ABSTRACT

LANE, JONNIE SEAY. Creating the Competency in Social Justice Action Scale. (Under the direction of Dr. Sylvia Nassar).

The goal of this study was to operationalize the construct social justice action by creating The Competency in Social Justice Action Scale (CSJAS). The action competencies from the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competency model were used to operationalize social justice action. It was hypothesized all items would show strong intercorrelation and thus, once subjected to exploratory factor analysis, a single factor structure would be revealed. After being reviewed by a panel of experts, the CSJAS was administered to a sample of 100 participants. The exploratory factor analysis identified a three-factor structure. The remaining items were analyzed for face validity and to identify themes. Items were further reduced to an 11-item scale to maintain a single factor. The CSJAS reported high internal consistency reliability. However, because of the amendments made during analysis, the CSJAS needs to be re-administered for accurate depictions of reliability. The study supported the CJAS’s reliability and construct validity, but additional research will be needed to further develop the psychometric properties of the CSJAS.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

This chapter presents an overview of multicultural counseling theory in relation to its emergence in the field of counseling. Through a chronological look at its history and inclusion in counseling, this chapter highlights ways in which the theory has been adapted to include concepts of social justice, bringing the life of multicultural counseling to its present day status. From this overview, a statement of the problem will be presented that will provide purpose to the research study. This chapter will include an overview of the research questions and definition of relevant terms. It ends by revealing the structure for the rest of the study.

Multicultural Counseling Theory

In the 1980s and 1990s, a theory of multiculturalism to describe human behavior emerged as a predominant orientation. Joining psychodynamic, behavioral, and humanistic theories, multicultural counseling became known as the “fourth force of counseling” (Pederson, 1991). The emergence of this theory meant, for the field of counseling, a shift in the understanding of human nature, presenting problems, symptom presentation, and effective treatment approaches. Multicultural counseling theory shifted away from biological and internal explanations as primary contributors to human behavior and allowed for systemic influences. Whereas psychodynamic, behavioral, and humanistic theories attributed client behaviors to “psychic determinism” within the “dynamic unconscious” (Bienenfeld, 2005), learning and conditioning (Neukrug, 2007), and efforts to achieve “self-actualization” (Moss, 2015), multicultural theories gave consideration to the contexts in which clients’ mental health presentation were situated. These contexts became just as pertinent, and, at times, the sole contributing factor to conceptualization of client mental health.
Multicultural Counseling Competencies

To complement this shift in ideology, Derald Sue, Patricia Arredondo, and Roderick McDavis, under the direction of the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD), joined to comprise the Professional Standards Committee. Together, they created 31 multicultural counseling competencies (MCC’s) for practitioners to adhere to when working with marginalized populations (1992). In the following year, these competencies were used to operationalize counselor characteristics in assessments aimed at measuring a counselor’s multicultural counseling competency.

Social Justice

In the mid 2000’s, a shift was evident in the field of counseling. The concept of advocacy became an important aspect of the counseling relationship and social justice became the fifth force of counseling (Ratts, 2009). Counselors were urged to provide services and interventions on behalf of the client at community and institutional levels. As a result, the advocacy competencies were developed and what it meant to be a multiculturally competent counselor was changed (Lewis, Arnold, House, and Toporek, 2003; Ratts, Toporek, and Lewis, 2010).

Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies

In 2015, the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development put together a workgroup that created the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (Ratts, Singh, Nassar-McMillan, Butler, & McCullough, 2015). These competencies bridged the gap between the multicultural counseling competencies and the advocacy competencies, placing them all within a single model. The model began with the same basic framework of the multicultural counseling competencies, adding into it components of social justice and advocacy.
Ratts, Singh, Nassar-McMillan, Butler, and McCullough used the competencies from Sue et al. to build a model that was more relevant for the modern day counselor by incorporating Urie Bronfenbrenner’s theory of socioecological layers to address the advocacy competencies’ elements of working within systems both with and on behalf of the client. This is one way in which the new competency model adds elements of social justice into the previous framework.

However, other relevant additions were made. The dimensions of the former multicultural counseling competency model remain; attitudes and beliefs, knowledge, and skills. To better include social justice into the model, the key concept of "Action" was added. In addition to suggesting that a counselor increase awareness of their beliefs and biases, attain cultural knowledge, and enhance their skills relative to multicultural counseling, this model suggests that, to be multiculturally competent, a counselor take action in social justice and advocacy efforts.

**Statement of the Problem**

When the MCCs were introduced in the early 1990s, counselors were tasked with putting the competencies into practice (Arredondo et. al, 1996). Assessments were created aligning the multicultural competencies as definitive contributors of counselor characterization with respect to cultural competence (D’Andrea, Daniels & Heck, 1991; Ponterotto, Gretchen, Utsey, Rieger, & Austin, 1996). The profession as a whole worked to support the competencies to ensure their use in practice, and to use the associated assessments as tools for enhancement. Doing so legitimized the competencies, united the counseling profession under a common cause, and reinforced the importance of the issues that were addressed. The same should be done with regard to social justice and, in particular, the new competencies.
The literature is rife with articles and texts emphasizing the importance of social justice when it comes to counseling and competence as a counselor (Chung & Bemak, 2012; Ellis & Carlson, 2009; Miller, 1999). However, a thorough search could not find an assessment that included social justice with respect to counseling as a general profession. Moreover, there has been no release of an assessment specifically tied to the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competency (MSJCC’s) model. To both support the movement within the field emphasizing social justice and to promote the MSJCC’s as a more inclusive model, as well as to encourage adherence toward social justice efforts amongst counselors, a valid and reliable assessment specifically addressing the additions in the newer model needs to be created and implemented into practice.

