in an educational environment. Black = Black/African American, Native = Native American, American Indian, Asian = Asian American/Pacific Islander, Latin = Hispanic/Latin, White = White/Caucasian, Multi = Multiracial, inter = international student/non US resident
Assessment of instruments

This section covers the reliability and validity data generated from the responses of the sample population to the various instruments. Internal consistency reliability coefficients and confirmatory factor analysis solutions and loadings are reported for each instrument. (See Appendix G for the individual items factor-loadings for each instrument). This information is provided to allow the reader to assess measurement effects on each of the analyses contained in the study. The reliability and validity information is reported in four primary subsections: Multicultural training measures, racial identity measures, gender identity measures, and measure of multicultural competencies. Each of the identity measure subsections (racial identity and gender identity) are further divided into two parts, one for each instrument (POCRIAS and WRIAS for racial identity, WIAS and RGIDS for gender identity).

Measure of Multicultural Training

The measure of multicultural training consists of two subscales from the Personal Questionnaire. One of these subscales, designated Formal Multicultural Training, consists of four items. The other subscale, designated Informal Multicultural Training, is comprised of three items. Reliability and factor analytic results for these two subscales are reported in the following paragraph.

The internal consistency reliability for these two subscales for the study's population was .68 for Formal Multicultural Training and .37 for Informal Multicultural
Training. It is likely that the internal consistency reliabilities for these subscales were influenced by the low number of items in each subscale. Principal components exploratory factor analysis for each subscale provided two solutions for each subscale. One of two solutions arrived at for each subscale supported a single factor structure. Formal Multicultural Training initially provided a three factor solution that accounted for 92% of the variance (F1 = 53%, F2 = 21%, F3 = 18%). However, all items loaded at .52 or better on factor one suggesting that the subscale might best be described as a single factor subscale. Informal Multicultural Training initially demonstrated a two factor solution that accounted for 78% of the variance. (F1 = 45%, F2 = 33%). In this factor structure, two items loaded only on factor one, while the third item loaded on both factor one and factor two. This third item, loaded .55 on factor one (it loaded .75 on factor two) suggesting that a single factor structure provides a satisfactory explanation of the structure of this subscale as well.

Racial Identity Measures

The factor analyses for these measures utilized a confirmatory principal component method using varimax rotation. Varimax rotation is used in most previous studies with the WRIAS and with the POCRIAS predecessors, the RIAS and RIAS-B, that report factor analytic results. Therefore, to aid in comparison of results from this study with other studies involving these instruments, parallel factor analytic strategies were used.

Both racial identity measures (POCRIAS and WRIAS) contained problematic subscales, as seen in obtained factor structure and in reliability estimates. These
psychometric problems are likely to create difficulties in the statistical analyses used in the study and the structural equation model analysis in particular. The problem for the structural equation model analysis is that this type of analysis is particularly sensitive to error variance. Measurement error, such as that suggested by the factor and reliability results for these instruments, is one source of error variance. Specific details of the psychometric analyses for these instruments are reported below.

POCRIAS

The reliability and validity of the POCRIAS for the sample population was fair. Factor analysis provided support for some of the subscales as defined by Helms (1995b). The internal consistency reliability was also adequate for half of the subscales. Details of the instrument analysis are reported below.

Internal consistency reliability coefficients of the POCRIAS subscales for the study population (N = 235 Persons of Color) were as follows: .58 for the Conformity/Preencounter subscale; .72 for the Dissonance subscale; .78 for the Immersion/Resistance subscale; and .56 for the Internalization subscale. The Dissonance and Immersion/Resistance subscales exhibited reliability above the .70 recommended by measurement experts (Kaplan & Sacuzzo, 1989). The Conformity/Preencounter and Internalization subscales did not reach the .70 cutoff.

Results of the confirmatory principal component factor analysis using varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization supported a four-factor solution which accounted for 31.46% of the variance. The first factor accounted for 11.20% of the variance, the second factor accounted for 8.78%, the third factor accounted for 5.92%, and the
fourth factor accounted for 5.56%. The rotation converged in nine iterations. The 
four-factor solution acquired with the study's sample population tended to support 
some of the subscales defined by Helms (1995b), although only the 
Immersion/Resistance subscale was strongly supported. All but two of the items 
from this subscale loaded on factor one. The two items, defined by Helms (1995b) 
as Immersion/Resistance items, that did not load on factor one, loaded on factor two. 
Additionally, two items from the Dissonance subscale also loaded on factor one.

The remaining three subscales demonstrated less clear factor structure. The 
Dissonance subscale in particular, did not exhibit a clear factor structure. Items 
defined by Helms (1995b) as belonging to the Dissonance subscale loaded on every 
factor. The majority of these items (7), loaded on factor two. Of the remaining items, 
only a few loaded on each of the three other factors. Four loaded on factor four. 
Two loaded on factor one. And, one loaded on factor three. One Dissonance item 
(#30) did not load at least .30 on any factor. One of the items that loaded most 
highly on factor four, also loaded above .30 on factor two, with the majority of the 
Dissonance items. These mixed factor results for the Dissonance subscale items 
would seem to conflict with the alpha reliability coefficient (.72) attained for this 
subscale with the study population. However, there was some correlation between 
factor two and factor four which contained the majority of both Conformity and 
Dissonance items. This relationship may have contributed to the reliability results for 
the Dissonance subscale in that both factors may be functioning similarly. Most of 
the Conformity subscale items loaded on these two factors (two and four). Those 
that did not, did not load on any factor (4 items). Five Conformity items loaded most
highly on factor two, while only two Conformity items loaded most highly on factor four. Several of the Conformity/Preencounter items demonstrated positive factor loadings for both factors two and four which did not all meet or exceed the .30 level (items 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9). Of these items several had loadings on factors two and four that were similar (item 1 = .20 on two and .20 on four, item 7 = .25 on two and .21 on four, item 9 = .15 on two and .21 on four). The Internalization subscale was supported as a single-factor structure. Half of the Internalization items loaded above .30 on one factor (factor-three). Nine of the ten items defined by Helms (1995b) as Internalization items loaded highest on this factor, although four of the items did not load at or above .30. The remaining item from this subscale did not load on any factor. The problem in the factor structure for this subscale was that although factor three clearly had the Internalization items it also contained several items from other subscales (2 from Immersion/Resistance and 1 from Dissonance).

**WRIAS**

The reliability and validity of the WRIAS for the sample population was fair. Factor analysis provided adequate support for two of the subscales. The factor structure of the remaining three subscales was extremely intermingled. The internal consistency reliability was adequate for three of the subscales. For the remaining two subscales the internal consistency reliability was problematic. Details of the instrument analysis are reported below.

Internal consistency reliability coefficients of the WRIAS subscales for the study population (N = 354 Whites) were as follows: .45 for the Contact subscale; .72
for the Disintegration subscale; .74 for the Reintegration subscale; .68 for the Pseudo-Independence subscale; and .44 for the Autonomy subscale. The Disintegration and Reintegration subscales exhibited reliability above the .70 recommended by measurement experts (Kaplan & Sacuzzo, 1989). The Pseudo-Independence subscale internal consistency reliability also closely approached this .70 cutoff. The Contact and Autonomy subscales did not reach or closely approach the .70 cutoff.

Results of the confirmatory principal component factor analysis using varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization supported a five-factor solution which accounted for 36.67% of the variance. The first factor accounted for 9.54% of the variance, the second factor for 9.29%, the third factor for 6.41%, the fourth factor for 6.33%, and the fifth factor for 5.10%. The rotation converged in 13 iterations. The five-factor solution provided fairly strong support for the Reintegration subscale as defined by Helms (1990a). The factor results were much more confused for the other four subscales.

The loadings for the Contact items provided some support for a single-factor structure. Half of the ten items loaded on factor four. The remaining five items loaded on factors two, three, and five. Of these five items, three exhibited multiple loadings. Items 1 and 21 loaded on factors three and five, while item 36 loaded on factors one and three. Factor four which contained a plurality of Contact items, also contained items from Disintegration (1), Pseudo-Independence (3), and Autonomy (1) subscales.
The Disintegration subscale did not exhibit a clear factor structure. Items from this subscale were dispersed across four factors (factor-two through factor-five). Factor two contained a plurality of items (4), but no factor contained a majority. The remaining items were scattered among the factors as follows: one on factor four, three on factor three, and two on factor five. Factor two, which contained the most Disintegration items, also contained primarily Reintegration (9) items.

The Reintegration subscale demonstrated a single factor structure with nine of ten items loading on a single factor (2). One of these nine items loaded second highest on this factor, although its loading on factor two was above .30. The remaining item, did not load on any factor. The factor loadings for Reintegration items were among the highest with eight items loading at .46 or above on factor two. Four other items loaded on factor two with the Reintegration items, all of these were from the Disintegration subscale.

The Pseudo Independence subscale exhibited a two-factor structure with five of the items loading on factor one and three of the items loading on factor four. Factor one also contained five Autonomy items. Factor four contained a mix of items from other subscales (Contact = 5, Disintegration = 1, Autonomy = 1).

The final subscale Autonomy did not demonstrate a clear factor structure. The items from this subscale were spread out across three factors as follows: 5 items loaded on factor one, 2 items loaded on factor three, and 1 item loaded on factor four. Two Autonomy items did not load on any factor. The Autonomy subscale items shared these factors with items from other subscales. For factor one, Pseudo Independence items (5) equaled Autonomy items (5). In factor three, every subscale
except Pseudo Independence was represented (Contact 2, Disintegration 3, Reintegration 1, Autonomy 2). Factor four contained items from Contact (5), Disintegration (1), and Pseudo Independence (3) in addition to the Autonomy item (1).

The factor analysis results described in the preceding paragraphs, show an intermingling of subscale items throughout the various factors. This intermingling does tend to clump items from higher level statuses together and items from lower level statuses together. Although the items from the lower level Contact status are anomalous in that they tend to clump with higher level status items. Thus, the items designated by Helms as belonging to the three subscales of Contact, Pseudo-Independence, and Autonomy tended to intermingle within three of the factor components (1, 3, and 4). Disintegration and Reintegration items tended to cluster on factors two and five. These results suggest that the WRIAS may more appropriately represent a two or three factor structure, rather than a five factor structure.

**Gender Identity Measures**

The factor analyses for these measures utilized a confirmatory principal component method using varimax rotation. Varimax rotation is used in most previous studies with the WIAS, that report factor analytic results. The studies on the RGIDS, reported by Wade (1998) include both non-rotated and rotated factor analytic results. To maintain consistency within the study analysis procedures, analysis of the RGIDS data was done using the same methods used for the other instruments. The use of
this type of factor analysis should enable readers to compare results from this study with other studies involving these instruments.

Both gender identity measures (WIAS and RGIDS) contained problematic subscales, as seen in obtained factor structure and in reliability estimates. Although the factor structure of the RGIDS was much better than that demonstrated by the WIAS. As with the racial identity instruments, these psychometric problems are likely to create difficulties in the statistical analyses used in the study and the structural equation model analysis in particular. The problem for the structural equation model analysis is that this type of analysis is particularly sensitive to error variance. Measurement error, such as that suggested by the factor and reliability results for these instruments, is one source of error variance. Specific details of the psychometric analyses for these instruments is reported below.

**WIAS**

The reliability and validity of the WIAS for the sample population was fair. Factor analysis provided adequate support for all of the subscales, although the Encounter/Dissonance subscale was defined as having two factors and the Preencounter subscale was defined as having only one. The internal consistency reliability was also adequate for most of the subscales. Details of the instrument analysis are reported below.

Internal consistency reliability coefficients of the WIAS subscales for the study population (N = 480) were as follows: .58 for the Preencounter/Masculine subscale; .69 for the Preencounter/Feminine subscale; .64 for the Encounter...
subscale; .68 for the Immersion/Emersion subscale; and .57 for the Internalization subscale. None of the subscales exhibited reliability above the .70 recommended by measurement experts (Kaplan & Sacuzzo, 1989). The Encounter and Immersion/Emersion subscales closely approached this .70 cutoff.

Results of the confirmatory principal component factor analysis using varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization supported a five-factor solution which accounted for 32.03% of the variance. The first factor explained 8.49% of the variance, the second 6.91%, the third 5.84%, the fourth 5.42%, and the fifth 5.37%. The rotation converged in 17 iterations. The five-factor solution tended to support the subscales as defined by Helms (1990c). Strongest support was found for the Immersion/Emersion and Internalization subscales. The Preencounter subscales (Masculine and Feminine) were supported as having a single factor structure. The majority of items from these two subscales (6 Preencounter Masculine, 9 Preencounter Feminine) loaded on the same factor (1). Of the remaining three items from Preencounter Masculine, one loaded on factor two and two did not load on any factor. Of the two items from Preencounter Feminine that did not load on factor one, the first item did not load at or above .30 on any factor and the second item loaded on factor two. The item that did not load at or above .30 on any factor did load at .29 on factor one. Factor one contained two items that were not from these two subscales, an Encounter and an Internalization item.

The Encounter subscale demonstrated the most problematic factor structure of all WIAS subscales. This subscale’s items loaded at .30 or better on all five factors, with many items loading at this level on multiple factors. The two factors that
best represented the Encounter subscale were factors two (7 of 12 items loaded at .30 or above) and five (7 of 12 items loaded at .30 or above). Three Encounter items also loaded at this level on other factors (1 on factor one, 1 on factor three, and 1 on factor four). Many Encounter items demonstrated multiple factor loadings. Several Encounter items (5) loaded on two factors and 1 item loaded on three factors. Finally, 1 item did not load on any factor.

The Immersion/Emersion subscale demonstrated a single-factor structure. Seven of the eleven items from this subscale loaded on factor three. The remaining items loaded on factor one (1), factor two (2), and factor five (1). Only one item from another subscale also loaded on factor three, an Encounter subscale item.

The Internalization subscale was also supported as having a single factor structure. The majority of Internalization items loaded on factor four (5). The remaining six items loaded on factor five (2) or did not load on any factor.

**RGiDS**

The reliability and validity of the RGiDS for the sample population was fair to good. Factor analysis provided support for the subscales as designed. The internal consistency reliability was also sufficient for use with this population. Details of the factor analysis are reported below.

Internal consistency reliability coefficients of the RGiDS subscales for the study population (N = 118 men) were as follows: .70 for the No Reference Group subscale; .51 for the Reference Group Dependent subscale; .66 for the Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity subscale; and .84 for the Reference Group Non
Dependent Diversity subscale. The No Reference Group and Reference Group Non Dependent Diversity subscales exhibited reliability above the .70 recommended by measurement experts (Kaplan & Sacuzzo, 1989). The Reference Group Dependent and Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity subscales did not reach the .70 cutoff. However, the Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity subscale did approach the .70 cutoff.

Results of the confirmatory principal component factor analysis using varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization supported a four-factor solution which accounted for 43.17% of the variance. The first factor accounted for 14.28% of the variance, the second for 13.31%, the third for 8.17% and the fourth for 7.40%. The rotation converged in 6 iterations. The four-factor solution tended to support the subscales as defined by Wade (1998), although not all items loaded most heavily on their designated subscale.

The No Reference Group subscale demonstrated a single-factor structure. Half of the items from this subscale (5) loaded on factor four. The remaining five items did not load at .30 or above on any subscale. One of the non loading No Reference Group items, had loadings approach .30 for factor four (.29). Factor four contained one item from another subscale (Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity).

The Reference Group Dependent subscale exhibited a single-factor structure that did not account for all of the items from this subscale. Four of the seven items from this subscale loaded on factor four. The remaining three items did not load on any factor. The Reference Group Dependent subscale shares factor four with the No
Reference Group subscale which has five items loading on this factor. Additionally, one item from the Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity subscale also loads on factor four.

Both of the two highest level RGIDS subscales demonstrated a single factor structure. The Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity subscale also exhibits a single-factor structure that does not account for all items. The majority of items (5) from the Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity subscale loaded on factor two. The remaining two items loaded on factor three. Two of the items that loaded on factor two had multiple loadings at or above .30. Finally, only Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity items loaded on factor two, no items from other subscales did so. The Reference Group Non Dependent Diversity subscale demonstrated a single-factor structure wherein all items loaded on factor one. Additionally, this factor contained no items from other subscales.

**Multicultural Competencies Measure**

The reliability and validity of the MCI for the sample population was good. Factor analysis provided support for the subscales as designed. The internal consistency reliability was also sufficient for use with this population. Only one subscale demonstrated problematic reliability, the Relationship subscale. This subscale may contribute to measurement error in the analyses used in this study. Details of the reliability and factor analyses are reported below.

Internal consistency reliability coefficients of the MCI subscales for the study population (N = 570) were as follows: .84 for the Skills subscale; .79 for the
Knowledge subscale; .82 for the Awareness subscale; and .56 for the Relationship subscale. Three of the four subscales of the MCI surpassed the .70 cutoff recommended by measurement experts (Kaplan & Sacuzzo, 1989). Only the relationship subscale did not reach the .70 cutoff.