**Purpose of the Study**

Assessments and scales of multicultural competence can greatly impact the understanding of multicultural competence (Sean, 2005). They help to shape the definition of the construct and provide the basis for operationalization (Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin, & Wise, 1994). Assessment also serves several functions in counseling and supervision. It provides readily accessible knowledge and feedback about a therapist’s relationships with the client and ability to work with diverse populations. It also allows for reflective feedback to create opportunities for growth.

Given the importance of assessment, the use of assessment with regard to previous multicultural competence models, and the lack of one directly related to additions in the counseling field, it is the purpose of this study to create an assessment that measures social justice action. The nature of creating an assessment that measures a concept as broad as social justice is an undertaking. Generally, researchers operationalize a construct by using definitions that have been widely accepted among experts in the field. In this case, there isn’t a clear
definition of social justice action. Therefore, this research study will rely on with Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies as it represents the best example we have of operationalizing the construct. It is the hope of the researcher that this assessment be used in training programs and by professionals in the field to take an honest look at their competence in the area of social justice. Results from this assessment should be used to guide action and hone such competence.

**Research Questions**

RQ 1: “Do all of the items in the CSJAS seem to measure social justice action?”

RQ 2: “Is the CSJAS a reliable instrument?”

**Definition of the Terms**

Because of the nature of this study in creating an assessment and its importance to adherence of construct operationalization, definition of the following terms will be provided: “multicultural counseling”, “social justice”, “counseling competencies”, and “assessment”.

Social justice is the construct in which the assessment will measure counselor competence. Multicultural counseling will be defined because of its relation to social justice and in order to assist in differentiating social justice. Counseling competencies provide the framework for the operationalization of competence.

**Multicultural Counseling**, Given the numerous ways in which culture can be defined and categorized, broad and narrow, some people consider all counseling to be multicultural. This belief is the universal perspective of multicultural counseling (Patterson, 1996, as cited in Neukrug, 2007).

Pederson (1996) writes of three errors that occur in multicultural counseling, the first being an overemphasis of similarities between minority cultures. This error leads to the melting
pot notion of culture and essentially, leads to oppression and marginalization. The second error is overemphasizing the differences. This error leads to an “us vs. them mentality” rife with stereotype and hostility. And the third error is in assuming that one must emphasize either the similarities or differences.

Pederson, suggest multicultural counseling search for common middle ground. Axelson (1999) suggested that multicultural counseling be defined by approach. In his definition, multicultural counseling encompasses technique and practices of pertinent counseling approaches with consideration taken for traditional and contemporary history and environmental experiences of diverse clients. It also entails consideration for how client needs may or may not be met through various resources. For purposes of this study, multicultural counseling can be viewed as contextual considerations made in the realm of a traditional therapeutic format.

Social Justice. Social justice is a component of multicultural counseling. Social justice involves redistribution of power (Chung & Bemak, 2012) in a way that upholds the right of each individual to fairness and equity (Bell, 1997 as cited in Chung & Bemak, 2012). Social justice is determined by social conditions (Chung & Bemak, 2012). It is “a response to social conditions that produce inequalities in how people in any given society gain access to rights to advantages and disadvantages (Miller, 1999). Social justice is the difference between equal treatment and equal access and opportunities to treatment. For the purposes of this study, social justice can be considered as attempts to fair and equal treatment to all. These attempts may or may not take place within the traditional therapeutic format.

Counseling Competencies. The American Counseling Association (ACA) endorses competencies for populations that appear to be underserved or in areas with which there is not a plentiful amount of training and knowledge in formal education. For example, the ACA endorses
competencies for the transgender population (Burnes, et al., 2009) and the multiracial population (Alvarado, et al., 2015). Competencies are written by professionals in the field who have experience working with said population. They suggest practical application of counseling theory and skill with clients from that population and suggest that in applying such competencies in counseling practice, a counselor will demonstrate effectiveness, or competence, in working with that population.

**Organization of the Study**

Five chapters make up this dissertation study. Chapter 1 provides an introduction into the history of the connection between multicultural counseling, practitioner competencies, and related assessments. Chapter 2 depicts a more detailed timeline of multicultural counseling and social justice, leading to the creation of the MSJCCs. Specifically, Multicultural Theory and the Social Justice Perspective are discussed along with the original Multicultural Counseling Competencies. Chapter 2 also highlights currently used assessments for gauging multicultural competence. Chapter 3 details the steps taken in creating an assessment for the MSJCCs, including assumption checks and data analysis. Chapter 4 will provide the results from the research study. Chapter 5 will offer discussion of the results, including implications the results have on the field of counseling and limitations of the study.
CHAPTER TWO  

Literature Review  

The primary focus of this literature review is to portray the evolution of multicultural counseling theory and related counselor assessment. It will review pertinent theory and models. It will, then, describe instruments that assess multicultural counseling competence. Lastly it will describe an alternative method of measurement, used in a business model, and how that method can address some of the weaknesses found in the described competence assessments.

Related Theories and Models  

Multicultural Counseling Theory. Multicultural Counseling Theory (MCT) developed over decades of time, beginning in 1973 at the Vail Conference (Korman, 1974). However, Sue formalized it in a text entitled “A Theory of Multicultural Counseling and Therapy” (1996). Sue highlighted a need to address concerns with the apparent lack of effectiveness traditional counseling theories had, specifically when in use with marginalized populations. He notes that traditional counseling theories, such as Cognitive-Behavioral Theory, hold the assumption that problem behavior is the result of distorted intrapsychic processes. MCT promotes a different explanation for human behavior.