Results of the confirmatory principal component factor analysis using varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization supported a four-factor solution which accounted for 39.03% of the variance. The first factor accounted for 11.66% of the variance, the second factor for 9.96%, the third for 9.76%, and the fourth for 7.65%. The rotation converged in 6 iterations. The four-factor solution supported the subscales as defined by Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin and Wise (1994) although not all items loaded most heavily on their designated subscale. Of the 40 items, 36 loaded more heavily on their designated subscale than on any other subscale. Skills items loaded on factor one, Knowledge items loaded on factor two, Awareness items loaded on factor three, and Relationship items loaded on factor four. Two Awareness items loaded on other factors (factor one and factor two) as did one Knowledge item (factor one). The fourth item that did not load on its respective subscale (Relationship) did not load on any subscale.

Analysis Across Descriptive Data

In this section, the means and standard deviations are reported for all measured variables which will be used for further analysis (Tables 4, 5 and 6). The statistics in table 4 describe the pooled sample of all scores for each variable.
Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Measured Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable*</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTICULTURAL TRAINING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Training</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Training</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POCRIAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter/Conformity</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonance</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion/Resistance</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter/Masculine</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter/Feminine</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion/Emersion</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGIDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reference Group</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group Dependent</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group Non Dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POCRIAS = People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale (N=236), WRIAS = White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (N=355), WIAS = Womanist Identity Attitude Scale (N=485), RGIDS = Reference Group Identity Dependent Scale (for men) (N=118), MCI = Multicultural Counseling Inventory (N=590). * N varies
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(Women of Color, White Women, Men of Color and White Men) within the total sample population. To provide a breakdown of statistically significant differences, Tables 5 and 6 provide descriptive statistics for the data from various subgroups across various subgroups (race, gender). ANOVAs were run. ANOVAs were run comparing multicultural training and multicultural competencies across several of the descriptive variables in the study (gender, race, and degree). Additional ANOVAs were run comparing racial and gender identity attitudes across race and gender. The proposed structural model (that includes multicultural training, racial identity attitudes, gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies) is the same for all groups, but the measurement model differs due to the use of different instruments for men and women and for People of Color and Whites. Consequently, this comparison across the demographic variables of race and gender may aid in pinpointing differences in the various groups' results that were found in shared instruments.

Multicultural Training and Multicultural Competencies Across Demographic Variables

Gender

No statistically significant differences were found in multicultural training or competencies between men and women. However, one mean difference (Formal Multicultural Training) neared statistical significance ($F = 3.81$, significance .05). The mean difference between the two groups for this variable was .24 (Mean for men = 2.20, Mean for women = 1.96). Since there were no statistically significant differences between men and women on these variables (multicultural training and
Table 5
Descriptive Statistics for Measured Variables for Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Women of Color*</th>
<th>White Women**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MULTICULTURAL TRAINING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Training</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Training</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POCRIAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter/Conformity</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonance</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion/Resistance</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WRIAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter/Masculine</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter/Feminine</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion/Emersion</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MCI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N = 192 for Women of Color, ** N = 294 for White Women
POCRIAS = People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale, WRIAS = White Racial Identity Attitude Scale, WIAS = Womanist Identity Attitude Scale, MCI = Multicultural Counseling Inventory
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Table 6
Descriptive Statistics for Measured Variables for Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Men of Color*</th>
<th>White Men **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MULTICULTURAL TRAINING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Training</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Training</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POCRIAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter/Conformity</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonance</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion/Resistance</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WRIAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RGIDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reference Group</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group Dependent</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group Non Dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MCI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N = 58 for Men of Color, ** N = 62 for White Men
POCRIAS = People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale, WRIAS = White Racial Identity Attitude Scale, RGIDS = Reference Group Identity Dependent Scale (for men), MCI = Multicultural Counseling Inventory
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multicultural competencies), they should not be responsible for any differences found in the proposed model between men and women.

**Race**

Mean comparisons for Multicultural Training (Formal and Informal) and Multicultural Competencies (Knowledge, Skills, Awareness, and Relationship) with Race resulted in significant F tests for three of the Multicultural Competency variables (Skills F = 2.76 p = .01, Awareness F = 6.30 p = .00, and Relationship F = 6.44 p = .00). There were no significant differences found for formal or informal multicultural training, or for the multicultural competency subscale of Knowledge for Race. Post hoc comparisons using Tukey’s HSD test revealed several specific significant relationships among the Multicultural Competency and Race comparisons. However, due to the unequal representation for the various racial groups, there is likely a greater incidence of Type I error in these analyses.

The multicultural competency Awareness component had only three specific statistically significant differences. These differences were all between Whites and another racial group. The means for the various racial groups for this variable in descending order were as follows: Multiracial (3.4), Hispanic (3.26), Asian American (3.22), International student (3.21), Native American (3.16), Black (3.07) and White (2.90). Higher scores indicate greater multicultural counseling competency. Statistically significant differences were found between Whites and Asian Americans (p = .02), between Whites and Hispanics (p = .00), and between Whites and multiracial individuals (p = .05).
The multicultural competency Skill component had only three specific statistically significant differences. These differences were all between the group of International Students and other racial groups. The means for the various racial groups for this variable in descending order were as follows: Multiracial (3.54), Native American (3.46), Asian American (3.42), Black (3.36), Hispanic (3.35), White (3.30), and International Students (3.08). Statistically significant differences were found between International Students and Blacks ($p = .04$), International Students and Asian Americans ($p = .03$), and between International Students and Multiracial Persons ($p = .00$).

The multicultural competency Relationship component had the largest number of specific, statistically significant differences. The means for the various racial groups for this variable in descending order were as follows: International Students (2.19), White (2.04), Asian American (1.95), Hispanic (1.88), Native American (1.86), Black (1.84), and Multiracial (1.75). Statistically significant differences were found between Blacks and Whites ($p = .00$), between Hispanics and International Students ($p = .01$), between Multiracial individuals and Whites ($p = .00$), and between Blacks and International Students ($p = .00$).

Of more value to the current study than specific racial differences are the differences that occurred between People of Color as a group compared against Whites. These differences contribute to the interpretation of the structural equation models. When comparisons were made across racial groupings (Whites and Persons of Color) rather than across all racial categories, statistical significance was found for racial differences in the MCI Awareness (Mean for Women of Color = 3.15,
Mean for White Women = 2.89; p = .00) and Relationship (Mean for Women of Color = 1.90, Mean for White Women = 2.05; p = .00) subscales for women. No statistically significant differences were found in multicultural competencies for men. The Awareness subscale was the only subscale to approach statistical significance with a mean difference of .18 (Mean for White Men = 2.99, Mean for Men of Color = 3.17) and a p value of .07. The differences found for race among women emphasize that these groups should be analyzed separately. No differences found between White Men and Men of Color suggests that the two groups of men can be pooled in a structural equation model that incorporates gender identity attitudes, multicultural training, and multicultural competencies.

**Educational Level**

Mean comparisons of multicultural competencies and multicultural training variables across education level were run to identify the effect of education on these variables. This information can be used to determine the effect of educational differences on the results obtained for other variables from the two recruitment source groups. This information also provides one form of external check for the measures of multicultural training and multicultural competencies since higher scores for both multicultural training and multicultural competencies are expected to accompany higher education levels.

Mean comparisons for Multicultural Training (Formal and Informal) and Multicultural Competencies (Knowledge, Skills, Awareness, and Relationship) with Year in Degree (1st year in master's degree program, 2nd year in master's degree
program. 3rd year in or completed master's degree program, 1st year in doctorate program, 2nd year in doctorate program, 3rd year in doctorate program, 4th year in doctorate program, 5th year in or beyond doctorate program) resulted in significant F tests for each of the Multicultural Competency variables (Knowledge $F = 4.04$ p = .00, Skills $F = 8.10$ p = .00, Awareness $F = 7.06$ p = .00, and Relationship $F = 2.11$ p = .03) and each of the Multicultural Training variables (Formal $F = 18.29$ p = .00, Informal $F = 5.84$ p = .00). In the post hoc analysis of all of the variables except the Multicultural Competency Relationship variable, groups with higher levels of education scored higher on multicultural training and competencies than groups with less education. These results mesh with expectations about the effect of educational level of training and competencies. The Multicultural Competency Relationship variable yielded results in the opposite direction from the other Multicultural Training and Multicultural Competency variables. In this variable, groups with less education reported higher scores than the groups with more education. This result did not fit predictions about the effect of educational level on multicultural competencies. This may because individuals with greater education have more awareness of the difficulties in forming relationships across group membership and therefore rate themselves lower than those with less training. Another possibility is that statistical differences found may not truly exist. This possibility is due to the unequal representation for the various education level groups, which increases the likelihood of Type I error in these analyses, especially in any post-hoc analysis results.
Comparison of Recruitment Source Groups

This subsection contains an evaluation of the similarities and differences between participants from each of the two recruitment sources (AMCD mailing list, university program). This evaluation serves two purposes: To determine if the use of two recruitment source groups effectively increased the range of scores on the measured variables; and to provide an external validity check for the measured variables. This section begins with a subsection that details the similarities and differences in demographics. These demographics are provided to illustrate differences between the two recruitment source groups and include: Gender, race, education level, socio-economic status, age, and sexual orientation. Demographic similarities will be addressed first, followed by demographic differences. The reports of the demographic variables are followed by reports of the comparison of means for the measured variables (Gender Identity Attitudes, Racial Identity Attitudes, Multicultural Training, and Multicultural Competencies). These are covered in separate paragraphs for each of these measured variables.

Demographic Data

Similarities Between Source Groups

Some of the demographic variables (age, gender, socio-economic scale) appeared fairly similar across source groups. Age categories operated similarly across source group. Both groups had very few members age 23 or under (AMCD = 2%, University program = 5%). The age of the largest proportion of respondents for
both groups fell between 24 and 33 inclusive (AMCD = 45%, university program = 62.5%). The next two age categories (34-43, 44-53) contained the majority of the remaining sample populations (34-43: AMCD = 26%, university program = 18%; 44-53: AMCD = 23%, university program = 13.5%). The final category (54-67) contained very few members in either source group (AMCD = 4%, university program = 1%). The range in age was slightly greater for AMCD members (21-67) than for individuals recruited through the university program (22-56). Additionally, the individuals recruited through the AMCD mailing list tended to be older than those recruited through the university program (AMCD members mean = 36.43, SD = 9.57; university program recruits mean = 32.31, SD = 9.00). The gender composition of both groups was similar (AMCD: Men = 20%, Women = 80%; University Program: Men = 22%, Women = 78%). The Socio-Economic Scale (SES) contained some small variation, but overall the two groups exhibited the same basic composition. For the AMCD group, percentages for the various levels of the socio-economic scale are as follows: 8% lower, 25% lower middle, 45% middle, 19% upper middle, and 4% upper. The composition of the university program demonstrated a substantive difference only for lower middle and middle SES levels. The percentages for the university program participants' socio-economic scale level was as follows: 8% lower, 9% lower middle, 59% middle, 22% upper middle, and 2% upper.

Differences Between Source Groups

Several areas within the sample demographics varied substantively by source (sexual orientation, race, and education level). Sexual orientation was similar
Comparison of Measured Variables

Comparisons of measured variables across the two recruitment source groups (AMCD student members, counselor education and counseling psychology students at a midwestern university) were done using independent samples T tests.
These analyses yielded statistically significant differences for Multicultural Training (Formal and Informal), specific Racial Identity Attitudes for both Whites and People of Color, and Multicultural Competencies between the two groups. No statistically significant differences were found between source groups for Gender Identity Attitudes.

**Multicultural Training**

In both formal and informal multicultural training, AMCD members reported higher levels of training and experience than those individuals recruited through the university program. For formal multicultural training the mean difference was 1.23 which was statistically significant at the .00 level. For informal multicultural training the mean difference, .79 was not as great. This difference was statistically significant at the .00 level. Differences in general clinical training were also statistically significantly different (mean difference 2.05, p = .00) with AMCD members reporting much more clinical training than participants recruited through the university program. The differences found between AMCD student members and university program students were expected. The reported higher average amount of education within the AMCD population and their expressed interest in the area of multicultural issues, as evidenced by their involvement in the AMCD were expected to be related to higher scores for multicultural training and multicultural competencies. Thus the differences found for multicultural training between these two groups tend to support the ability of the Personal Questionnaire to provide an effective measure of multicultural training.
Racial Identity Attitudes

Differences in Racial Identity Attitudes between the two recruitment source groups were found for only three racial identity statuses, one for Whites and two for Persons of Color. For Whites, the scores for the reintegration status varied statistically significantly between AMCD members and participants recruited through the university program. The mean difference was .13 (p = .02) with university program recruited individuals scoring higher than AMCD members. For Persons of Color, the scores for the Dissonance and Immersion statuses differed statistically significantly across source group. The mean difference for the Dissonance status was .26 (p = .04) with university recruited individuals scoring higher than AMCD members. The mean difference for the Immersion status was .29 (p = .03) and again university program recruited individuals scored higher than AMCD members. These results provide some external support for the identified racial identity attitude subscales since the group with the lower level of multicultural training (university recruited) gave a stronger endorsement to lower level racial identity statuses than the group with the higher level of multicultural training (AMCD members). The racial identity subscales identified in this subsection are among those subscales with the best reliability and factor structure for these measures.

Multicultural Competencies

Statistically significant differences were found between source groups for every one of the multicultural competency variables. AMCD student members scored higher than those individuals recruited through the university program on
three of the multicultural competency variables (Knowledge, Skills, Awareness). University program recruits scored higher than AMCD student members on the Multicultural Competency Relationship subscale. The following mean differences were found: Knowledge .23 (p = .00), Awareness .55 (p = .00), Skill .20 (p = .00), and Relationship .14 (p = .00). The higher endorsement by AMCD members of the three multicultural competency variables (Knowledge, Awareness, Skill) provides strong external validity support for these MCI subscales.

Canonical Correlation Analysis

The result of the correlational analysis of the relationship between racial identity and gender identity for each of the four demographic groups (Women of Color, White Women, Men of Color, White Men) is detailed in this section. Canonical Correlation analyses provided information about the relationships between the two factors of racial and gender identity for each racial/gender group and detailed which subscales contributed most to these relationships. Correlation matrix analyses contributed information to evaluate the relationships between all of the individual subscales across factors. For each of the racial/gender demographic groups, adequate power was obtained (at or above .80 for most analyses) to identify relationships of .30 or greater. The .30 value was recommended for practical significance.

Canonical Correlation analyses relies upon several assumptions. The first is that measurement error of the variables under consideration is minimal. The second is that the variance of the variables is not restricted. The third is that there are no
large differences in the shape of the two distributions under consideration. This type of analyses does not require that the data be normally distributed. The results for each of the racial/gender groups reported below may have been effected by failure to meet some of these assumptions. As discussed previously, the variables under consideration may not be adequately measured. This is especially true for the racial identity variable for both Whites and People of Color. In addition to problematic measurement, several aspects (e.g. subscales) of the different variables have severely restricted ranges and variances. The following subscales' ranges were half of that possible: WIAS Internalization and POCRIAS Internalization. Several other subscales also had restricted ranges. The effects of measurement error and the truncated range of scores for any given variable should be considered when evaluating the results reported below. This section provides the results for the canonical correlation analyses and is divided into four subsections one for each demographic group. The first subsection is for Women of Color. This is followed by a subsection for White Women. The third subsection details the results for Men of Color. The fourth and final subsection provides the results for White Men.

Women of Color

Canonical Correlation analysis of the relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes for Women of Color (N = 192) revealed a definite relationship between these two types of attitudes. The first canonical correlation yielded a .71 correlation which was statistically significant (p = .00). This result was achieved by collapsing all of the subscales from each group (gender
identity attitudes and racial identity attitudes) into a single score. The two scores arrived at for each group were then compared to each other. The procedure then identified the pair of subscales, one from each variable that contributed most to this result. The POCRIAS Integration and WIAS Internalization subscales contributed the most to this canonical result (R square = .62), contributing to 22% of the variance. Additionally, the following pairs were identified: POCRIAS Dissonance and WIAS Encounter, POCRIAS Immersion/Resistance and WIAS Immersion/Emersion, and POCRIAS Preencounter/Conformity and WIAS Preencounter/Feminine. To determine the depth of the relationship between the two groups of variables involved, the procedure continues to run comparisons until it reaches a point where the relationship is no longer significant. In the second and consecutive steps of analysis, the comparison between both groups of variables is run again removing the correlation between the two subscales that contributed most to the first, second, third, etc. canonical variable. The second and third canonical variates for the analysis between gender identity attitudes and racial identity attitudes for Women of Color were also statistically significant (R square = .55, p = .00; R square = .34, p = .01 respectively). The second canonical variate accounted for 6% of the variance. Finally, the third canonical variate only accounted for 1% of the total variance.

Since canonical correlation analysis does not explore the relationship between each individual subscale with every other subscale, a Pearson Product Moment correlation matrix was run to further explore the specific relationships between every racial identity attitude subscale and every gender identity attitude subscale (See Table 7). These correlations tended to follow theoretically expected
Table 7
Correlations Between Racial Identity Attitudes and Gender Identity Attitudes for Women of Color

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WIAS Subscale</th>
<th>POCRIAS Subscale</th>
<th>Pre/F</th>
<th>Pre/M</th>
<th>Enc</th>
<th>Im/Em</th>
<th>Int</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity Preencounter</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonance</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion Resistance</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = .05, ** p = .01

WIAS = Womanist Identity Attitude Scale, Subscales are: Pre/F = Preencounter Feminine, Pre/M = Preencounter Masculine, Enc = Encounter, Im/Em = Immersion/Emersion, Int = Internalization, POCRIAS = People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale, subscales are: Conformity/Pre = Conformity Preencounter, Dissonance, Immersion/Resistance, Internalization.

Directions. Lower level subscales from each measure tended to correlate positively. Higher level subscales from each measure tended to correlate positively. While combinations of lower level and higher level subscales tended to correlate negatively. Statistically significant correlations were found between all subscales for this demographic group. POCRIAS Preencounter/Conformity, Dissonance, and Immersion/Resistance subscales correlated positively with WIAS Preencounter/Masculine, Preencounter/Feminine, Encounter.
and Immersion/Resistance. The correlations between the POCRIAS Internalization subscale and the WIAS subscales were in the opposite direction from that between the other POCRIAS subscales and the WIAS subscales (i.e. POCRIAS Internalization correlated positively with WIAS Internalization and negatively with all other WIAS subscales). The only subscales that did not correlate in the predicted directions were the POCRIAS Immersion/Emersion and WIAS Immersion Emersion. These two subscales tended to correlate similar to the lower level subscales rather than the higher level subscales.

White Women

Canonical Correlation analysis of the relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes for white women (N = 293) revealed a definite relationship between these two types of attitudes. The first canonical correlation yielded a .60 correlation which was statistically significant (p = .00). This result was achieved by collapsing all of the subscales from each group (gender identity attitudes and racial identity attitudes) into a single score. The two scores arrived at for each group were then compared to each other. The procedure then identified the pair of subscales, one from each variable that contributed most to this result. The WRIAS Disintegration with WIAS Encounter subscales contributed the most to this canonical result, contributing to 17% of the variance. The other subscale pairs identified within the first canonical variate include: WRIAS Pseudo Independence and WIAS Internalization, WRIAS Reintegration and WIAS Preencounter/Feminine, WRIAS Contact and WIAS Preencounter/Masculine, and
WRIAS Autonomy and WIAS Immersion/Emersion. To determine the depth of the relationship between the two groups of variables involved, the procedure continues to run comparisons until it reaches a point where the relationship is no longer significant. In the second and consecutive steps of analysis, the comparison between both groups of variables is run again removing the correlation between the two variables that contributed most to the first, second, third, etc. canonical variable. The second, third and fourth canonical variates were also statistically significant (R square = .43, p = .00; R square = .30, p = .00; and R square = .15, p = .03 respectively).

Since canonical correlation analysis does not explore the relationship between each individual subscale with every other subscale, a Pearson Product Moment correlation matrix was run to further explore the specific relationships between every racial identity attitude subscale and every gender identity attitude subscale. This exploration revealed a statistically significant correlation between 19 of the 25 possible combinations of racial identity attitude subscales with gender identity attitude subscales (See Table 8). These correlations tended to follow a similar pattern as the results exhibited for Women of Color. Although for White Women there was more deviation across identity levels than exhibited in the results for Women of Color. WRIAS Contact was statistically significantly correlated in a positive direction with three of the WIAS subscales (Preencounter Masculine, Encounter, and Internalization). The correlation between WRIAS Contact and WIAS Internalization is in the opposite direction of that expected for parallel development.
Table 8
Correlations Between Racial Identity Attitudes and Gender Identity Attitudes for White Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WIAS Subscale</th>
<th>WRIAS Subscale</th>
<th>Pre/F</th>
<th>Pre/M</th>
<th>Enc</th>
<th>Im/Em</th>
<th>Int</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = .05, **p = .01

WIAS = Womanist Identity Attitude Scale. Subscales are: Pre/F = Preencounter/Feminine, Pre/M = Preencounter/Masculine, Enc = Encounter, Im/Em = Immersion/Emersion, Int = Internalization, WRIAS = White Racial Identity Attitude Scale

subscales was statistically significant for all relationships. The relationships were positive between Disintegration and the four lowest WIAS subscales and negative with the highest WIAS subscale. Results of correlations between WRIAS Reintegration subscale and the WIAS subscales demonstrated positive relationships with the four lower subscales and a negative relationship with the highest Womanist Identity Attitude subscale. Of these relationships, four were statistically significant: WIAS Preencounter Masculine, WIAS Preencounter Feminine, WIAS Encounter,
and WIAS Internalization. The correlations between the WRIAS Pseudo Independence subscale and the WIAS subscales were in the opposite direction from those between the earlier WRIAS subscales (Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration) and the WIAS subscales. Of these relationships, four were statistically significant. The relationship was negative with WIAS Preencounter Feminine, WIAS Encounter, and WIAS Immersion/Emersion and positive for WIAS Internalization. Only three correlations between the final WRIAS subscale (Autonomy) and the WIAS subscales were statistically significant (p = .01). Two of these were negative (WIAS Preencounter Feminine and WIAS Encounter) and one was positive (WIAS Internalization).

Men of Color

Canonical Correlation analysis of the relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes for men of color revealed no relationship between these two types of attitudes. The first canonical variate approached significance (R square = .57, p = .08). The relationship that contributed most to this result was that between the RGIDS Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity subscale and the POCRIAS Integration subscale (.49 correlation).

White Men

Canonical Correlation analysis of the relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes for white men revealed a relationship between these two types of attitudes. The first canonical correlation yielded a .66 correlation,
which was statistically significant \((p = .00)\). This result was achieved by collapsing all of the subscales from each group (gender identity attitudes and racial identity attitudes) into a single score. The two scores arrived at for each group were then compared to each other. This was the only canonical variate that was statistically significant. The procedure then identified the pair of subscales, one from each variable that contributed most to this result. The WRIAS Disintegration and RGIDS No Reference Group subscales contributed the most to this canonical result, contributing to 19% of the variance. The other pairs identified in the first canonical analysis were: WRIAS Autonomy and RGIDS Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity, WRIAS Reintegration and RGIDS Reference Group Dependent, and WRIAS Pseudo Independence and RGIDS Reference Group Non Dependent Diversity.

Further exploration of the specific relationships using a Pearson product moment correlation matrix revealed a statistically significant correlation between 7 of the 20 possible combinations of racial identity attitude subscales with gender identity attitude subscales (See Table 9). All of the statistically significant correlations followed theoretically expected directions. Lower level subscales from each measure correlated positively. Higher level subscales from each measure correlated positively. Combinations of higher level and lower level subscales from each measure correlated negatively. WRIAS Contact was not statistically significantly correlated with any of the RGIDS subscales. The relationship between the WRIAS Disintegration subscale and the RGIDS subscales was statistically significant for three of the four possible relationships (No Reference Group, Reference Group
Table 9

Correlations Between Racial Identity Attitudes and Gender Identity Attitudes for White Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRIAS Subscale</th>
<th>NRG</th>
<th>RGD</th>
<th>RGNDS</th>
<th>RGNDD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo Independence</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = .05, ** p = .01
RGIDS = Reference Group Identity Dependence Scale, Subscales are: NRG = No Reference Group, RGD = Reference Group Dependent, RGNDS = Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity, RGNDD = Reference Group Non Dependent Diversity, WRIAS = White Racial Identity Attitude Scale

Results of correlations between the WRIAS Reintegration subscale and the RGIDS subscales demonstrated only one statistically significant relationship, with the Reference Group Dependent subscale. There was also only one statistically significant correlation between the WRIAS Pseudo Independence subscale and the RGIDS subscales. This relationship was with the RGIDS Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity subscale. For the final WRIAS subscale (Autonomy) two correlations with RGIDS
subscales were statistically significant (Reference Group Dependent and Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity).

Structural Equation Model Analysis

This section contains the results of separate structural equation model analyses of the proposed model for Women of Color and White Women. These analyses are contained in the first two subsections. The third subsection contains the structural equation model analysis of a more limited model (gender triangle) containing only multicultural training, gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies for the group of all men (White Men and Men of Color). Analysis for this limited model was done for all men because the number of returns necessary to run the separate full model analyses for each male racial group (Men of Color, White Men) was not received.

The results obtained for the various structural equation analyses used in this study are influenced by the extent that the data meets several assumptions inherent in this type of analysis. SEM requires the use of multiple measures of any given variable. This procedure also requires large sample sizes. Data are expected to be normally distributed. Finally, measurement devices are expected to be free from measurement error. Two of these assumptions were violated to varying degrees. The data was not normally distributed for all or even most of the variables under analysis. The distribution of scores for only three subscales were normally distributed (RGIDS Reference Group Dependent and Reference Group Non Dependent Diversity, and POCRIAS Immersion/Resistance) although other subscales
approximated normal distributions, especially the remaining two RGIDS subscales and the POCRIAS Dissonance subscale. The subscales with the most restricted ranges included WRIAS Autonomy, POCRIAS Preencounter/Conformity and Internalization, and WIAS Preencounter Masculine and Internalization. In addition to failing to meet the assumption of normally distributed data, the requirement for no or minimal measurement error was also violated. The measures used to operationalize the various factors contain fairly significant amounts of measurement error. Additionally, the same instrument produced the multiple measures for any given factor (e.g. the WRIAS produced all of the racial identity measures for Whites), although since the instruments each generate several subscale scores which can be used to satisfy the need for multiple measures. These violations of the assumptions of structural equation model analysis inevitably influenced the results generated through these analysis. It is likely that these violations created greater disturbances in the model and reduced model fit.

Women of Color

The number of subjects necessary to run the Structural Equation Model analysis was achieved for Women of Color (N = 172). Analysis of the full model (Model 1, See Figure 3) provided the following Chi Square results: 339.70 for 79 degrees of freedom which was statistically significant (p < .00). Since in structural equation model analysis, the research hypothesis and null hypothesis are the same, the significant Chi Square results suggest that the model does not fit the data. Due to the robustness of Chi Square in structural equation model analysis (i.e. it tends to identify very small fit deviations), other indices are used to improve fit evaluation.
Figure 3. The Full Model for Women of Color, Containing All Four Factors (Multicultural Training, Racial Identity, Gender Identity, and Multicultural Competencies) and All Measured Variables.
These indices are the Chi Square/df, Bentler-Bonnet Non Normed Fit Index (NNFI), and the Comparative Fit Index (CFI). For the Chi Square/df a good fit is indicated by a score of 2.0. For the other fit indices, typically a good fit is identified by a score of .90 or better. For the proposed full model, other indices of fit also yielded results suggesting that the model was not a good fit for the data: Chi Square/df = 4.3, NNFI = .54, and CFI = .65. This model was compared with the more limited racial triangle model (Model 2, See Figure 4) containing only Multicultural Training, Racial Identity Attitudes and Multicultural Competencies that was suggested by the results of previous research. When compared to this model, the full model which also incorporated gender identity attitudes, did not provide as good a fit for the data. Results for the racial triangle model (Model 2) were as follows: Chi Square = 135.99, 29 df. p < .00; Chi Square/df = 4.69; NNFI = .61; and CFI = .75. Although, this model (2) also did not provide a good fit for the data.

![Figure 4. Racial Triangle Model for Women of Color.](image-url)
Psychometric insufficiencies in the instruments used for this study (low internal consistency reliability, muddy factor structure) likely created a significant amount of measurement error in the structural equation model analysis. To control for the effects of this measurement error, separate analyses were run for these models using fewer subscales for the various factors. Subscales were eliminated from the model if their internal consistency reliability did not reach at least .60. In general, the better the internal consistency reliability of a subscale, the better the factor structure as well. The factors that were removed from the full model for the measurement error control models for Women of Color, were POCRIAS Preencounter/Conformity, POCRIAS Internalization, WIAS Preencounter Masculine, WIAS Internalization, MCI Relationship. For almost every model, the measurement error control version provided a better fit for the data than its counterpart containing all instrument subscales. See Table 10 for a comparison of the goodness of fit indices for models containing all instrument subscales and models containing only the more reliable subscales for Women of Color.

For Women of Color, the Measurement Error Control (MEC) model corresponding to the full model provided a better fit for the data than the full model containing all applicable subscales. Chi Square for this model was 61.30, 24 df, p = .00. The goodness-of-fit indices also suggest that this model provides a better fit for the data: 2.55 Chi Square/df: .84, NNFI, .92 CFI. The MEC counterpart to the racial triangle model suggested by previous research also provided a better fit for the data (Chi Square = 18.48, df = 8, p = .02; Chi Square/df = 2.31; NNFI = .89; CFI = .96).
Table 10
Goodness of Fit Indices for Models Containing All Subscales and Models Containing Only More Reliable Subscales for Women of Color

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>All Subscales</th>
<th>Reliable Subscales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>CS/df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Model-1</td>
<td>3(328) 339.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Triangle-2</td>
<td>4(329) 135.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Triangle-3</td>
<td>5(333) 99.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Variable-4</td>
<td>6(335) 20.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Variable-5</td>
<td>7(335) 111.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Variable-6</td>
<td>8(335) 78.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CS = Chi Square, CS/df = Chi Square/degrees of freedom, NNFI = Bentler-Bonnet Non Normed Fit Index, CFI = Comparative Fit Index. ( ) contains page number where figure may be found.

MacCallum, Wegener, Uchino, and Fabrigar (1993) state that within all structural equation models, there exist many alternative mathematically equivalent models that will explain the variance in the model. They note, however, that not all of these mathematically equivalent models will provide equally reasonable explanations. Because of the inevitable existence of mathematically equivalent models, MacCallum et al. (1993) stress the importance of acknowledging the presence of equivalent models in any structural equation model analysis. In
response to this suggestion, the researcher explored the feasibility of several theoretically plausible alternative models.

Two strategies were used to identify theoretically plausible alternative models. The first strategy involved retaining all four variables from the full model and altering the path structure among the variables. Most of the models generated in this way did not provide as good a fit for the data as that provided by the full model. MEC counterparts for these models provided a better fit for the data than the versions containing all subscales, but the goodness of fit of these models did not surpass that of the MEC counterpart to the full model. One model of those that incorporated only path changes provided a fit that was somewhat better than the full model. This model explored only one small change in the full model, changing the non-directional, interrelational effect between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes. Making this a one-way effect in either direction provided the same results (Chi Square 288.13, 80 df, p < .001; Chi Square/df 3.60; NNFI .64; CFI .72) and a slightly better fit than that provided by the full model. Removing this interrelational effect created a model that provided a substantially poorer fit for the data than that provided by the full model.

The second strategy used to generate alternative models involved progressive simplification of the full model by removing variables. Results for a three variable gender triangle model (Model 3, See Figure 5) containing multicultural training, gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies fared better than the full model. This model provided a better fit for the data than that provided by the racial triangle model (Model 2) as well. Results for the gender triangle model (Model
3) were: Chi Square = 99.10, 38 df, p < .00; Chi Square/df = 2.6; NNFI = .79, CFI = .86. A MEC version of the gender triangle model (Model 3) yielded better results. Chi Square for this version was 28.43 for 14 df (p = .01). The other indices of fit also indicate that this model provides a fairly good fit for the data: Chi Square/df = 2.03; NNFI = .91, and CFI = .96. This model was one of the best fitting models for Women of Color.

Figure 5. Gender Triangle Model for Women.

Further reduction in parameters created alternative models that were even more limited (i.e. models containing only two of the four variables from the full model). Model 4 (See Figure 6) considered only Multicultural Training and Multicultural Competencies. Results for this model were: Chi Square = 20.84, 6 df, p = .00, Chi Square/df = 3.47, NNFI = .85, CFI = .94. This model provided the best fit of the models analyzed without correcting for measurement error. The MEC version of this model was only marginally better (Chi Square = 7.75, 2 df, p = .02; Chi Square/df = 3.87; NNFI = .87; CFI = .97). The fit improved for all indices except Chi Square/df.
Figure 6. Two-factor Model Containing Multicultural Training and Multicultural Competencies for All Racial/Gender Groups.