MCT takes a sociological perspective when considering individual behavior. The primary premise of MCT is that people are socialized to uphold the status quo. This translates into social pressures to maintain outdated belief systems that include stereotypes, discrimination, and an “us-versus-them” way of thinking. Thus, what is created is an environment of oppression that leads to psychological distress for those at a disadvantage. Hence, individual behavior is the result of implications from environmental factors.
Counselors working from a multicultural theoretical standpoint address topics of prejudice and discrimination with their client. In essence, these counselors remove their cultural frame of reference. They aim to understand the context of the presenting problem and to adopt the client’s cultural frame of reference when engaging in the helping relationship. They are mindful of environmental circumstances when diagnosing, treating, and referring clients for services. The focal point for problem definition is the impact of the environment. Using MCT, counselors view the client in relation to systems and contexts, as belonging to groups, interconnected to others and to society. As a result, counseling from a multicultural perspective requires attunement to cultural variables and focus on identity development.

The Multicultural Counseling (MCC) model. In 1981, the American Psychological Association’s (APA) Division 17 set their Education and Training Committee to the task of highlighting rationale for the use of multicultural therapy in practice and outlining the major themes inherent in such therapy. What resulted was a categorization of 11 competencies into attitudes and beliefs, knowledge, and skills domains (Sue, et. al, 1982). In their position paper, Sue, et al., provide a foundation for multicultural counseling competencies and call the APA to action in continued development.

In 1991, the Professional Standards Committee of the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD) took the 11 previously proposed competencies and turned them into thirty-one. They suggested the use of these competencies by the American Association of Counseling and Development (AACD) to create guidelines for practice and education (Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis, 1992). The AACD agreed. Until the emergence of the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies, the model developed in 1991, the MCC model, has stood as the gold standard for multicultural counseling.
The framework of the MCC model is a 3x3 matrix of characteristics and dimensions. *Characteristics* represent traits that a counselor competent in multicultural counseling should possess and those seeking competence in multicultural counseling should strive for. *Dimensions* represent areas in which these characteristics are expressed. The characteristics are (1) a sense of self-awareness, (2) an understanding of the client’s worldview, and (3) the ability to choose and implement effective interventions through a multicultural lens. Intersecting with the characteristics are the proposed dimensions, areas where the characteristics are expressed: (1) attitudes and beliefs, (2) knowledge, and (3) skills. Any given competency will be housed in one characteristic and one dimension. For example, competencies include developing self-awareness about ones *attitudes and beliefs*. Others competencies address a counselor’s *knowledge* as it relates to techniques and interventions.

As mentioned previously, the MCC model represented the gold standard of multicultural counseling for years. In fact, it provides the basis for most of the multicultural counseling assessments discussed later in this chapter. However, as the world changed, and counseling perspectives shifted, new models emerged.

**Social Justice Perspective.** While Multicultural Counseling Theory (MCT) shifted counseling in a way that creates a more effective method for treating clients, criticisms of the approach exist. The primary criticism is that MCT remains encapsulated in the therapeutic context. While it recognizes the influence of culture and environment on the individual client and encourages a shift in the therapeutic approach to counseling, more can be done to provide effective treatment of clients. Systems advocacy is a vital piece to client wellbeing, one that is unaddressed in MCT. In order to best effect change, a counseling approach needs to reinforce counselor action (Lee, 2007).
The Social Justice Perspective (SJP) is an approach best viewed as an added layer to Multicultural Counseling Theory. Like MCT, SJP holds that every client experiences privilege and oppression as a result of contextual and demographic factors. It adds that expression of privilege and oppression are based on personal impact and are related to a person’s advantages and disadvantages in society.

Moreover, according to SJP, the therapist represents an agent of change. They engage in interventions at system wide levels on behalf of their clients. Beyond that, the counselor promotes equity and a just world, free from systemic oppression. SJP suggests that social justice efforts be routine agenda items for the counselor, focusing on decreasing disadvantage and promoting advantage for all groups of people, regardless of relevance to client caseload. Social justice becomes a part of their personal and professional identity.

The Social Justice Perspective adds a role to counselor identity, one that reinforces advocacy and action. It promotes a blend of therapeutic intervention and social advocacy, informed by research and education, in a way that betters the lives of clients. Lastly, SJP challenges the definition of multicultural counseling competence. Competence no longer applies solely to counselor characteristics (e.g. attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, and skills), but includes counselor actions.

**Advocacy Competencies.** In 2003, the Governing Council for the American Counseling Association (ACA) endorsed the Advocacy Competencies developed by Lewis, Arnold, House, and Toporek. The advocacy competencies supplemented the pre-existing multicultural competencies, adding that counselors acknowledge the social, political, and economic impacts that contribute to human development and engage in efforts to affect these impacts.
This competency model not only incorporated the notion of advocacy, but also suggested that the counselor extend service beyond the therapist’s office. Situated along two axes; that of advocacy type and that of contextual level, the specific advocacies delineate between acting *with* the client and acting *on behalf of* the client. In this way, the advocacy competencies expand upon the multicultural competencies by encouraging the counselor to use their power and resources in a way that had not yet been seen.

The advocacy competencies suggest that counselor action occurs within systems, from micro-level to macro-level. This is depicted in the model by the inclusion of three domains where advocacy occurs, each greater in size than the next. At the micro-level is the client/student. Mid-level is the school/community setting and the macro-level is the public arena. Each level provides competencies for the counselor to either work *with* or *on behalf of* the client.

Incorporation of these advocacy competencies into clinical practice illustrated movement in the field of counseling to instill responsibility and empower the counselor in effecting social change. When social, economic, and cultural factors affect clients in a way that creates problems in their lives, and those clients have little power in removing barriers, the counselor may be the only catalyst for change in the client’s life.