However, the MEC version of Model 4 did not provide the best fit when compared with the other MEC models. Model 5 (See Figure 7) contained only two variables, Racial Identity Attitudes and Multicultural Competencies. The goodness-of-fit for this model was also better than the full model and comparable to the three-variable racial triangle model containing Multicultural Training, Racial Identity Attitudes, and Multicultural Competencies (Model 2). Analysis of this model yielded the following

Figure 7. Two-Factor Model Containing Racial Identity Attitudes and Multicultural Competencies for Women of Color.

model was also better than the full model and comparable to the three-variable racial triangle model containing Multicultural Training, Racial Identity Attitudes, and Multicultural Competencies (Model 2). Analysis of this model yielded the following
statistics: Chi Square = 111.00, 17 df, p < .00; Chi Square/df = 6.53; NNFI = .58; CFI = .75. The MEC version of this model was quite a bit better (Chi Square = 9.26, 2 df, p = .01; Chi Square/df = 4.63; NNFI = .82; CFI = .96). Model 6 (See Figure 8) contained the two variables of Gender Identity Attitudes and Multicultural Competencies, this model also provided a better fit for the data than the full model and a comparable fit to the three-variable gender triangle model containing Multicultural Training, Gender Identity Attitudes, and Multicultural Competencies.

Figure 8. Two-Factor Model Containing Gender Identity Attitudes and Multicultural Competencies for Women of Color and White Women.

Results for this model were as follows: Chi Square = 78.52, 24 df, p < .001, Chi Square/df = 3.27; NNFI = .78, CFI = .85. The MEC version of this model was much better (Chi Square = 16.27, 6 df, p = .10; Chi Square/df = 2.71; NNFI = .91; CFI = .96). This model, and the three-factor gender-triangle model, were the best fitting models for Women of Color and were nearly equivalent in goodness-of-fit. Although, differences between this model and model 4 were slight. Model 4 demonstrated a better Chi Square result but the Chi Square/df and NNFI for model 4 was not as
good. Since the NNFI tends to correct for model complexity and sample size issues, scores on this index were used to determine the relative goodness of fit of these two models.

In summary, no model for Women of Color provided a good fit for the data based upon a non-significant chi-square. Two models provided a reasonably good fit for the data based upon the other three measures of fit. These two models both contained gender identity but not racial identity and utilized the measurement error control strategy of removing subscales. The best fitting of the two models was the three-factor gender triangle model (Chi Square/df = 2.03, NNFI = .91, CFI = .96). The second best fitting (2-factor model containing gender identity and multicultural competency) was nearly equivalent having identical NNFI and CFI scores (Chi Square/df = 2.71, NNFI = .91, CFI = .96).

White Women

The number of subjects necessary to run the Structural Equation Model analysis was achieved for White Women (N = 277). Analysis of the proposed full model (Model 1, See Figure 9) provided the following Chi Square results: 384.92 for 94 degrees of freedom which was statistically significant (p < .001). In structural equation model analysis, the research hypothesis and null hypothesis are the same, therefore the significant Chi Square results suggest that the model does not fit the data. Since Chi Square results tend to be particularly robust in structural equation model analysis (i.e. it tends to reject the model for very small fit deviations), other indices are used to improve fit evaluation. These indices are the Chi Square/df,
Figure 9. The Full Model for White Women.
Bentler-Bonnet Non Normed Fit Index (NNFI), and the Comparative Fit Index (CFI). For the Chi Square/df a good fit is indicated by a score of 2.0. For the other fit indices, typically a good fit is identified by a score of .90 or better. For the proposed full model, other indices of fit also yielded results suggesting that the model was not a good fit for the data: Chi Square/df = 4.09, NNFI = .71, CFI = .77. When compared to the more limited racial-triangle model (Model 2, See Figure 10) containing only the variables for Multicultural Training, Racial Identity Attitudes, and Multicultural Competencies, the full model did not provide as good a fit for the data as the more limited model. Results for the racial-triangle model (Model 2) were as follows: Chi Square = 145.20, 38 df, p < .00; Chi Square/df = 3.82; NNFI = .82, CFI = .88. Although, this model (2) also did not provide a good fit for the data.

Figure 10. Racial Triangle Model for White Women.
Psychometric insufficiencies in the instruments used for this study (low internal consistency reliability, muddy factor structure) likely created a significant amount of measurement error in the structural equation model analysis. To control for the effects of this measurement error, separate analyses were run for these models using fewer subscales for the various factors. Subscales were eliminated from the model if their internal consistency reliability did not reach at least .60. In general, the better the internal consistency reliability of a subscale, the better the factor structure as well. The subscales that were removed from the full model for the measurement error control models for White Women were WRIAS Contact, WRIAS Autonomy, WIAS Preencounter Masculine, WIAS Internalization, and MCI Relationship. For almost every model, the measurement error control (MEC) version provided a better fit for the data than its counterpart containing all instrument subscales. See Table 11 for a comparison of the goodness of fit indices for models containing all instrument subscales and models containing only the more reliable subscales for White Women.

The Measurement Error Control (MEC) model corresponding to the full model provided a better fit for the data than the full model containing all applicable subscales. Chi Square for this model was 107.86, 34 df, p = .00. The goodness of fit indices also suggest that this model provides a better fit for the data than the full model that is not adjusted for measurement error: 3.17 Chi Square/df, .88 NNFI, and .91 CFI. The MEC counterpart to the model suggested by previous research (racial
triangle model) also provided a better fit for the data (Chi Square = 47.01, df = 14, p = .00; Chi Square/df = 3.36; NNFI = .90; CFI = .95).

Table 11

| Goodness of Fit Indices for Models Containing All Subscales and Models Containing Only More Reliable Subscales for White Women |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Figure CS. CS/df NNFI CFI CS. CS/df NNFI CFI |
| Figure CS. CS/df NNFI CFI |
| Full Model-1 9(337) 384.9 4.1 .71 .77 107.9 3.17 .88 .91 |
| Racial Triangle-2 10(339) 145.2 3.8 .82 .88 47.0 3.36 .90 .95 |
| Gender Triangle-3 5(333) 164.7 4.3 .74 .82 48.1 3.43 .86 .93 |
| 2 Variable-4 6(335) 29.5 4.9 .87 .95 21.9 11.0 .75 .95 |
| 2 Variable-5 11(342) 112.6 4.7 .81 .87 24.7 4.11 .91 .96 |
| 2 Variable-6 8(335) 130.5 5.4 .70 .80 20.2 3.37 .89 .96 |

CS = Chi Square, CS/df = Chi Square/degrees of freedom, NNFI = Bentler-Bonnet Non Normed Fit Index, CFI = Comparative Fit Index, ( ) contains page number where figure can be found.

MacCallum et al. (1993) state that within all structural equation models, there exist many alternative mathematically equivalent models that will explain the variance in the model. They note, however, that not all of these mathematically equivalent models will provide equally reasonable explanations. Because of the inevitable existence of mathematically equivalent models, MacCallum et al. (1993)
stress the importance of acknowledging the presence of equivalent models in any structural equation model analysis. In response to this suggestion, the researcher explored the feasibility of several theoretically plausible alternative models.

Two strategies were used to identify theoretically plausible alternative models. The first strategy involved retaining all four variables from the full model and altering the path structure among the variables. Most of the models generated in this way did not provide as good a fit for the data as that provided by the full model. Some models provided as good a fit for the data, although none provided a better fit for the data than the full model. MEC counterparts for these models provided a better fit for the data than the versions containing all subscales, but the goodness-of-fit of these models did not surpass that of the MEC counterpart to the full model.

The second strategy used to generate alternative models involved progressive simplification of the full model by removing variables. Results for a three variable gender-triangle model (Model 3, See Figure 5) containing multicultural training, gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies fared better than the full model. This model did not provide as good a fit for the data as that provided by the racial triangle model (Model 2). This contrasts with the results achieved for Women of Color where the model containing gender identity attitudes provided a better fit than the model containing racial identity attitudes. Results for the gender triangle model (Model 3) were: Chi Square = 164.70, 38 df, p < .00; Chi Square/df = 4.33; NNFI = .74, CFI = .82. A MEC version of model 3 yielded better results. Chi Square for this version was 48.08 for 14 df (p = .00). The other indices of fit also
indicate that this model provides a fairly good fit for the data: Chi Square/df = 3.43, NNFI = .86, and CFI = .93.

The best fit results, among the various plausible alternative models were achieved for even more limited models containing only two of the four variables from the full model. Model 4 (See Figure 6) considered only two variables Multicultural Training and Multicultural Competencies. Results for this model were: Chi Square = 29.55, 6 df, p < .001, Chi Square/df 4.92, NNFI .87, CFI .95. This model provided the best fit of the models that did not control for measurement error that were analyzed. The MEC version of this model provided a fit that was no better, if not worse than the model containing all applicable subscales (Chi Square = 21.93, 2 df, p = .00; Chi Square/df = 10.96; NNFI = .75; CFI = .95). The MEC version of Model 4 was not the best fitting model among MEC models. Model 5 (See Figure 11) contained only two variables, Racial Identity Attitudes and Multicultural Competencies. The goodness-of-

Figure 11. Two-Factor Model Containing Racial Identity Attitudes and Multicultural Competencies for White Women.
fit for this model was also better than the full model and the two three-variable triangle models (Model 2 and Model 3). Analysis of this model yielded the following statistics: Chi Square = .112.59, 24 df, p < .00; Chi Square/df = 4.69; NNFI = .81, CFI = .87. The MEC version of this model was better than the model containing all applicable subscales. This model yielded the following results: Chi Square = 24.69, df 6, p = .00; Chi Square/df = 4.11; NNFI = .91; and CFI = .96. Model 6 (See Figure 8) contained the two variables of Gender Identity Attitudes and Multicultural Competencies this model also provided a better fit for the data than the full model or the three-variable models. Results for this model were as follows: Chi Square = 130.47, 24 df, p < .00, Chi Square/df = 5.44, NNFI = .70, CFI = .80. The MEC counterpart to this model also provided a better fit for the data than the model containing all subscales. The goodness-of-fit indices for model 6 with problematic subscales removed were: Chi Square 20.22, df 6, p = .00; Chi Square/df = 3.37; NNFI = .89; and CFI = .96.

In summary, no model for White Women provided a good fit for the data based upon a non significant chi square. Two models provided a reasonably good fit for the data based upon the other three measures of fit. These two models both contained racial identity but not gender identity and utilized the measurement error control strategy of removing subscales. The best fitting of the two models was the two factor model containing racial identity and multicultural competency (Chi Square/df = 4.11, NNFI = .91, CFI = .96). The second best fitting was the three factor racial triangle model (Chi Square/df = 3.36, NNFI = .90, CFI = .95).
Men

Insufficient numbers of packets were received from male participants of either racial group to allow for the structural equation model analysis of the full model containing the four variables of Multicultural Training, Gender Identity, Racial Identity, and Multicultural Competencies. Sufficient numbers of male participants were achieved by combining all packets received from men into one group (N = 114). Combining the two groups of men allowed the researcher to run a limited structural analysis for a gender-triangle model (See Figure 12) containing only Multicultural Training, Gender Identity, and Multicultural Competencies. Since no statistically significant differences were found between these two groups for multicultural training or multicultural competencies and only one statistically significant difference was

Figure 12. Gender Triangle Model for Men.
found between these two groups for gender identity statuses (Reference Group Dependent) this pooling of data did not appear to pose any extreme problems for interpretation. The analyses, done for men, compared a full model containing the variables of Multicultural Training, Gender Identity Statuses, and Multicultural Training with two other models also containing all three variables and with two models that each contained only two of the three variables.

Results of the structural equation model analysis of the gender-triangle model (men's full model) for men did not provide a good fit for the data (Chi Square = 65.031, 29 df, p < .001; Chi Square/df = 2.24; NNFI = .78, CFI = .86). To control for the effect of measurement error on the structural equation model analysis, separate analyses were run for the full model using fewer subscales for the various factors. Subscales were eliminated from the model if their internal consistency reliability did not reach at least .60. The subscales that were removed from the full model for the measurement error control models for Men were RGIDS Reference Group Dependent and MCI Relationship. The removal of the psychometrically problematic Reference Group Dependent subscale in addition to correcting for measurement error in the gender identity variable also corrected for group differences between Men of Color and White Men since it was the only subscale to demonstrate a statistically significant mean difference between these two groups. See Table 12 for a comparison of the goodness-of-fit indices for models containing all instrument subscales and models containing only the more reliable subscales for Men. The Measurement Error Control (MEC) model corresponding to the full model provided a
better fit for the data than the full model containing all applicable subscales. Chi Square for this model was 33.94, 14 df, p = .00. The goodness-of-fit indices also suggest that this model provides a better fit for the data than the full model that is not adjusted for measurement error: 2.42 Chi Square/df, .82 NNFI, and .91 CFI.

### Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Subscales</th>
<th>Reliable Subscales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Triangle</strong></td>
<td>12(345)</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Variable-2</td>
<td>6(335)</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Variable-3</td>
<td>13(347)</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CS = Chi Square, CS/df = Chi Square/degrees of freedom, NNFI = Bentler-Bonnet Non Normed Fit Index, CFI = Comparative Fit Index

In response to the exhortation by MacCallum et al. (1993) that researchers using structural equation model analysis identify and consider alternative models, this researcher explored the feasibility of several theoretically plausible alternative models. Two strategies were used to identify theoretically plausible alternative models. The first strategy involved retaining all three variables from the full model and altering the path structure among the variables. None of the theoretically plausible alternative models using all applicable subscales and all applicable factors
provided a good fit for the data. Relative goodness of fit between the various models suggested that the full model (Model 1, Figure 12) provided a better fit for the data than any of the other two models that contained all three variables. MEC counterparts for these models provided a better fit for the data than the versions containing all subscales, but the goodness of fit of these models did not surpass that of the MEC counterpart to the full model.

The second strategy used to generate alternative models involved progressive simplification of the full model by removing variables. Both of the two-factor models containing multicultural competencies and either gender identity or multicultural training (Models 2 and 3, Figures 6 and 13) provided a better fit for the data than the full model. The model (3, Figure 13) that proposed a direct effect from Gender Identity Statuses to Multicultural Competencies (Chi Square = 29.93, 17 df, p = .03; Chi Square/df = 1.76; NNFI = .89; CFI = .93) provided a better fit for the study.

Figure 13. Two-Factor Model Containing Gender Identity Statuses and Multicultural Competencies for Men.
data than the model (2, Figure 6) that proposed a direct effect from Multicultural Training to Multicultural Competencies (Chi Square = 37.07, 6 df, p < .00; Chi Square/df = 6.18, NNFI = .61, CFI = .84). This model in which Gender Identity Statuses were directly related to Multicultural Competencies was the best fitting model considered in the analyses of the men's data. When these two models were run removing subscales that demonstrated problematic reliability, model three (containing gender identity statuses and multicultural competencies) provided significant improvement over its counterpart containing all subscales (Chi Square 5.04, df 6, p = .54; Chi Square/df .84; NNFI 1.01; CFI 1.00). This model, MEC Model 3 for Men, was the only model among all of the model analyses that was not rejected and appeared to demonstrate a good fit for the data. This is evident in a non significant Chi Square and fit indices above 1.0. For Model 2, containing multicultural training and multicultural competencies, two of the fit indices (Chi Square/df and NNFI) for the measurement error correction model indicated a poorer fit than the same indices did for the full counterpart. The other indices of fit remained comparable to the full subscale counterpart model. Statistics for this analysis were as follows: Chi Square 24.18, df 2, p = .00; Chi Square/df = 12.09; NNFI = .40, and CFI = .88.

In summary, the best fitting model for men was a two factor model containing only gender identity and multicultural competency. This model when corrected for measurement error, was the only model to yield a non significant Chi Square as well
as meeting goodness of fit criteria for all other fit indices. This was the only model that provided a good fit for the data for men.

Regression Analysis for Male Racial Groups

The mailed survey generated insufficient numbers of responses from either male racial group (58 Men of Color, 62 White Men) to run the structural equation model analysis of the full model containing the four variables of Multicultural Training, Racial Identity, Gender Identity, and Multicultural Competencies for these two groups. To provide information about the full model, multiple regression analyses were run to provide data about the portions of the model, those containing racial identity attitudes, not covered in the men’s more limited structural equation model. To analyze the relationships that were missing from the men’s structural model, four sets of regression analyses were run for each population group (Men of Color, White Men). The first set of analyses regressed multicultural training onto racial identity attitudes. The other sets of analyses regressed either multicultural training variables or racial identity variables or both onto multicultural competency variables. These regression analyses, by evaluating the relationships between variables that make up the separate linkages in the model, can provide some information about the overall model fit. The structural equation model done for men as a complete group evaluated the triangle that formed the gender identity portion of the model. Therefore, these analyses, evaluate the paths of the hypothesized structural model that would create the racial identity triangle of the model. For each analysis, a hierarchical regression was done wherein, if present, the multicultural training...
variables were entered first. Formal followed by Informal. Then, for the analyses with the various multicultural competencies as dependent variables, the identity variables were entered in developmental order from lowest to highest level status. The order of entry was designed to determine if racial identity attitudes added to the model beyond the contribution of multicultural training. Separate regression analyses were run for each of the multicultural competency variables: Knowledge, Awareness, Skills, and Relationship. These results will be provided for each of the two male groups (Men of Color and White Men) in the succeeding paragraphs, beginning with the results for Men of Color.

Multiple regression analysis requires certain assumptions to be met. These assumptions are: one, that observations are independent of each other; two, that one variable can be explained as a linear function of the other variable; three, that the variance of the different data points of one variable are the same for any fixed point on the other variable (i.e. homoscedasticity); and four, that the variables are normally distributed. The data for these analyses meet the requirements for the first assumption. Each of the other assumptions are violated to varying degrees. The assumption of linearity between variables is fairly well met. However, as discussed under the section on structural equation model analysis, the assumption of normality is only met for some of the subscales of the different variables (primarily for the subscales representing male gender identity). Additionally, the truncated range of some of the subscale scores influences the homoscedasticity as well.
Men of Color

The racial identity portion of the model being covered in these regression analyses corresponds to several paths in the full structural equation model. Beginning with multicultural training, the regression analyses explore two paths that in the structural model lead from this factor. One of these leads from multicultural training to racial identity attitudes while another leads from there to multicultural competencies. The regression analyses also provide results to explore the path that in the structural equation model leads from racial identity attitudes to multicultural competencies. One set of these regression analyses were done to evaluate the path from multicultural training to racial identity attitudes while the other sets of regression analyses were run to evaluate the remaining two paths.

The first set of regression analyses were run regressing Formal and Informal Multicultural Training onto each of the racial identity attitudes. These analyses yielded only one statistically significant result for Men of Color. Formal Multicultural Training predicted Conformity/Preencounter attitudes (Beta = .28).

The remaining sets of regression analyses were run regressing both training variables (Formal and Informal) and all racial identity attitudes onto each of the multicultural competency variables. Within the various multicultural competencies, some racial identity attitudes and both multicultural training variables predicted scores for Men of Color. The regression analyses for the Knowledge multicultural competency yielded a model (R square = .08, p = .02) in which only Dissonance racial identity attitudes were useful predictors (Beta = -.33). The overall regression analysis for the Awareness multicultural competency subscale was statistically
significant (R square = .34, p = .00). A breakdown of the variables responsible for this result, found that scores on Formal Multicultural Training (Beta = .43), racial identity Dissonance attitudes (Beta = -.24), and racial identity Internalization attitudes (Beta = .34) predicted multicultural competency Awareness subscale scores. The regression analyses for the multicultural competency Skills were also statistically significant. The analysis regressing both training and identity subscales yielded a significant result (R square = .22, p = .00) that included Formal Multicultural Training (Beta = .37) and Conformity/Preencounter racial identity attitudes (Beta = -.46). The two analyses regressing training and racial identity variables separately, yielded equivalent results for racial identity but somewhat different results for training. When entered without the identity variables (R square = .08, p = .02), Informal Multicultural Training (Beta = .31), but not Formal Multicultural Training was a significant predictor of Skills multicultural competencies. The overall regression analysis was statistically significant for the multicultural competency subscale of Relationship (R square = .19, p = .00). For the Relationship subscale, only scores on the racial identity Dissonance subscale were significant predictors in this model (Beta = .44).

White Men

The racial identity portion of the model being covered in these regression analyses contains several paths. Beginning with multicultural training one path leads from there to racial identity attitudes while another leads to multicultural competencies. There is also a path from racial identity attitudes to multicultural competencies. One set of regression analyses were done to evaluate the path from
multicultural training to racial identity attitudes while other sets of regression analyses were done to evaluate the remaining paths.

The first set of regression analyses were run regressing Formal and Informal Multicultural Training onto each of the racial identity attitudes. These analyses yielded three statistically significant results for White Men. Formal Multicultural Training (Beta = -.36 for Dissonance, .35 for Pseudo Independence, and .28 for Autonomy) was a statistically significant predictor of WRIAS Disintegration (R square = .13, p = .00). WRIAS Pseudo Independence attitudes (R square = .13, p = .00) and WRIAS Autonomy attitudes (R square = .08, p = .03).

The other sets of regression analyses were run regressing either training variables (Formal and Informal), racial identity attitude variables, or both onto each of the multicultural competency variables. For White Men as well, both multicultural training variables as well as some racial identity attitudes predicted scores on multicultural competency subscales. For the multicultural competency Knowledge subscale the overall regression model was statistically significant (R square = .36, p = .00). Within this model, the racial identity attitude subscales of Autonomy (Beta = .38) and Pseudo Independence (Beta = .29) predicted Knowledge scores. The overall regression analysis containing both multicultural training and racial identity variables, for the multicultural competency subscale of Awareness, was statistically significant (R square = .43, p = .00). Scores on two variables, one from each of the variable groups (training, racial identity attitudes) predicted scores on the multicultural competency Awareness subscale in this analysis. The two variables were Formal Multicultural Training (Beta = .45) and the racial identity attitude subscale of Pseudo Independence (Beta = .37). The separate regression analyses
for each of the two groups yielded additional predictors for the racial identity model.
(R square = .34, p = .00). The additional predictors were Contact (Beta = -.25) and
Autonomy (Beta = .31) attitudes. The regression model for the multicultural
competency Skill subscale was statistically significant (R square = .41, p = .00). Two
racial identity subscales contributed to this result, Pseudo Independence (Beta =
.59), and Contact (Beta = -.34). Finally, the multicultural competency subscale of
Relationship was predicted (R square = .10, p = .01) only by Informal Multicultural
Training (Beta = -.34).
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Overview of the Chapter

This chapter contains a summarization and discussion of the results reported in Chapter IV. The chapter contains four parts: Canonical correlation summary and conclusions, structural equation model summary and conclusions, problems in the study, and suggestions for future research. The first part of the chapter contains a summary of the results and the conclusions drawn for the Canonical Correlation Analyses. The second part of the chapter contains a summary of the results obtained for the Structural Equation Model Analysis and the conclusions that were drawn from these results. The third part of the chapter provides a discussion of the limitations of the study. The fourth and final part of the chapter details some suggestions for future research suggested by the results of the study.

Canonical Correlation Summary and Conclusions

Results Summary

Correlational analyses were used to explore the relationships between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes for the four racial/gender demographic groups in this study (Women of Color, White Women, Men of Color, and White Men). This section contains subsections that explore the results of these analyses for each
demographic group. These four subsections are followed by a subsection that compares the results obtained from these analyses for these four groups.

**Women of Color**

The researcher hypothesized that there would be a parallel relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes for Women of Color. This hypothesis was based upon the idea that both gender identity development and racial identity development are oppressed identities for this demographic group and, therefore, development should progress similarly. The results tended to support a parallel relationship between these two variables. Lower level subscales from one instrument correlated positively with lower level subscales from the other. The highest level subscales from each instrument also correlated positively. Lower level subscales from either instrument correlated negatively with the highest level subscale from the other instrument. The only anomaly in these results was for the WIAS Immersion/Emersion and POCRIAS Immersion/Resistance subscales. These two higher level subscales were expected to correlate positively with higher level subscales from the other instrument and negatively with the lower level subscales of the other instrument. They did not. These two subscales (WIAS Immersion/Emersion and POCRIAS Immersion/Resistance) did, however, correlate positively with each other. This result suggests that these two subscales may be functioning more similarly to the lower level subscales within these measures than to the highest level subscales. Within their respective theories (People of Color Racial Identity, Womanist Identity), each of these subscales represents a transitional status.
between the lower level statuses and the highest level status. The transitions encompassed by these statuses involve change from lower level attitudes toward higher level attitudes. Therefore, these statuses could conceivably relate to either lower level statuses or the highest level status of their respective theory. There is more change inherent in the lower level statuses than in the highest level status from each theory. Since these two subscales (WIAS Immersion/Emersion, POCRIAS Immersion/Resistance) represent specific changes (from lower level statuses to the highest level status), their connections with lower level subscales are theoretically supported. Overall, the results obtained for these two subscales also support the theory of parallel process between racial identity and gender identity for Women of Color.

The magnitude of the relationships between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes also supports the hypothesis that these processes are parallel for Women of Color. Most of the correlations between racial identity subscales and gender identity subscales were above or close to the .30 cutoff recommended for practical significance. Several of the relationships were much higher (POCRIAS Dissonance with WIAS Encounter .58; POCRIAS Immersion/Resistance with WIAS Preencounter/Masculine .41; POCRIAS Immersion/Resistance with WIAS Immersion/Emersion .43; and POCRIAS Internalization with WIAS Internalization .61). Additionally, the magnitude of each of the correlations for Women of Color was equal to or greater than half a standard deviation for the respective subscales for that correlation with one exception. The correlation between the racial identity Dissonance subscale and the gender identity...
Internalization subscale was only 1/3 of the standard deviation value for the Dissonance subscale although it was 1/2 of the standard deviation value for the Internalization subscale.

The level of the correlation, as indicated by the number of correlations between identity subscales of these two types of attitudes for Women of Color (all correlations were statistically significant) suggest that other effects, in addition to the developmental relationship between these two types of identity, may also be related. The similarity in the two theories (racial identity attitude development and womanist identity attitude development) and in the two instruments designed to measure them (POCRIAS, WIAS) is likely to be contributing to these relationships. Both theories were developed by the same researcher (Helms). Both theories stress the importance of the effects of oppression on identity development. Both theories utilize comparisons between own-group and a contrast group (Whites for Persons of Color, Men for Women). These theoretical similarities permeate the instruments. Additionally, many of the ideas expressed in the instruments are identical across measures. only the contrast group is different (Whites for Persons of Color, Men for Women). If instrument similarities are influencing the results for both groups of women, it seems reasonable to presume that the level and magnitude of difference found in the results between these two groups supports a relationship between racial and gender identity for Women of Color in addition to any effect caused by similarities in the instruments and theories.
**White Women**

The researcher hypothesized that for White Women, there would be either no relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes or that there would be a non-parallel relationship between these two types of attitudes. This hypothesis was based upon the idea that racial identity development is a majority culture identity development process for White Women, but that female gender identity development is a minority identity development process. Minority identity development and majority identity development are proposed to progress separately due to different cultural stimuli and are therefore not expected to demonstrate parallel processes. Contrary to the proposed hypothesis, correlational results for White Women tended to support a parallel process between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes. Lower level subscales from each measure correlated positively with lower level subscales from the other measure. The two highest level subscales for racial identity (Pseudo Independence and Autonomy) correlated positively with the highest level subscale for gender identity (Internalization). The two highest level subscales for racial identity correlated negatively with the lower level gender identity subscales. The highest level subscale for gender identity correlated negatively with two of the lower level subscales from racial identity (Disintegration and Reintegration). The relationships between the gender identity subscale Immersion/Emersion and the racial identity subscales were anomalous and did not support the parallel relationship. The relationships found between racial identity attitude subscales for White Women and the gender identity Immersion/Emersion subscale are similar to those obtained for this subscale for Women of Color.
reinforcing the idea that this subscale may be functioning as a lower level subscale. Another relationship that did not follow the parallel results of the majority of relationships between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes was the positive correlation found between the racial identity subscale Contact and the gender identity subscale of Internalization. This relationship may be related to the factor structure of the Contact subscale, which indicated a strong relationship between items on this subscale and items on the highest level racial identity subscale (Autonomy). With these two anomalies attributable to psychometric effects, it appears that the relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes for White Women is also parallel.

There is, however, some evidence that calls the results suggesting a parallel process between racial identity and gender identity for White Women into question. This is found in the magnitude of the correlational relationships between racial identity attitude subscales and gender identity attitude subscales for White Women. The relative magnitude of the relationships between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes is not as great as that found between these two processes for Women of Color. Most of the correlations between racial identity subscales and gender identity subscales for White Women were not above or close to the .30 cutoff recommended for practical significance. Only 7 of the 25 possible correlations (28%) reached this cutoff. Additionally, the magnitude of many of the correlations for White Women was below 1/2 of a standard deviation for the respective subscales (several were below 1/3 of a standard deviation). This suggests that the greater numbers of
White Women are generating enough statistical power to identify very small, potentially trivial relationships between the subscales of these two variables.

Additionally, the universal level of the correlation between these two types of attitudes for White Women was similar to that attained for Women of Color. The similarity in the two theories (racial identity attitude development and womanist identity attitude development) and in the two instruments designed to measure them (WRIAS, WIAS) is likely to also be contributing to these relationships. Both theories were developed by the same researcher (Helms). Both theories stress the importance of the effects of oppression (or reaction to oppression) on identity development. Both theories utilize comparisons between own-group and a contrast group (Blacks for Whites, Men for Women). These theoretical similarities permeate the instruments. Additionally, many of the ideas expressed in the instruments are identical across measures, only the contrast group is different (Blacks for Whites, Men for Women). If instrument similarities are influencing the results for both groups of women, it seems reasonable to presume that the magnitude of difference found in the results between the two women's groups (i.e. the relationship was much stronger for Women of Color) does not support a relationship for White Women in addition to that caused by similarities in the instruments and theories.

**Men of Color**

The researcher hypothesized that for Men of Color there would be no relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity statuses. This hypothesis was based upon the idea that racial identity development is a minority
culture identity development process for Men of Color. But male gender identity development is a majority identity development process. Minority identity development and majority identity development are proposed to progress separately due to different cultural stimuli and are therefore not expected to demonstrate parallel processes. The results of the correlational analysis for Men of Color supported this hypothesis. There was no relationship found between racial identity attitudes and gender identity statuses for Men of Color. The small numbers of participants who were Men of Color may have contributed to the lack of findings for this group. However, the numbers for Men of Color and White Men were equivalent and a relationship was found between racial identity attitudes and gender identity statuses for White Men.

**White Men**

The researcher hypothesized that there would be a parallel relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity statuses for White Men. This hypothesis was based upon the idea that both gender identity development and racial identity development are majority culture identities for this demographic group and therefore development should progress similarly. The results tended to support a parallel relationship between these two variables. Lower level subscales from racial identity correlated positively with lower level subscales from gender identity. Higher level subscales from both types of identity correlated positively with each other. Lower level subscales from one type of identity correlated negatively with higher level subscales from the other.
The parallel relationship between racial identity attitudes and gender identity statuses is not supported nearly as strongly for White Men as it is for Women of Color, although the results suggest that the relationship may be better supported for White Men than for White Women. The magnitude of the relationships between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes is not as great as that found for Women of Color, but is better than that found for White Women. Of the statistically significant correlations between racial identity subscales and gender identity subscales most were above or close to the .30 cutoff recommended for practical significance. Of the relationships that reached the .30 cutoff, several were much higher (WRIAS Disintegration with RGIDS No Reference Group, Reference Group Dependent, and Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity; WRIAS Pseudo Independence and Autonomy with RGIDS Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity). The magnitude of each of the statistically significant correlations for White Men was equal to or greater than half a standard deviation for the respective subscales. The lower numbers of White Men in the study may have had an effect on these results compared to those attained for Women of Color and White Women. Relative to the findings from either women’s group, the number of statistically significant correlations was less. However, the number of correlations reaching a practical level (i.e. .30) fell between that achieved for Women of Color and White Women. This suggests that for White Men, the parallel relationship between racial identity and gender identity is supported beyond that of White Women.

The results obtained for White Men support a relationship between racial identity variables and gender identity variables that is not tied to similarities in theory.
or more importantly instrument construction. The two theories do share several key concepts. Both use a developmental perspective in which higher level statuses are equated with higher levels of identity development. Within their developmental perspectives, progressive statuses contain more complex and sophisticated constructs and relationships. The highest level statuses from both theories contain both individuation and affiliation aspects of personal identity. Finally, higher level statuses from both theories include the acceptance of and appreciation for cultural differences. These similarities suggest that both instruments are measuring a similar developmental process. However, in contrast to Helms’s theories, Wade’s Reference Group Identity Dependence theory does not use a contrast group. Questions are designed to explore relationships within a single group, men, rather than across two groups (e.g. men and women). Another key difference between the two theories is that Wade’s theory does not consider oppression a key factor in identity development. While the theory and instrument do not explicitly address oppression, this does not prohibit oppression from impacting on the developmental process being assessed. The differences between the two theories suggest that theory and instrument similarities will have less impact on the relationships between these two types of identity development (racial and gender) for Men. While the similarities suggest that the two types of processes are conceptually related as proposed. The results of the canonical correlations between the two men’s groups (relationship for White Men and the lack of relationship for Men of Color) thus provide strong support for the hypothesis that racial and gender identity development that originates from a similar outlook (i.e. majority race/majority gender, minority-
oppressed race/minority-oppressed gender) will tend to progress similarly while racial and gender identity development that originates from opposing outlooks (majority race or gender and minority-oppressed race or gender) will not progress in similar ways.

Conclusions

There is fairly strong support for the hypothesis that racial and gender identity development will be more closely related when they share a cultural perspective (majority vs. minority/oppressed) than when they flow from different cultural viewpoints. This is supported by the relationships found between racial identity and gender identity for both Women of Color and White Men. Additionally, it is supported by the minimal practical relationship found between these two constructs (racial identity and gender identity) for White Women and the lack of relationship found between these two constructs for Men of Color.