**Culture Infused Counseling Model.** The Culture Infused Counseling model was developed in 2010 by Collins and Arthur who aimed to make the previous multicultural counseling competency model more comprehensive, more inclusive, and easily operational. Their model highlights the intersection of identities and considers multiple internal and external factors that contribute to the core themes of attitudes/beliefs, knowledge, and skills. It also depicts competency from a “self” and “other” perspective. This model introduced the concept of social justice into an established multicultural competency model (whereas the advocacy model...
focused solely on social justice). However, it maintains the viewpoint of a dominant (e.g. white) counselor working with a marginalized (e.g. non-white) client. It also fails to discriminate between the counselor and advocate role and instead offers an ambiguous inclusion of social justice. The term is only mentioned in two of its competencies and does not provide concrete steps (i.e. “Uphold social justice and equity for all members of society” and “Engage in professional and personal activities to promote social justice”) (p. 8, Collins and Arthur, 2010).

Counselor-Advocate-Scholar (CAS) model. The Social Justice Perspective led to the 2014 Counselor-Advocate-Scholar (CAS) model (Ratts & Pedersen). This model, adapted from the scientist-practitioner-advocate model, describes the roles in which counselors engage (i.e. counselor, advocate, scholar). It presents a frame of reference for which counselors can view their actions. However, it is solely a descriptive model and does not suggest specific action steps.

The Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies. In 2015, the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD) endorsed the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (MSJCC’s) (Ratts, Singh, Nassar-McMillan, Butler, and McCullough). The MSJCC model blends together key aspects of the models that come before it. It builds upon the MCC model which includes competencies categorized into dimensions of attitudes and beliefs, knowledge, and skills (Sue, 1992). It also incorporates concepts from the Culture Infused Counseling model and the advocacy competencies, specifically the assertion that the counselor act as a change agent and that consideration needs to be made from both the viewpoint of the counselor as well as the client. Lastly, like the Counselor-Advocate-Scholar model, it more thoroughly covers all of the roles in which the counselor performs. However, unlike this model, it provides prescribed steps in better serving in the advocate role.
In the MSJCC model this is represented by the addition of the “action” dimension. The action competencies in the MSJCC model are embedded within three of four domains: Counselor Self-Awareness, Client Worldview, and Counseling Relationship. They enhance accompanying competencies in the competency areas (i.e. attitudes and beliefs, knowledge, skills) by promoting social justice concepts of privilege and marginalization. For example, an action competency within the Client Worldview domain states that the counselor, “Immers[e] oneself in the communities in which privileged and marginalized clients reside to work through the discomfort that comes with learning about privileged and marginalized clients.”. This competency highlights the counselor’s role of change agent and promotes transformative learning by experiencing external factors that influence client health and behavior. This work is done in a way that will serve the counselor as he or she works within the counseling setting, with the client, as well as when engaging in social justice efforts, on behalf of the client.

The onset of these competencies provides counselors with an observable, concrete definition of competent counseling from a social justice perspective. It also provides direction for enhancement of such competence. As it stands, there is no assessment tool associated with the updated MSJCC’s. However, multiple valid and reliable tools exist that measure the previous competencies, specifically the competency areas of attitudes and beliefs, knowledge, and skills.

**Measures of Multicultural Competence**

A search of counseling literature returned zero accounts of assessment tools aimed at measuring competence in social justice action. In fact, the literature is scant on ways to assess counselor action in any area. However, what was found were several assessments that measure multicultural counseling competence in accordance with the previous MCC model as well as an assessment that measures social justice interest in career counselors.
The Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised. The Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory--Revised (CCCI-R) was developed by LaFromboise, Coleman, and Hernandez (1991) to assess counselor effectiveness when working with clients from culturally diverse populations. The CCCI-R is a modified version of the original Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory (CCCI; Hernandez & LaFromboise, 1985) and is based on the original 11 cross-cultural counseling competencies developed by the Education and Training Committee for the American Psychological Association’s Division of Counseling Psychology (Sue et al., 1982). The committee organized competencies into three general areas: cultural awareness and beliefs, cultural knowledge, and flexibility in counseling skills. LaFromboise et al. used these categorizations to create the three-scales of the CCCI-R: "Socio-Political Awareness", "Cultural Sensitivity", and "Cross-Cultural Counseling Skill".

The assessment consists of 20 items and employs a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree. Items point to specific competencies, while the assessment overall depicts a self-report of competence. Items include, "Counselor is aware of how own values might affect the client", "Counselor demonstrates knowledge about client’s culture", and "Counselor is willing to suggest referral when cultural differences are extensive".

The Multicultural Counseling Awareness Scale--Form B. The Multicultural Counseling Awareness Scale--Form B (MCAS-B) is a revised version of the MCAS. Developed by Ponterotto, Sanchez, and Magids (1990), this version is also conceptually rooted in the Division 17 competency report (Sue et al., 1982), specifying that multicultural competence consists of awareness, knowledge, and skills. It adds to the original MCAS by including a measure of multicultural counseling knowledge/skills in addition to awareness. This assessment employs a social desirability scale to validate response accuracy.
The MCAS-B contains 45 items rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = Not at all True to 7 = Totally True. Sample items include, "I feel all the recent attention directed toward multicultural issues in counseling is overdone and not really warranted" (awareness item); "I am knowledgeable of acculturation models for various ethnic minority groups" (knowledge/skills item); and "At this point in my professional development, I feel I could benefit little from clinical supervision of my multicultural client caseload" (social desirability item).

The Multicultural Counseling Inventory. The Multicultural Counseling Inventory (MCI), developed by Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin, and Wise in 1994, consists of four scales to measure multicultural competence. The scales are based on a matrix developed by D. W. Sue (1992). The matrix fuses concepts from work done by the APA’s Division of Counseling Psychology Education and Training Committee (1982) and the Standards Committee of the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development (1992). Using the matrix as a framework, it separates knowledge and skills into their own scales and highlights the importance of the counseling relationship.