Differences in cultural status (minority/oppressed and majority) also appear to be related to which identity, race or gender, will develop first or to the greatest extent. The mean differences (adjusted for differences in scaling) between racial and gender identity subscales for each racial/gender group (Women of Color, White Women, Men of Color and White Men) suggest that minority/oppressed identity develops before or beyond majority identity. For White Women, higher level gender identity subscale scores (oppressed identity) were higher than higher racial identity subscale scores (majority identity). Men of Color scored higher on higher levels of racial identity (oppressed identity) than on the higher levels of gender identity (majority identity).
identity). For White Men, results were equivalent for both identities (racial and gender are both majority identities for this group). For Women of Color, higher level racial identity subscale scores were higher than higher level gender identity subscale scores. This suggests that for Women of Color (both identities are oppressed identities), racial oppression may be greater or more overt than gender oppression.

One implication of these results for multicultural training is that identity development may require more input for some groups than for others. For Women of Color and White Men, addressing only one type of identity development may be sufficient to propel identity development in the other since these two processes are so closely related. For White Women and Men of Color addressing only one type of identity may result in change in only that identity. In order to initiate change in both identities, it may be necessary to target training toward both identities. In working with the latter two groups (White Women and Men of Color) it might be useful to identify the better developed identity and utilize understandings of that process to inform change in the other identity.

Structural Equation Model

Results Summary

The hypothesis for the structural equation model analysis for each of the demographic groups in the study (Women of Color, White Women, Men of Color and White Men), was the same. This hypothesis suggested that a model (the full model), wherein multicultural training predicts racial identity attitudes, gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies and racial identity attitudes and gender identity
attitudes each predict multicultural competencies, would provide a good fit for the study data. In addition to exploring the absolute goodness of fit of this model, a second hypothesis suggested that this full model would provide a better fit for the data than a more limited model (Model 2 or Racial Triangle Model) containing only multicultural training, racial identity attitudes, and multicultural competencies. These two hypotheses were only able to be tested in this complete form for the two groups of women (Women of Color and White Women). Insufficient numbers of packets were received from men of either racial group (Men of Color and White Men) to run the structural equation model analyses for these hypotheses.

For both groups of women, the full model did not provide a good fit for the data. The more limited racial triangle model (Model 2) provided a better fit than the full model, although it also did not provide a good fit for the data. Consideration of the model and its components suggested that the psychometric properties of the various instruments (i.e. low internal consistency reliability and poor factor structure) might be responsible for this lack of fit. To compensate for the psychometric problems in the instruments, subscales whose internal consistency reliability did not reach at least .60 were removed from the analysis. The structural equation model analysis of the two models (Full and 2) containing only subscales with internal consistency reliability at or above .60, still did not find the models a good fit for the data. Since both versions (corrected and uncorrected) of the more limited racial triangle model (2) provided a better fit for the data than their respective version of the full model, parameter reduction (removing factors from the model) was used to generate additional models. These models provided differing levels of fit for the two different
women's groups (Women of Color and White Women). These results will be detailed in the next two subsections. A third subsection will detail model results for men generated from a more limited analysis. The final subsection will discuss conclusions that were generated through comparing the various model results across all racial/gender demographic groups.

**Women of Color**

For Women of Color none of the models provided a good fit for the data until model analyses were run that corrected for psychometric insufficiencies in the instruments. Once the models were adjusted to compensate for these instrument psychometric insufficiencies, the best fitting model was one that included gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies, but not racial identity attitudes. The two models that included gender identity attitudes both demonstrated relatively good fit for the data and were nearly equivalent across fit indices (three-factor gender triangle containing multicultural training, gender identity and multicultural competencies and two-factor model containing only gender identity and multicultural competencies). The model containing only multicultural training and multicultural competencies provided the next best fit for the data for this demographic group. This was followed by the models that contained racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies but not gender identity attitudes.

The relative fit of the models for Women of Color suggest that there is an overlap of effect in identity attitudes. This overlap is clearly exhibited in the results of the correlational analysis between racial identity attitudes and gender identity.
attitudes for this group. This overlap appears to create a situation where the addition of the second set of identity attitudes into the model does not add to the explanatory power of the model. This explains the better fit results for three- and two-factor models containing either racial or gender identity over the full model. Given the extensive overlap between identity attitudes (racial and gender) for Women of Color, it would be logical to presume that these identity processes would provide equivalent contributions to the explanation of multicultural competencies. This is not the case. For Women of Color, gender identity attitudes predict multicultural competencies better than racial identity attitudes. Based on the subscale scores for racial and gender identity, it also appears that racial identity is more fully developed than gender identity for Women of Color. Thus, for Women of Color, the least well developed identity process is a stronger predictor of multicultural competencies than the better developed process.

White Women

For White Women none of the models provided a good fit for the data until model analyses were run that corrected for psychometric insufficiencies in the instruments. After accounting for these psychometric insufficiencies, the best fitting model was one that included racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies but not gender identity attitudes. Both the three-factor racial triangle model containing multicultural training, racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies and the two-factor model containing only racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies provided a similar, and adequate fit for the data. The best
fitting racial identity models (containing racial identity attitudes and not gender identity attitudes) and the two gender identity models (three-factor gender triangle model and two-factor model containing gender identity and multicultural competencies) performed better than the model containing only multicultural training and multicultural competencies for White Women.

The relative fit of the models for White Women suggests that there is an overlap of effect in identity attitudes. This overlap is clearly exhibited in the results of the correlational analysis between racial identity attitudes and gender identity attitudes for this group. This overlap appears to create a situation where the addition of the second set of identity attitudes into the model does not add to the explanatory power of the model. This explains the better fit results for three- and two-factor models over the full model. The overlap in identity attitudes for White Women does not equate to identical effects of each of these two identities (racial and gender) on multicultural competencies. For White Women, racial identity attitudes explain model effects better than gender identity attitudes when taken separately. Based on the subscale scores for racial and gender identity, it also appears that gender identity is more fully developed than racial identity for White Women. Thus, for White Women also, the least well developed identity process is a stronger predictor of multicultural competencies than the better developed process.

Men

In order to explore the proposed model for men, a different analysis strategy was required. The total number of responses from men allowed for the structural
equation model analysis of a limited model containing multicultural training, gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies which was used to explore that portion of the model. The other portion of the model containing multicultural training, racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies was explored through regression analyses for the two different men's racial groups (Men of Color and White Men).

For Men, the three-factor gender triangle model did not provide a good fit for the data. Altering the model to correct for instrument psychometric insufficiencies, by removing one subscale from the measure of gender identity attitudes and one subscale from the measure of multicultural competencies, did not provide a substantial improvement in the goodness of fit of this model. Reduction of the full model resulted in two two-factor models, one of which provided a better fit for the data than the three-factor model. The two-factor model containing gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies provided a fairly good fit for the data with only the NNFI index demonstrating insufficient fit. After compensating for the psychometric insufficiencies in the instruments, this two-factor model not only provided a good fit for the data, but yielded the only good fit across every fit index found in the entire study. This model provided a much better fit than the two-factor model that contained multicultural training and multicultural competencies. This suggests that for men, gender identity may be of greater importance in the acquisition of multicultural competencies than multicultural training. However, it is unclear how gender identity is influenced, since the gender model that included multicultural training effects on gender identity attitudes, did not provide as good a fit.
for the data as the model that did not include multicultural training effects on gender identity. It is possible that the training currently available does not effectively address the development of gender identity statuses and that training could be devised that would do so.

Three different sets of regression analyses were run for each men's group (Men of Color and White Men). The first set of regression analyses regressed the two multicultural training variables onto racial identity attitude subscales. The second set of regression analyses regressed multicultural training variables and racial identity attitude subscales onto multicultural competency subscales. The third set of regression analyses regressed multicultural training and racial identity attitude subscales separately onto multicultural competencies. Results of these regression analyses for men demonstrated partial support for the racial triangle (containing multicultural training, racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies) of the proposed full model. Some of the subscales representing various aspects of multicultural training or racial identity were useful in explaining other variables. For both Men of Color and White Men, Formal Multicultural Training was a useful predictor. This predictor explained variance in both racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies. Informal Multicultural Training was a useful predictor only for Men of Color and only of Skills multicultural competencies. For White Men, multicultural training predicted three types of identity attitudes, while for Men of Color it predicted only one. Finally, only higher level racial identity attitudes (i.e. Pseudo Independence and Autonomy) predicted multicultural competencies for White Men.
while for Men of Color lower level racial identity attitudes were the primary predictors of multicultural competencies.

For Men of Color, results of the regression analyses suggested that the racial-triangle model would not provide a good fit for the data. The connection between multicultural training and racial identity attitudes was not supported. The two other models explored through these regression analyses were partially supported. The model wherein multicultural training predicts multicultural competencies was supported by a relationship between formal multicultural training and Awareness and Skills multicultural competency subscale scores. The model in which racial identity predicts multicultural competencies was supported by the relationship between several racial identity attitude subscales (Conformity/Preencounter, Dissonance, and Internalization) and multicultural competency subscales (Awareness, Skills, and Relationship). Although these results provide support for the two-factor model containing racial identity attitudes and multicultural competencies, it is unclear how the fit of this model would compare with the two-factor gender identity model that provided such a good fit for the men's data.

The results of the regression analyses for White Men suggested that the racial-triangle model would not provide a good fit for the data. The relationship between multicultural training and multicultural competencies was only minimally supported (Formal Multicultural Training predicted only Awareness multicultural competency scores). The minimal relationship between multicultural training and multicultural competencies also impacts the likely fit results for the two-factor model in which multicultural training predicts multicultural competencies. The only models of
those explored through regression analyses for White Men that received any support were the model in which racial identity predicted multicultural competency. Two such models found some support. The first model is a three-factor model in which multicultural training predicts racial identity which then predicts multicultural competencies. The second model is a two-factor model in which racial identity predicts multicultural competencies. The three-factor model is supported by the relationship found between formal multicultural training and two racial identity subscales (Dissonance and Pseudo Independence) and the relationship found between racial identity subscales (Contact, Pseudo Independence, and Autonomy) and multicultural competencies (Knowledge, Awareness, and Skills). These results suggest that for White Men the connection between multicultural training and racial identity attitudes may be substantive. However, multicultural training’s connection with multicultural competencies is extremely tenuous. The results of these regression analyses for White Men do not provide sufficient information to clearly discern how the relative fit of the two supported models would compare with the two-factor gender identity model that provided such a good fit for the men’s data.

Results from the regression analyses suggest that pooling the two racial groups for men likely created the extremely poor fit found for the two-factor model containing multicultural training and multicultural competencies in the SEM analysis. Results of the regression analyses for these two groups suggest that multicultural training has a differential effect on multicultural competencies for Men of Color and White Men. This effect undoubtedly influenced the results obtained for the three-factor model as well. The regression results for these relationships (multicultural
training on multicultural competencies) suggest that these two models (2-factor and 3-factor racial identity models) might provide substantially better fit results than that obtained for all men for the subgroup of Men of Color, and worse fit results for White Men.

Conclusions Across Racial/Gender Group Models

Results of the analyses for the different structural equation models for women (Women of Color and White Women) and men (Men of Color and White Men) suggest several considerations for the acquisition of multicultural competencies. The first of these is that multicultural training alone is insufficient to explain the acquisition of multicultural competencies. This is seen in the results obtained for every group (Women of Color, White Women, Men of Color, and White Men). For the structural equation analyses for both groups of women, models containing identity attitudes provided better fit statistics than the model containing only multicultural training when the models were adjusted for psychometric insufficiencies in the instruments. The structural equation analyses for the men's pooled data yielded better fit statistics for the model in which gender identity statuses predicted multicultural competencies over the model in which multicultural training predicted multicultural competencies, regardless of whether the model was adjusted for psychometric insufficiencies in the instruments. The regression analyses for White Men found little or no relationship between multicultural training and the various multicultural competency subscales.

Combining the results of the SEM analyses with the Canonical Correlation analyses provides some information about areas of training to be addressed. These
combined results provide some evidence to suggest that training addressing only racial identity may be somewhat effective in improving multicultural competencies for Women of Color, White Men and White Women, but addressing only racial identity may not address the needs of Men of Color. In contrast, training that addresses only gender identity may be somewhat effective in improving multicultural competencies for Women of Color, White Men, and Men of Color, but may not address the needs of White Women. Additionally, training addressing one or the other of these types of identity development (racial and gender), although it may provide some improvement in multicultural competencies for any given racial/gender group, may not provide the optimal training approach for any group. The best multicultural training for propelling racial and gender identity development likely involves addressing both types of identity development and providing experiences and information that draws parallels between these two processes.

The results reported above also support the second conclusion which is that identity development is important in the acquisition of multicultural competencies. In these results, a model containing identity statuses provided a better fit for the data for each racial/gender group than the model that did not contain any identity statuses (between multicultural training and multicultural competencies). However, the type of identity (racial or gender) that was most important in the prediction of multicultural competencies varied across the racial/gender groups.

This leads to the third conclusion, that the type of identity status that most influences acquisition of multicultural competencies depends upon racial/gender group membership. The most relevant identity appears to be the least well
developed identity, as evidenced by the relative level of development of the two types of identity for each group. For groups that have a majority and minority cultural status, it is also the majority status. For Women of Color, gender identity is most useful in predicting multicultural competencies. For White Women, the majority identity of race is most influential. While for Men of Color change in the majority identity of gender is useful in predicting change in multicultural competencies. For White Men it is unclear which identity process (race or gender) is most important in the acquisition of multicultural competencies since the results for both types of identity were fairly robust.

The implications for multicultural competencies suggested by the results of the SEM analyses are also influenced by the results of the canonical correlation analyses, in ways similar to those for multicultural training. Change in either identity (racial or gender) may improve multicultural competencies for Women of Color and White Men, since the two processes are likely to influence each other. For White Women and Men of Color, it is unlikely that addressing the other identity process (gender for White Women or racial for Men of Color) will produce the desired effect.

The fourth and final conclusion is that multicultural training (either as measured or as currently disseminated) does not influence identity statuses for all groups. The effect of multicultural training on racial and gender identity differed across the four racial/gender groups. For Women of Color and White Men, multicultural training appears to influence identity statuses. However, for Men of Color and White Women it does not seem to have the same amount of influence. The difference in the efficacy of multicultural training to influence identity
development between these two groups suggests that individuals who have an affiliation with both a majority culture and a minority culture acquire their identity attitudes differently than individuals whose affiliation is within two cultural statuses that match in terms of either both being oppressed or both being majority cultures.

The results for Women of Color and Men of Color, that multicultural training does not appear to influence identity development may be affected by the type of identity that is most important in the acquisition of multicultural competencies for these two groups. For both of them, gender identity development most influences multicultural competencies. The importance of racial identity development has been addressed in the multicultural training literature for some time (Mio & Morris, 1990; Ottavi et al., 1994; Ponterotto, 1988; Sabnani, Ponterotto & Borodovsky, 1991). However, the importance of gender identity development in multicultural training and multicultural competency acquisition has not been considered. Since there is no research on this variable, it is likely that multicultural courses have not included it in the course content. This may explain why multicultural training was not an effective predictor of gender identity statuses. It is also likely that multicultural training currently being done, is targeted toward racial-majority group members. Racial-majority group members are the majority in most training programs. Additionally, the literature has targeted racial-majority group members as needing to be made aware of multicultural issues (Carney & Kahn, 1984; Corvin & Wiggins, 1989; Katz & Ivey, 1977; and Terry, 1970). The focus on influencing the racial identity development of racial-majority members may create an environment where racial-minority group members receive less training and less effective training.
Current multicultural training practices seem to be working for developing the racial identity of racial-majority culture members. For racial-majority group members, a difference in exposure to multicultural issues furnished through the graduate counseling or psychology training program may in part be responsible. For these racial majority group members, this involvement may represent the first time that they have had to actively address multicultural issues. The results obtained for the two racial-majority gender groups (White Women and White Men) suggest that multicultural training helps to explain the acquisition of multicultural competencies. However, this is done primarily as multicultural training operates through racial identity. For racial-majority group members, multicultural training affects racial identity which then affects multicultural competencies. This is in contrast to the results for racial-minority group members, where multicultural training exhibits a direct effect on multicultural competencies. Thus, multicultural training affects multicultural competencies for all groups. Identity development also seems to affect multicultural competencies for all groups. However, multicultural training has variable effects on identity development across different racial/gender groups.

Limitations of the Current Research

As indicated previously, the psychometric qualities of several of the instruments used in this study create problems in interpreting the achieved results. The tangled factor structure of some of the subscales eliminates any type of clear differentiation between statuses whose items intermingle. The mediocre internal consistency reliability of some subscales imply that the subscales are not measuring
a distinct status. However, removal of subscales to compensate for this measurement error is also problematic. Each subscale of any of the identity measures represents one status in a developmental continuum. Removing some subscales truncates the measurement of the developmental continuum. This results in a model that can only speak to specific types of identity development attitudes rather than to the entire range of identity development attitudes.