The MCI’s scales include Counseling Skills, Counseling Relationship, Counseling Knowledge, and Multicultural Awareness. The inventory consists of 40 items. Responses are made on a 4-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = Very Inaccurate to 4 = Very Accurate.

The Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale-Revised. The Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale-Revised (MCKAS-R) is an update to the MCKAS (Ponterotto, 2002). Both are built upon Sue’s model of Multicultural Counseling (1982). The revision aims to increase reliability and validity measures by reassessing the individual items of the MCKAS. The assessment contains two scales: Knowledge and Awareness and has a built-in social desirability check.
The MCKAS-R is a 32-item measure. Responses are made according to a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = “Not At All True”, to 7 = “Totally True”. A sample question from the instrument is “I am aware of individual differences that exist among members within a particular ethnic group based on values, beliefs, and level of acculturation”. Like the other assessment inventories aforementioned, of the 32 items, none refer to social justice or counselor action outside of the counseling setting.

The Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey (Counselor Edition)-Revised. The Multicultural Awareness, Knowledge, and Skills Survey Counselor Edition-R (MAKSS-CE) revised version was created by Kim, Cartwright, Asay, and D’Andrea in 2003. It maintains the structure of the original MAKSS-CE while implementing modifications to address criticisms of rigor. The scales of the MAKSS-CE stem from the 1992 Multicultural Counseling Competencies. It consists of 33 items spread across awareness, knowledge, and skills scales. Responses are made according to three different 4-point Likert scales. The awareness scale ranges from 1 = Very Limited to 4 = Very Aware. The Knowledge scale ranges from 1 = Very Limited to 4 = Very Good. And lastly, the Skills scale ranges from 1 = Strongly Disagree to 4 = Strongly Agree.

In the revised version, modifications were included to create a more valid instrument. The primary modification was the inclusion of two scales to measure the construct of social desirability. If a respondent scores high on the scales to measure social desirability, the accuracy of his or her responses come into question as potentially motivated by the desire to appear culturally competent.

The Multicultural and Social Justice Competencies Scale. This Multicultural and Social Justice Competencies Scale (MSJCS) was developed by Collins, Arthur, McMahon, and
Bisson in 2014. It was constructed using the framework of the Culture-Infused Counseling (CIC) model and the domains of the Multicultural Counseling Competencies (i.e. attitudes and beliefs, knowledge, and skills) (Sue, et al, 1992). It represents the sole assessment found in the literature that maintains a deliberate focus on counseling from a social justice perspective.

The instrument consists of 82 items answered on two scales; “Importance to Career Practice” and “Current Competency Level”. Responses are recorded based on a 5-point Likert-scale ranging from 1 = “Very Low” to 5 = “Very High”. Example items from the scale include “Believe in the equal worth of all people” and “Explain how belonging to particular groups can lead to certain privileges in society”. Respondents use the Likert-scale to rate their opinion in terms of importance of the statement to effective counseling and their perceived level of competence in reference to the statement. The items are divided into three domains (i.e. Cultural Self-Awareness, Awareness of Client Cultural Identities, and Culturally Sensitive Working Alliance). Each domain is further divided into relevant topics, many of which are directly related to the promotion of social justice (e.g. Personal and Professional Privilege, Barriers and Facilitators of Social Justice).

However, while the MSJCS represents the best existing example of an assessment of social justice, it isn’t without flaws. First and foremost, there is an issue of external validity. The intended audience for the MSJCS is career counselors and was normed using this narrow population. Secondly, it’s a lengthy instrument. There are 82 items that need to be answered on two Likert-scales, requiring 164 responses. This leaves the MSJCS vulnerable to testing fatigue and potential issues with internal validity.

Additionally, it doesn’t account for social desirability effects. A 4-point Likert scale removes a neutral option. Given the personalization of the domains (e.g. Personal and
Professional Privilege), the absence of a neutral option can be problematic. When forced to choose between “Somewhat Accurate” and “Somewhat Inaccurate”, social desirability effects can coax a respondent to answer in a pro-social manner.

**Creating a New Scale**

The assessment tools included in this chapter represent the outstanding measures that are currently available. They are all operationalize multicultural competence according to key components defined in relevant theory and approved models. This serves to provide construct validity to the assessments. However, they are all self-report measures using Likert-scales for item response. Though this method provides a quick and easy way to administer and measure social constructs, there are inherent flaws.

Using self-report measures as means to collect data leads to potential issues that can affect validity. When the construct being measured is commonly believed to be a sought-after trait (e.g. competence), the desire to be seen as possessing that trait can bias responses and confound findings. Additionally, Likert scales are often based on subjective measures (e.g. “Strongly Agree”). Their use poses potential threats to internal validity in addition to impeding on practical use. Two people with different levels of competence can appear to be equal simply because they interpret “strongly agree” differently. A supervisor or counselor educator may not be able to obtain a thorough picture of their trainees using such methods.

Providing a scale to measure social desirability can control for that as a mediating variable. However, adding a scale increases the amount of time spent taking the assessment, which can contribute to testing fatigue and interfere with internal validity. The proposed strategy to account for social desirability, mitigate testing fatigue, as well as diminish discrepancies across respondents is to incorporate a measurement scale that relies less on subjective responses.
Competence Based Likert Scale. The National Institutes of Health (NIH) promotes the use of a competence based Likert scale to measure job effectiveness. In this way, the measurement is less susceptible to reporter bias. Assessment using this scale provides more accurate results. The scale uses competence as its basis for rating. Thus, it can be used to measure effectiveness in a variety of job functions.

The scale includes five points of measure. Responses range from 1 = “Fundamental Awareness” to 5 = “Expert” with an option of “n/a” if a particular function does not pertain to the employee’s position. Higher scores indicate a higher degree of competence for the particular job function under review. To ensure clarity in definition and accurate measuring of competence, NIH clarifies response choices by providing examples for each level of competence.

Fundamental Awareness (a score of 1) is defined as having basic knowledge of the competency. NIH further defines a score of 1: “You have a common knowledge or an understanding of basic techniques and concepts.”

Novice (a score of 2) is described as having the education as well as limited experience (e.g. “You have the level of experience gained in a classroom and/or experimental scenarios or as a trainee on-the-job. You are expected to need help when performing this skill.”, “You understand and can discuss terminology, concepts, principles and issues related to this competency”; “You utilize the full range of reference and resource materials in this competency.”)

Intermediate (a score of 3) requires practical application of the competency in a real-world setting (e.g. “You are able to successfully complete tasks in this competency as requested”; “Help from an expert may be required from time to time, but you can usually perform the skill independently”, “You have applied this competency to situations occasionally...”
while needing minimal guidance to perform successfully”, “You understand and can discuss the application and implications of changes to processes, policies, and procedures in this area.”)

Advanced (a score of 4) demonstrates an ability to apply theory (e.g. “You can perform the actions associated with this skill without assistance. You are recognized within your immediate organization as ‘a person to ask’ when difficult questions arise regarding this skill”, “You have consistently provided practical/relevant ideas and perspectives on process or practice improvements which may easily be implemented”, “You are capable of coaching others in the application of this competency by translating complex nuances relating to this competency into easy to understand terms”, “You participate in senior level discussions regarding this competency”, “You assist in the development of reference and resource materials in this competency”).

Lastly, expert (a score of 5) places the employee into the category of a “recognized authority” on that particular competency (e.g. “You are known as an expert in this area”, “You can provide guidance, troubleshoot and answer questions related to this area of expertise and the field where the skill is used”, “You have demonstrated consistent excellence in applying this competency across multiple projects and/or organizations”, “You are considered the “go to” person in this area within NIH and/or outside organizations”, “You create new applications for and/or lead the development of reference and resource materials for this competency”, “You are able to diagram or explain the relevant process elements and issues in relation to organizational issues and trends in sufficient detail during discussions and presentations, to foster a greater understanding among internal and external colleagues and constituents”.

This NIH scale is self-report, however it circumvents social desirability effects by using competence as its standard for measure. This method of measurement is more objective than
those used in existing multicultural counseling competency assessments. The scale is used to evaluate a competence in a particular role by measuring each of its job functions in relation to this scale. Employee evaluations of competence are compared to supervisors’ perceptions, using the same scale. This generates discussion during evaluation and assists in identifying strengths and weaknesses in job performance and reinforcing expectations. Responses can be reviewed in terms of competence in specific job functions or as an aggregate measure. Overall scoring of the assessment is represented by the average of the sum of scores for individual items and translates into general competence in work role.

Summary

It is clear the importance the counseling profession has placed on multicultural and social justice competence. With each advance in practice and theory, competency models and assessments have followed. Most recently, the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies operationalized the construct of “action”. Thus, the logical next step in advancing the profession is the creation of an assessment aligning with the “action” competencies of the MSJCC’s.

Assessing competence in counseling serves an important ethical function; it ensures quality client care. With respect to multicultural counseling, there exist reliable instruments, spanning a variety of conceptualizations of the term. However, when it comes to assessing social justice in counseling, there is much left to be done. One reason for the lack of existing assessments is a vague definition of social justice counseling and advocacy competence.

Creating an assessment from a newly defined construct is difficult. Given the abstract nature of behavioral health terming, one can only rely on what has been opined upon in the literature. In essence, this defines the construct according to the worldview of a few. Although
this presents an issue due to its innate subjectivity, it represents the best approach we currently have.

The emergence of the MSJCC’s represents concrete definition of action competence as it relates to counseling with a social justice perspective. Using the competencies from the action domain of the MSJCC’s to operationalize the construct, an assessment can be created that measures competence in counseling from a social justice perspective (i.e. “action”). Further, by using the Likert scale used by the NIH, an assessment can be created that accounts for social desirability factors without extra test items and potential testing fatigue.
CHAPTER 3

Method

The purpose of this study was to construct an instrument to measure social justice. To operationalize social justice, the action competencies introduced by the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (MSJCC’s) were used. This chapter will introduce the reader to the proposed structure and items for the Competency in Social Justice Action Scale (CSJAS). It will also describe the procedure for data collection and analysis in addition to reviewing the research questions. Lastly, it will describe the methodology and the safeguards that were put into place prior to research completion.

Participants

Participation in the study was solicited via email. A recruitment message was sent to recipients on the Qualtrics listserv. Data collection and participation was completed online and submitted to Qualtrics for preliminary review. Only responses from participants who met criteria were included in the sample. The researcher reviewed the data, eliminating any unusable results, and assessed the need to expand the participant search or to move to analysis.

Participants for the study were recruited through Qualtrics Panels. They located prospective participants for the study using researcher-designated criteria. Eligibility criteria for this study included participants who identify as “currently working or have worked in a therapeutic capacity in one of the helping professions”. “Therapeutic capacity” was defined as engaging in one of several functions with identified clients. These functions included individual or group counseling, assessment, case management, crisis intervention, and discharge planning. “Helping professions” include counseling, psychology, and social work. In addition to item responses, demographic information about each participant was collected. In this section,
participants were asked to identify specific subpopulations of the helping profession in which they work, as well as years of experience, and number of trainings on the topic of interest (social justice and multicultural counseling). This served the purpose of verifying participant’s eligibility as well as their familiarity with the topic.