Another problem with the current research was the inability, due to insufficient numbers, to run full model structural equation analyses for the two men's racial groups (Men of Color and White Men). The lack of sufficient numbers created two problems, one caused by pooling the data from the two men's racial groups and the other caused by the use of regression analyses to explore portions of the full structural equation model. The literature suggests that race/ethnicity is a powerful factor in identity development and multicultural competency acquisition. Pooling the data from both men's groups may have influenced the results of the limited structural equation model analyses that were run. In particular, the poor fit findings for the model containing multicultural training and multicultural competencies for the pooled group of men may have been influenced by the lack of relationship between these two variables for only one group: White Men. The second problem, involves the limitations of regression analysis for this study. The regression analyses done for the two men's groups do not explore the complex relationships among factors that are analyzed by the structural equation model analyses. Therefore, the effect of the racial identity attitude variable on the full model for the two groups of men is not clear.
A third problem in the current study is in the measurement of multicultural training. For this study multicultural training was assessed by asking respondents to provide the amount of various experiences (number of: multicultural courses, multicultural conferences, workshop hours, hours with non-majority clients, supervision sessions addressing multicultural topics, non-majority instructors and supervisors, non-majority fellow graduate students). While amount of training provides valuable information, there is a great deal of variability within these types of experiences that was not assessed in this study. More detail about the methods used in multicultural training or the topics covered might help to explain model differences found for the different racial/gender groups. One such difference was that multicultural training does not affect identity attitudes for two racial/gender groups (Men of Color and White Women). The identities for these two groups included both a majority and a minority identity. Development of the majority identity was most important (gender for Men, race for Women) for predicting multicultural competencies. Without knowing if and how these two types of identity development are addressed in multicultural training situations it is difficult to explain the meaning of the differences found. It is possible that multicultural training could/or does affect these variables. If it does, than the measures used in this study were insufficient to determine this effect. If multicultural training does not affect identity attitudes, it is possible that the multicultural training being taught in counselor and counseling psychology education programs is not effectively addressing these issues. Without more information, beyond simply the number of multicultural experiences, it is impossible to know.
A fourth limitation of the current study is in the design. This study is an observational study using correlational data. There is no manipulation of an independent variable and there is no assessment of change over time. The one-time data collection strategy limits the evaluation of change over time. Additionally, the mailed survey format precludes manipulation of an independent variable. For these reasons, the only relationship that can be assessed among the variables is correlational. Therefore, although the results of the structural equation model may suggest that change in identity attitudes (either racial or gender) may affect change in multicultural competencies, the actual data can only support the conclusion that these variables are related. The correlational nature of the data does not allow for cause and effect conclusions.

Suggestions for Future Research

This researcher was unable to acquire sufficient numbers of subjects to analyze the full Structural Equation Model for men. While the regression analyses and the three-factor structural equation model analysis for men provided some information about the probable results of a full model analysis, it would be interesting to see how the full model performed for each of the men's demographic groups (White Men, Men of Color). Particularly in light of three results for men. The first result is that, the two-factor structural equation model analysis for the pooled men's data was the only model in the study that provided a good fit for the data across all fit indices. The second result is that differences were found in the relationship between multicultural training and racial identity attitudes for the two male groups. The third
and final result is that differences were found between multicultural training and multicultural competencies for Men of Color and White Men. The three results reported above suggest that structural equation model analysis for these two different groups of men would identify different models as best fitting and provide different fit results for the full model.

Future research might consider how multicultural issues are being taught. The results of this study have highlighted the importance of identity attitudes in explaining multicultural competencies. However, they have also suggested that current multicultural training is not effectively addressing these types of identity, especially for White Women and Men of Color. Since White Women make up the plurality of students in counseling and psychology training programs, development of multicultural training curricula that can produce change in these attitudes is important.

One of the major problems for this research was the psychometrics of the identity instruments. Despite the psychometric insufficiencies of the instruments used, this study's structural model analysis suggests that identity attitudes (racial and gender) are important in explaining multicultural competencies. Important aspects of multicultural competence for counselors and therapists have been documented (i.e. Neville et al., 1996; Ottavi et al., 1994; Parker, Moore & Neimeyer, 1998; Sodowsky & Taffe, 1991; Steward et al., 1998). The importance of multicultural competency for improving therapeutic outcomes has also been touched upon (Carter & Helms, 1992). Many theorists and researchers have stressed that multicultural competence is an important aspect of therapeutic competence (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1983;
Arredondo. 1999: Arredondo-Dowd & Gonsalves. 1980: Arredondo et al., 1996; Carney & Kahn, 1984; Sue & Sue, 1990). Therefore, understanding the acquisition of multicultural competencies would appear to be a desirable end. After completing this study, this researcher suggests that a part of that understanding is the role of racial and gender identity development. In order to clarify the roles of these types of identity in the development of multicultural competencies, more effective measures, and measures that address a wider range of identity-status markers (e.g., attitudes, behaviors) of the various identity statuses need to be devised. The results from this study suggest that instruments with better overall psychometric properties may more clearly identify the relationships among these variables across a range of research designs.

A final suggestion is that researchers consider whether there is a cause and effect relationship between multicultural training and identity attitudes (racial and gender) and between identity attitudes and multicultural competencies for all four racial/gender groups that were included in the present study. There have been two previous studies addressing these relationships. The study by Brown, Parham and Yonker (1996) evaluated the effect of a multicultural training course on racial identity attitudes using a pre-post-test format with a one year interval. The Brown et al. (1996) study used only 35 White participants. The study by Neville et al. (1996) explored the effect of a multicultural course on racial identity attitudes. The Neville et al. (1996) study using a similar format, only evaluated the results from 38 White individuals. Both of these studies provide limited support for the respective causal relationships due to small sample populations and limited racial demographics.
Additionally, neither study utilized a control group which could compensate for nuisance variables like shared cohort, and program or time effects. The current study suggests that higher scores on identity attitudes (which identity is most salient varies across racial/gender group) reflect higher scores on multicultural competencies. In order to evaluate the presence, or absence of a cause and effect relationship, research needs to be done wherein multicultural training is manipulated as an independent variable. One possible design could use a pre-post test design using two groups, an experimental group (who take a multicultural training course) and a control group (e.g. who take a counseling techniques course) so that change in racial identity, gender identity and multicultural competencies can be assessed over time. This design could demonstrate the affect of multicultural training on identity attitudes, although it might not provide a definitive accounting of the results of identity attitudes on multicultural competencies.

In addition to the specific recommendations above, this researcher proposes one general recommendation. This study has added the variable of gender identity into the mix of factors that help to explain multicultural competencies. This study has also demonstrated a relationship between gender identity and racial identity for some racial/gender groups. In the future, researchers may want to incorporate gender identity into research designed to explore multicultural competencies. Researchers may also want to incorporate gender identity in research exploring and/or using racial identity.
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Recruitment Materials
June 28, 1999

Debbie Koeltzow
4820 Washtenaw, A12
Ann Arbor, MI 48108

Dear Ms. Koeltzow

This letter is in response to your request to recruit students from Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology courses to participate as subjects in your dissertation study. As chairperson of the department, I grant you my administrative permission to approach the departmental instructors. As you noted in your request, you will also need to acquire permission from each instructor in order to do the classroom recruitment you have outlined. Good luck with your data collection.

Sincerely,

Joseph R. Morris, Ph.D. Chairperson
Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
June 16, 1999

Debbie Koeitzow
4820 Washtenaw Ave., #A12
Ann Arbor, MI 48105

Dear Ms. Koeitzow:

The American Counseling Association is providing you with a mailing list and labels for all its members who also are members of the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development. ACA gives its approval for you to use this list for your dissertation research.

Let us know if we can be of any other assistance to you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James W. Macdonald
Manager, Special Projects
Participant Recruitment Script

Hi my name is Debbie Koeltzow and I am a doctoral student in Counseling Psychology at Western Michigan University. Currently I am working on my dissertation and would appreciate your help in completing it. The study I am doing is designed to assess the relationship between training experiences, socio-cultural attitudes, and multicultural competencies. Participation should only require about 30 minutes to an hour of your time and may provide information that could help to improve multicultural training.

If you provide your name, address, race and gender, you are agreeing to allow me to mail you a survey and a follow-up letter if the survey is not returned. You are free to decide to participate or not participate at the time you receive the survey. The packets you will be mailed will contain instruments that correspond to your identified racial and gender designations. There are two separate measures for gender attitudes one for men and one for women. There are also two separate measures for racial attitudes one for Whites and one for People of Color. Based on the designation you apply to yourself for each of these categories you will be sent one gender attitude and one racial attitude instrument. Each packet will contain a consent document, one personal questionnaire, one measure of racial identity, one measure of gender identity, the Multicultural Counseling Inventory and an addressed and stamped return envelope. You will then be asked to answer the questions in the packet outside of class time and return the packet to me by mail. The packets will be coded individually and for recruitment source (white for those recruited through AMCD mailing list and gold for students recruited in WMU CECP classrooms). The individual coding will be removed by cutting it from the upper right hand corner of the Personal Questionnaire upon receipt of the packet. This will be done by a third party who will not have access to the names on the mailing list. This will be done to ensure anonymity of the results, that responses cannot be matched to any individual. A second packet will be sent out approximately two weeks after the initial mailing to those individuals previously expressing interest who have not yet returned the survey. The coding exists to allow me to follow up with individuals who do not return the initial survey to ask again if they would like to participate. The coding system will also allow me to enter those who have returned the surveys by the four week deadline into a raffle. The coding numbers from all packets received by the four week deadline date will be placed in a container from which one number will be drawn. That number will be matched with the individual’s name on the master list and a check will be sent for $100.

I will be handing out 3x5 cards to each of you. Having all of you receive and return cards helps to ensure others cannot know whether you have expressed interest in participation. Please wait to hand your card in until everyone has had time to complete them. Once all of you have a card in hand, please notice that there are two questions printed on the card. It will be very helpful to me in keeping track of how many total students have been asked to participate in this study if each of you will answer the first question on the card. Let me know whether or not you have been previously approached to participate in this study by circling either yes or no. If you are not interested in receiving a research packet, please stop at this point and leave the remainder of the card blank. For those of you interested in receiving a research packet, please...
packet. please answer the second question on the card, whether you are a member of the Association of Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD), again by circling yes or no. If you are unsure whether you are a member of AMCD, if you are a member you should be receiving this journal. Show the students a copy of the Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development. Finally, for those of you interested in receiving information about this study, please write your race, gender, name and mailing address on the card. Wait until students are done writing. Now, please place your card in this bag when I come by your seat.
Classroom Participant Recruitment Card

I have been asked to participate in this study before: YES NO

I am a member of AMCD: YES NO

RACE: _____________________________

GENDER: __________________________

NAME AND MAILING ADDRESS:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Appendix B

Consent Information for Participation in Research Study
Dear Counseling Student:

You are invited to participate in a research study designed to clarify the relationship between multicultural training, certain types of social attitudes around the topics of race and gender, and multicultural counseling competency. Your participation is requested because of your interest in multicultural issues as indicated by your membership in the Association of Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD). The investigator in this study is Debbie Koeltzow, doctoral candidate in the Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology at Western Michigan University. She is supervised by her dissertation advisor, James M. Croteau, Associate Professor in the same department.

While there are several studies that have considered similar issues, no study has attempted to explore the relationships among multicultural training, racial and gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies in the same study. Your participation in the study will help provide empirical information on a model that incorporates the aforementioned variables in explaining the acquisition of multicultural competencies.

Participation in the study consists of answering and returning the enclosed survey packet. This packet contains questionnaires asking about your multicultural training experiences, about your gender related social attitudes, about your racially related social attitudes and about your attitudes, abilities, and experiences in working as a counselor with multicultural clients. Within the survey packet there are instruments for Whites and for People of Color and for Men and Women. Please respond to the instruments that correspond to your own racial and gender identities. Completing the entire packet should take about 30 to 60 minutes of your time. We anticipate little or no risk in responding to this survey. As in all research, there may be unforeseen risks to participants. If accidental injury occurs, no compensation or additional treatment will be made available. Those who respond to the survey may benefit from the opportunity to reflect on their own multicultural training, competence, and attitudes. No other benefits are expected to accrue for the individual participant.

Data from the study will be shared in aggregate form with Dr. Janet E. Helms author of both racial identity instruments and the woman's identity instrument as part of the agreement to use these instruments. Data in aggregate form will also be published in my dissertation and may appear in future publications. All results will be reported in aggregate form so that the data is not traceable to individuals. To ensure this, I have assigned a code number to each name on the list of mailing addresses to which this survey was sent. The number associated with your name appears in the upper right hand corner of your first survey instrument. Immediately upon receipt of your survey, the number will be detached. This is done to ensure that your responses are no longer traceable to you.
The detached code numbers will be used to eliminate names from the follow-up mailing, to enter respondents in a raffle for $100, and to track the number of respondents returning surveys from each group involved in the mailing. During data collection the list of mailing addresses and code numbers will be stored in a secure confidential location and the person detaching code numbers from surveys will not have access to the list. Upon completion of data collection, the list of names and code numbers will be destroyed.

As an incentive to participation, the researcher has provided $100 for a raffle of all individuals returning the survey within a month of the initial mailing. One code number will be drawn after the deadline. The name of the corresponding individual will be accessed from the master list and a check will be sent by mail to this individual.

Your participation in the study is entirely voluntary and you may refuse to participate without penalty or prejudice by simply not returning this or follow-up surveys. If you do not wish to receive a follow-up request for participation, please return this survey and write on it that you are not interested in participating. Return of the survey indicates your consent for the answers you supply.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right hand corner. You should not participate in this project if the corner does not have a stamped date and signature. If you have any questions or concerns about this study, you may contact me at 734-528-9787, or my dissertation advisor Dr. Croteau at 616-387-5100. You may also contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at Western Michigan University at 616-387-8293 or the Vice-President for Research at that university at 616-387-8298 with any questions or concerns. Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Debbie Koeltzow. MA
Dear Counseling or Counseling Psychology Student:

Recently, following a presentation by this researcher in one of your classes at Western Michigan University, you filled out a card saying that you would be interested in participating in a study designed to clarify the relationship between multicultural training, certain types of social attitudes around the topics of race and gender, and multicultural counseling competency. The investigator in this study is Debbie Koetzow, doctoral candidate in the Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology at Western Michigan University. She is supervised by her dissertation advisor, James M. Croteau, Associate Professor in the same department.

While there are several studies that have considered similar issues, no study has attempted to explore the relationships among multicultural training, racial and gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies in the same study. Your participation in the study will help provide empirical information on a model that incorporates the aforementioned variables in explaining the acquisition of multicultural competencies.

Participation in the study consists of answering and returning the enclosed survey packet. This packet contains questionnaires asking about your multicultural training experiences, about your gender related social attitudes, about your racially related social attitudes and about your attitudes, abilities, and experiences in working as a counselor with multicultural clients. Completing the entire packet should take about 30 to 60 minutes of your time. We anticipate little or no risk in responding to this survey. As in all research, there may be unforeseen risks to participants. If accidental injury occurs, no compensation or additional treatment will be made available. Those who respond to the survey may benefit from the opportunity to reflect on their own multicultural training, competence, and attitudes. No other benefits are expected to accrue for the individual participant.

Data from the study will be shared in aggregate form with Dr. Janet E. Helms author of both racial identity instruments and the woman’s identity instrument as part of the agreement to use these instruments. Data in aggregate form will also be published in my dissertation and may appear in future publications. All results will be reported in aggregate form so that the data is not traceable to individuals. To ensure this, I have assigned a code number to each name on the list of mailing addresses to which this survey was sent. The number associated with your name appears in the upper right hand corner of your first survey instrument: Immediately upon receipt of your survey, the number will be detached. This is done to ensure that your responses are no longer traceable to you.
The detached code numbers will be used to eliminate names from the follow-up mailing, to enter respondents in a raffle for $100, and to track the number of respondents returning surveys from each group involved in the mailing. During data collection the list of mailing addresses and code numbers will be stored in a secure confidential location and the person detaching code numbers from surveys will not have access to the list. Upon completion of data collection, the list of names and code numbers will be destroyed.

As an incentive to participation, the researcher has provided $100 for a raffle of all individuals returning the survey within a month of the initial mailing. One code number will be drawn after the deadline. The name of the corresponding individual will be accessed from the master list and a check will be sent by mail to this individual.

Your participation in the study is entirely voluntary and you may refuse to participate without effect on your grades or relationship with Western Michigan University or the Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology Department by simply not returning this or follow-up surveys. If you do not wish to receive a follow-up request for participation, please return this survey and write on it that you are not interested in participating. Return of the survey indicates your consent for the answers you supply.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right hand corner. You should not participate in this project if the corner does not have a stamped date and signature. If you have any questions or concerns about this study, you may contact me at 734-528-9787, or my dissertation advisor Dr. Croteau at 616-387-5100. You may also contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at Western Michigan University at 616-387-8293 or the Vice-President for Research at that university at 616-387-8298 with any questions or concerns. Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Debbie Koeltzow, MA
Appendix C

Personal Questionnaire
Personal Questionnaire

On this questionnaire most questions utilize a multiple choice format. For these questions please circle the appropriate answer. Some questions covering personal demographic data require you to provide the designated information.