**Demographic Questions**

Age...............................................................................................................#

Gender........................................................................................................M/F/I/decline

Race/Ethnicity...............................................................................................W/B/A/H/N/C/I/decl.

Years of Experience.......................................................................................#

Job Title..........................................................................................................(cnslor, educ, sup-sor)

Degree..........................................................................................................BA, MS, PhD

Field of Experience.......................................................................................open-ended

Number of Multicultural Counseling Training Course/Workshop...........R:(0-3,4-7,7-10, 10+)

Most Recent Multicultural Counseling Training Course/Workshop.........R:(w/in1/3/5/7/10yrs)

**Description of Protections**

Approval for this study was obtained through the Institutional Review Board. The Institutional Review Board oversees student research, ensuring safe and ethical practices for participants. Ethical practices include informed consent and voluntary participation, both of which will be made available in this study. Participants were given access to the survey once they had been informed of the purpose of the study and reviewed their rights as a participant. Participants were given the option to refuse to answer any question for any reason and had the option to leave the study at any time. An additional safeguard in research includes protecting against potential researcher bias. Because of the anonymous nature of online data collection, the
Researcher was unaware of participants’ identities, privy only to demographic background collected. No identifying information was included in the data given to the researcher by Qualtrics Panels. Additionally, aside from confirmation of eligibility criteria, demographic responses were only reviewed once data analyses were run for the purposes of investigating limitations and discussion points.

**Instrumentation**

The CSJAS consists of a single scale aimed at measuring a counselor’s competence in social justice action. Using the MSJCC’s action competencies to define social justice action, the CSJAS asked participants to review items constructed around the 19 action competencies from the MSJCC’s. Participants were asked to rate their proficiency on the competency on a 6-point Likert-scale. The instrument is self-administered and took approximately 20-30 minutes to complete.

As mentioned in chapter two, previous assessments designed to measure proficiency in proposed multicultural competencies have employed the use of self-reported Likert scale. Many of these scales asked participants to rate themselves on measures of “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree” on items that implied a level of adherence to points of view consistent with cultural competence. To account for this, several studies used social-desirability measures to investigate potential issues with internal consistency (Kim, Cartwright, Assay, D’Andrea, 2003). Researchers believe that participants may rate themselves higher on measures of proficiency and competence because being seen as proficient is desirable.

In the present study, an attempt to control for the same issues of internal consistency was made by using of an objective scale of measurement. To measure competence within a variety of work-related areas, the National Institutes of Health employs a specific Likert-scale to rate
competence of job functions according to objective measures. This measures proficiency based on self-reported level of expertise (NIH, 2017). Tools are created with items specific to particular job functions (e.g. a counselor tool might have an item related to ability to assess). Employees rate their proficiency for each item/job function.

Overall scoring of the assessment is represented by the average of the sum of scores for individual items and translates into overall proficiency level according to the Likert scale used to score assessment items. Higher scores indicate a higher level of perceived proficiency in the job under investigation. Employee perceptions of proficiency are then compared to the supervisors’ determination of the employee’s proficiency on the same scale to generate discussion for the purposes of promotion, evaluation, and to reinforce job expectations. Responses on the survey can be reviewed in terms of individual items and/or overall total score.

An amended version of the Likert scale used in the NIH instruments was used to create the CSJAS. The NIH instrument responses range from 1 = “Fundamental Awareness” to 5 = “Expert” with an option of “n/a” if a particular function does not pertain to the employee’s position. Higher scores indicate a higher degree of competence for that particular job function. For the CSJAS, I added a choice of 0 = “No Awareness”. This replaces the “n/a” response option provided in the NIH assessments. Justification for this alteration is based on the presumption that all competencies included in the MSJCC’s are reasonable expectations of social justice action for any counselor, in any setting. A response of “n/a” would imply that the competency in question does not apply and is not a routine part of the respondent’s position and therefore not an expected competency for the respondent to possess. Replacing it with “no awareness” implies that this respondent does not possess proficiency in a competency that he or she should have
competency in and therefore highlights an area for growth for both the respondent and any supervisor or educator working with the respondent.

**Procedure**

Prior to data collection, to ensure content validity when developing an instrument, it is suggested that item analysis be completed (Lee & Lim, 2008). In this study, a panel of experts was compiled to review the items in the CSJAS. The panel was educated on the MSJCC’s via the document endorsed by the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development, referenced in chapter 1, that introduced the competencies to the field of counseling. Additionally, the experts on the panel were provided with the proposed items and scale for intended use in construction.

The panel included three helping professionals (e.g. LPC, LCAS, LCSW) who were chosen because of interest in the topic and convenience of proximity to the researcher. They were asked to provide feedback related to content and construct validity of the instrument. Specifically, they were instructed to identify for elimination any questions that pose potential threats to construct validity, lead to ambiguity, or further threaten statistical validity.

The suggestions made by the panel were to keep the items as intact as possible in an attempt to recreate the MSJCC’s accurately, since they served as the basis of operationalization. However, they did suggest separating items that serve dual purposes or speak to two different areas (e.g. “Invite conversations about oppression” and “Invite conversations about privilege”). It was suggested that these items referred to two separate concepts and could potentially lead to confusion and or inaccurate reporting. As a result, the CSJAS was constructed with 33 items, as opposed to the 19 that were proposed, the number corresponding to the amount of competencies included in the MSJCC model.
The Competency in Social Justice Action Scale (CSJAS)

Below is the Competency in Social Justice Action Scale in its entirety.