1. Please indicate the category that best describes the way you identify.
   0. African American/Black  1. American Indian/Native American
   2. Asian American/Pacific Islander  3. Hispanic/Latin
   4. European American/White or Caucasian  5. Multiracial
   6. International student/non-US resident  7. Other (Specify)___________

2. Please indicate your gender.
   0. Male  1. Female

3. Please indicate your sexual orientation.
   0. Heterosexual  1. Lesbian/Gay Man
   2. Bisexual Woman or Man  3. Other

4. Please indicate the Socio-Economic Status of your family of origin.
   0. Lower Economic  1. Lower-Middle Economic  2. Middle Economic
   3. High-Middle Economic  4. Upper Economic

5. Please indicate your degree and year in program:
   0. Masters 1st year  1. Masters 2nd year  2. Doctorate 1st year
   3. Doctorate 2nd year  4. Doctorate 3rd year
   5. Doctorate 4th year  6. Doctorate 5th year or beyond

6. Please provide your age. __________________________
7. What was the percentage of the population in your last work environment (or school environment if no work environment) that shared your racial ethnicity?
   0: No other shared  1: Less than 12%  2: 13-25%  3: 26-37%
   4: 38-50%  5: 51-62%  6: 63-75%  7: 76-87%  8: 88-99%
   9: All others shared

8. How many college courses have you taken that were designed to address multicultural topics?

9. How many conferences have you attended where the principle focus was multicultural issues?
   0. Zero  1. One  2. Two  3. 3-4  4. 5-7  5. 8 or more

10. How many hours have you spent in workshops that focused on multicultural issues?
    0. Zero  1. 1-2  2. 3-5  3. 6-10  4. 11-25  5. 26 or more

11. Please indicate from the choices below, the one that most closely represents the total number of clients with whom you have worked as a counselor or therapist in practicum or work settings.
    0. Zero  1. 1-3  2. 4-7  3. 8-14  4. 15-25  5. 26 or more

12. Please indicate from the choices below, the one that most closely represents the total number of clients with whom you have worked as a counselor or therapist in practicum or work settings, who were members of a non-majority culture.
    0. Zero  1. One  2. 2-4  3. 5-9  4. 10-15  5. 16 or more

13. Please indicate from the choices below, the one that most closely represents the total number of individual supervision sessions in which you participated while you were engaged in working with clients.
    0. Zero  1. 1-7  2. 8-14  3. 15-28  4. 29-42  5. 43 or more
14. Please indicate from the choices below, the one that most closely represents the number of individual supervision sessions (from item 13 above) where some aspect of culture and its impact on the therapy sessions was addressed.

0. Zero  1. 1-3  2. 4-7  3. 8-14  4. 15-21  5. 22 or more

15. Please indicate how many instructors and supervisors who were members of non-majority cultures you have had teaching your courses or supervising you in your degree program.

0. Zero  1. One  2. Two  3. Three  4. Four  5. Five or more

16. How many of the graduate students with whom you currently take classes represent non-majority cultures?

0. Zero  1. One  2. 2-3  3. 4-6  4. 7-10  5. 11 or more
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Permission to Use Research Instruments
Permission from Dr. Helms to use the POCRIS, WRIAS, and WIAS

Permission to Reproduce Research Measures

I/We, ______________________ are requesting permission to reproduce the following measure(s): POCRIS, WRIAS, WIAS

I/We intend to use the measure(s) as follows: (provide a brief description or attach an abstract of your project):

_________________________________________________________________

I/We agree that in exchange for permission to reproduce the scale(s) that I have listed, I will provide Dr. Janet E. Helms with the raw data involving her measures. I also agree to collect demographic data from respondents to the measures including (but not limited to) the following: age, gender, ethnicity (e.g., Haitian, Italian, etc.), socioeconomic status, percentage of the respondents' last school (e.g., high school if the person is now in college) or work environment who were of her/his ethnicity.

I/We understand that permission to reproduce the measures will only be granted for the project that I/we have described herein and that if I/we wish to reproduce the measure(s) for other projects, I/we must obtain additional approval.

Signature of Requestor

Mailing Address

Advisor's Signature

Mailing Address

I, Janet E. Helms, give the above-signed permission to reproduce POCRIS, WRIAS, and WIAS for the above described project.
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Permission from Dr. Wade to use the RGIDS


Date: Sat, 21 Nov 1998 11:16:52 -0800
From: "Dr. Jay Wade" <jwade@murray.fordham.edu>
Subject: Re: RGIDS
To: X90KOELTZOW@wmich.edu

Give me your address and I'll send you a copy of the measure and scoring procedure.

At 04:55 PM 11/19/98 -0500, you wrote:
>Dr. Wade,
>    I am interested in using the RGIDS in my doctoral dissertation.
>    Is there a particular way I should go about getting permission and obtaining
>    the measure?
>    Debbie Koeltzow, MA
>    Dept. of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology
>    Western Michigan University

Press return for more...

EMAIL>
Alt-Z for Help ; ANSI | 19200·N8·1 FDX | | P | | Online 00:2

>
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December 11, 1998

Jay C. Wade, Ph.D.
Psychology Department
Fordham University
Bronx, NY 10458

Dear Dr. Wade,

Thank you very much for giving me permission to use the RGIDS in my doctoral dissertation study and for sending me the copy of the RGIDS and the scoring protocols for it.

The RGIDS will be part of an instrument packet that will be given to master’s level counseling students to complete. The intent of the study is to consider the impact of attitudes about maleness, femaleness, and race on multicultural competency. The study will expand upon much of the previous work by including individuals from more cultural demographic categories (e.g., Whites, Persons of Color, Men and Women). Packets will be tailored to the demographic characteristics of the individual participants. For example, men will receive the RGIDS while women will receive a corresponding measure of female identity attitudes. If you have any further questions regarding the proposed study you can contact me by phone at (734) 528-9787 or by e-mail at X90Koeltzow@wmich.edu.

A copy of this letter will be included in the appendix of my dissertation as proof that your permission was given to use the RGIDS. Again, my thanks, especially for the promptness of your response to my request.

Sincerely,

Debbie Koeltzow, MA
4820 Washtenaw, A12
Ann Arbor, MI 48108

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
AGREEMENT FOR THE PROCEDURAL USE OF MULTICULTURAL COUNSELING INVENTORY (MCI)

- The MCI will only be used for my own research purposes.
- The entire scale will be used when administering the MCI.
- Individual items and/or subscales will not be used separately.
- Individual items and/or subscales will not be used or adapted for the development of other instruments.
- The MCI will be kept under secure conditions.
- The MCI will not be shared with other interested parties who need to be referred to the author if they wish to use the instrument.

I understand and agree to the terms stated above. In addition I understand and agree that the $50 use fee entitles me to make unlimited copies of the MCI for one year from the date given below, for one study only.

Signature ___________________________ Date 1/29/99
Name (please print) Deborah Koeltzow
Address 4825 Washtenaw # A12
City, State, Zip Ann Arbor, MI 48108
Research Topic Title: Investigate that racial identity and gender identity
Planned Use of the MCI: Dissertation
(e. g., Dissertation. Survey of Counseling Students, etc.)

Supervisory Signature and name in print Jean M. Cutten
Please return this form to: Gargi Roysircar Sodowsky, Ph.D.
Multicultural Consultation
1231 Eldon Drive
Lincoln, NE 68510
(402) 489-2017

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Thank you for your purchase of the Multicultural Counseling Inventory (MCI). I have enclosed the instrument for your use as outlined in the Agreement for Procedural Use.

For scoring purposes, I employed a Likert scale with values of 1 through 4, with 4 indicating high multicultural competence, and 1 indicating poor multicultural competence. Item numbers 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 15, and 19 are to be reversed. Listed below are the specific subscales and the items included in each:

Subscale one, Multicultural Counseling Skills, consists of 11 items: 18, 20, 21, 24, 26, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 40.

Subscale two, Multicultural Awareness, consists of 10 items: 22, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34.

Subscale three, Multicultural Counseling Relationship, consists of 8 items: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 15, and 19.

Subscale four, Multicultural Counseling Knowledge, consists of 11 items: 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 23.

Good luck on your research. Please contact me at (402) 489-2017 if you have any further questions.

Sincerely,

Gargi Roysircar Sodowsky
Multicultural Consultation
1231 Eldon Drive
Lincoln NE 68510

enclosure
Appendix E

Follow-up Letter
Dear AMCD Student Member:

Approximately two weeks ago you received a survey packet with a request for your participation in my dissertation research on social attitudes and multicultural training as indicators of multicultural competency. At the time of this mailing, I had not received a return packet from you. In case you do want to participate, I am sending this second packet to you. If you have returned a survey, thank you and please disregard this reminder notice. The investigator in this study is Debbie Koeltzow, doctoral candidate in the Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology at Western Michigan University. She is supervised by her dissertation advisor, James M. Croteau, Associate Professor in the same department.

While there are several studies that have considered similar issues, no study has attempted to explore the relationships among multicultural training, racial and gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies in the same study. Your participation in the study will help provide empirical information on a model that incorporates the aforementioned multicultural training and racial and gender identity attitude variables in explaining the acquisition of multicultural competencies.

Participation in the study consists of answering and returning the enclosed survey packet. This packet contains questionnaires asking about your multicultural training experiences, about your gender related social attitudes, about your racially related social attitudes and about your attitudes, abilities, and experiences in working as a counselor with multicultural clients. Within the packet there are instruments for Whites and for People of Color and for Men and Women. Please respond to the instruments that correspond to your own racial and gender identities. Completing the entire packet should take about 30 to 60 minutes of your time. We anticipate little or no risk in responding to this survey. As in all research, there may be unforeseen risks to participants. If accidental injury occurs, no compensation or additional treatment will be made available. Those who respond to the survey may benefit from the opportunity to reflect on their own multicultural training, competence, and attitudes. No other benefits are expected to accrue for the individual participant.

Data from the study will be shared in aggregate form with Dr. Janet E. Helms author of both racial identity instruments and the woman’s identity instrument as part of the agreement to use these instruments. Data in aggregate form will also be published in my dissertation and may appear in future publications. All results will be reported in aggregate form so that the data is not traceable to individuals. To ensure this, I have assigned a code number to each name on the list of mailing addresses to which this survey was sent. The number associated with your name appears in the upper right hand corner of your first survey instrument. Immediately upon receipt of your
survey, the number will be detached. This is done to ensure that your
responses are no longer traceable to you.

The detached code numbers will be used to eliminate names from the follow-up
mailing, to enter respondents in a raffle for $100, and to track the number of
respondents returning surveys from each group involved in the mailing. During data
collection the list of mailing addresses and code numbers will be stored in a secure
confidential location and the person detaching code numbers from surveys will not
have access to the list. Upon completion of data collection, the list of names and
code numbers will be destroyed.

As an incentive to participation, the researcher has provided $100 for a raffle of all
individuals returning the survey within two weeks for this follow-up mailing. One code
number will be drawn after the deadline. The name of the corresponding individual
will be accessed from the master list and a check will be sent by mail to this
individual.

Your participation in the study is entirely voluntary and you may refuse to participate
without penalty or prejudice by simply not returning this survey. Return of the survey
indicates your consent for the answers you supply.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human
Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and
signature of the board chair in the upper right hand corner. You should not
participate in this project if the corner does not have a stamped date and signature. If
you have any questions or concerns about this study, you may contact me at 734-
528-9787, or my dissertation advisor Dr. Croteau at 616-387-5100. You may also
contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at Western
Michigan University at 616-387-8293 or the Vice-President for Research at that
university at 616-387-8298 with any questions or concerns. Thank you for your time
and attention.

Sincerely,

Debbie A. Koeltzow
Dear Counseling or Counseling Psychology Graduate Student:

Approximately two weeks ago you received a survey packet with a request for your participation in my dissertation research on social attitudes and multicultural training as indicators of multicultural competency. At the time of this mailing, I had not received a return packet from you. In case you do want to participate, I am sending this second packet to you. If you have returned a survey, thank you and please disregard this reminder notice. The investigator in this study is Debbie Koeltzow, doctoral candidate in the Department of Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology at Western Michigan University. She is supervised by her dissertation advisor, James M. Croteau, Associate Professor in the same department.

While there are several studies that have considered similar issues, no study has attempted to explore the relationships among multicultural training, racial and gender identity attitudes and multicultural competencies in the same study. Your participation in the study will help provide empirical information on a model that incorporates the aforementioned multicultural training and racial and gender identity attitude variables in explaining the acquisition of multicultural competencies.

Participation in the study consists of answering and returning the enclosed survey packet. This packet contains questionnaires asking about your multicultural training experiences, about your gender related social attitudes, about your racially related social attitudes and about your attitudes, abilities, and experiences in working as a counselor with multicultural clients. Completing the entire packet should take about 30 to 60 minutes of your time. We anticipate little or no risk in responding to this survey. As in all research, there may be unforeseen risks to participants. If accidental injury occurs, no compensation or additional treatment will be made available. Those who respond to the survey may benefit from the opportunity to reflect on their own multicultural training, competence, and attitudes. No other benefits are expected to accrue for the individual participant.

Data from the study will be shared in aggregate form with Dr. Janet E. Helms author of both racial identity instruments and the woman's identity instrument as part of the agreement to use these instruments. Data in aggregate form will also be published in my dissertation and may appear in future publications. All results will be reported in aggregate form so that the data is not traceable to individuals. To ensure this, I have assigned a code number to each name on the list of mailing addresses to which this survey was sent. The number associated with your name appears in the upper right hand corner of your first survey instrument. Immediately upon receipt of your survey, the number will be detached. This is done to ensure that your responses are no longer traceable to you.
The detached code numbers will be used to eliminate names from the follow-up mailing, to enter respondents in a raffle for $100 and to track the number of respondents returning surveys from each group involved in the mailing. During data collection the list of mailing addresses and code numbers will be stored in a secure confidential location and the person detaching code numbers from surveys will not have access to the list. Upon completion of data collection, the list of names and code numbers will be destroyed.

As an incentive to participation, the researcher has provided $100 for a raffle of all individuals returning the survey within two weeks of this follow-up mailing. One code number will be drawn after the deadline. The name of the corresponding individual will be accessed from the master list and a check will be sent by mail to this individual.

Your participation in the study is entirely voluntary and you may refuse to participate without effect on your grades or relationship with Western Michigan University or the Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology Department by simply not returning this survey. Return of the survey indicates your consent for the answers you supply.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (HSIRB) as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right hand corner. You should not participate in this project if the corner does not have a stamped date and signature. If you have any questions or concerns about this study, you may contact me at 734-528-9787, or my dissertation advisor Dr. Croteau at 616-387-5100. You may also contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at Western Michigan University at 616-387-8293 or the Vice-President for Research at that university at 616-387-8298 with any questions or concerns. Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

Debbie A. Koeltzow
Date: 10 September 1999

To: James Croteau. Principal Investigator
    Debbie Koeltzow. Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Sylvia Culp. Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 99-07-13

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled "An Exploration of the Relationships Among Four Variables: Multicultural Training, Racial Identity Attitudes, Gender Identity Attitudes, and Multicultural Competency" has been approved under the expedited category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you may only conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: 10 September 2000
Appendix G

Instrument Factor Loadings
Table 13

Item Factor Loadings for the Personal Questionnaire Formal and Informal Multicultural Training Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Multicultural Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.85*</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal Multicultural Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.82*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates values greater than .30, ---- indicates values less than .10
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Table 14

Item Factor Loadings for the People of Color Racial Identity Attitude Scale by Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conformity/Preencounter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissonance</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissonance—Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immersion/Resistance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Immersion/Resistance—Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates values of .3 or better, — indicates values less than .1
### Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disintegration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration—Continued</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.64*</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo Independence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 15—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pseudo Independence—Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Represents statistically significant correlations.
Table 15—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy—Continued</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates values of .3 or greater. —— indicates values less than .1

Table 16

Item Factor Loadings for the Womanist Identity Attitude Scale by Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter/Masculine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preencounter/Masculine—Continued</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>Factors</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encounter—Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immersion/Emersion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion/Emersion—Continued</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalization</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates values of .3 or greater, — indicates values less than .1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Reference Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>— .12</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>— .48</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>— .10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>— .16</td>
<td>.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>— .51</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>— .46</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>— .22</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>— .81</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>— .48</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>— .16</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference Group Dependent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>— .21</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>— .10</td>
<td>— .39</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>— .25</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>— .57</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>— .11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>— .17</td>
<td>— .58</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>— .22</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>— .20</td>
<td>— .37</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>— .14</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>— .10</td>
<td>— .51</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group Dependent—Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group Non Dependent Similarity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Group Non Dependent Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.83*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates values of .3 or greater, — indicates values less than .1
Table 18
Item Factor Loadings for the Multicultural Counseling Inventory by Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 18—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Awareness—Continued</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>.67*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates values of .3 or greater, —— indicates values of less than .1
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