Please rate your (your supervisee or student’s) cultural competency on the following scale:

0 = No Experience (e.g. “I have no idea how I would do this, what the first step would be in completing this, where I would go to do this”)

1 = Fundamental Awareness (e.g. “I possess basic knowledge about how to do this”)

2 = Novice (e.g. “I have some limited experience in this area”; practiced in class, supervision, or during my internship; I have engaged in this action in a non-counseling setting)

3 = Intermediate (e.g. “I have some practical application using this concept/idea/theory”)

4 = Advanced (e.g. “I have connected my actions in this area to specific theory”)

5 = Expert (e.g. “I am recognized as proficient in this area by my peers and colleagues”)

ITEMS

1. Learn about my personal assumptions, worldviews, values, and beliefs.

2. Learn about any stereotypes or biases I have.

3. Learn about myself and my culture as a member of a privileged group.

4. Learn about myself and my culture as a member of a marginalized group.

5. Immerse myself in the community to learn more about my culture.

6. Immerse myself in the community to learn more about other cultures.

7. Learn about how power, privilege, and oppression influence experiences.

8. Learn how my communication style is influenced by my privileged statuses.

9. Learn how my communication style is influenced by my marginalized statuses.
10. Engage in discourse about how historical events shape the worldview, cultural background, values, beliefs, biases, and experiences of privileged clients.

11. Engage in discourse about how historical events shape the worldview, cultural background, values, beliefs, biases, and experiences of marginalized clients.

12. Engage in discourse about how current issues that shape the worldview, cultural background, values, beliefs, biases, and experiences of marginalized clients.

13. Engage in discourse about how current issues shape the worldview, cultural background, values, beliefs, biases, and experiences of privileged clients.

14. Attend professional development trainings to learn how privilege and oppression influence marginalized clients.

15. Attend professional development trainings to learn how oppression influences privileged clients.

16. Attend professional development trainings to learn how privilege influences privileged clients.

17. Apply multicultural and social justice theories and models to one’s work.

18. Assess my limitations and strengths when working with privileged clients.

19. Assess my limitations and strengths when working with marginalized clients.

20. Identify any discomfort that comes with learning about privileged clients.

21. Identify any discomfort that comes with learning about marginalized clients.

22. Be able to effectively explain how clients’ privileged statuses influence their culture, worldview, experiences, and presenting problem.

23. Be able to effectively explain how clients’ marginalized statuses influence their culture, worldview, experiences, and presenting problem.
24. Be able to effectively explain how clients’ privileged statuses influence their presenting problem.

25. Be able to effectively explain how clients’ marginalized statuses influence their presenting problem.

26. Collaborate with clients to identify individual, group, and universal dimensions of human existence that shape the identities.

27. Initiate conversations with clients to determine how culture, worldview, values, beliefs, and biases held by counselor and client influence the counseling relationship.

28. Collaborate with clients to identify the ways that identity development influence the counseling relationship.

29. Explore how counselor and clients’ marginalized statuses influence the counseling relationship.

30. Explore how counselor and clients’ privileged statuses influence the counseling relationship.

31. Invite conversations about how oppression influences the counseling relationship.

32. Invite conversations about how privilege influences the counseling relationship.

33. Collaborate with clients to determine whether individual counseling or systems advocacy is needed.

**Data Analysis**

Research questions described in chapter 1 were be analyzed during this study using appropriate statistical operations (Lee & Lim, 2008). The goal of this research is to create a reliable and valid measure for social justice action. This is reflected in the research questions.
Table 1. Research Questions, Hypotheses, Analyses, and Variables for the Competence in Multicultural Counseling Action Scale (CSJAS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ1:</strong> Do all of the questions in the CSJAS seem to measure social justice action?</td>
<td>Findings will reveal a solution with items retained according to single factor loading</td>
<td>Exploratory Factor Analysis</td>
<td>All Items of the CSJAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ2:</strong> Is the CSJAS a reliable measure?</td>
<td>An internal consistency score of .70 or higher indicates a reliable measure.</td>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha</td>
<td>Items remaining after EFA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor Analysis**

To identify potential constructs (factors) underlying the items in the CSJAS, exploratory factor analysis was conducted. This resulted in a proposed factor structure for the scale. Confirmatory factor analysis was not possible due to limitations with regard to sample size.

**Exploratory factor analysis.** Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is used in instrument construction. Its purpose is to obtain a factor structure from which a researcher can negotiate their tool. The statistical analyses in an EFA provide a framework that implies the number of variables the assessment measures (Thompson, 2004). From that, the researcher can remove or alter questions to better represent the construct. The researcher can also use the factor structure to guide creation of subscales in the instrument. All of this enhances validity and reliability measures for the instrument.
An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was used in instrument construction to create a structure for the CSJAS and to highlight items with statistical insignificance. This allowed the creation of subscales and guidance for removal of items which seem to examine variables unrelated to the construct under question. To do this, EFA examined how strongly individual items “load onto a factor”. The analysis determined how each item of the assessment compares to other items statistically and how likely those items represent (load onto) a unitary construct (factor). Factor analysis can yield a number of factors anywhere from 1 to the number of items in the assessment.

The factor structure for the CSJAS was determined by principal factor analysis (PFA). In PFA, data analysis results in a Scree plot of Eigenvalues. The number of common factors for a given scale (e.g. the number of constructs influencing the items on the scale) is indicated on the Scree plot by a visible drop or tapering of the plotted Eigenvalues for the dataset (Cattell, 1966). Rotation was then completed to examine the variance accounted for by the number of factors indicated in the Scree plot. The majority of variance between the items should be indicated by the number of factors found to be influencing the items on the Scree plot.

Summary

The purpose of this study is to construct an assessment to measure a counselor’s competence in social justice action. Using recent proposal for operationalization of action, the MSJCC’s, a 33 question assessment using a 6-point self-response Likert scale was constructed. The assessment was distributed through Qualtrics to 100 participants. Data were collected and analyzed using exploratory factor analysis to investigate validity and reliability measures. Additionally, descriptive statistics were used to explore potential uses for the CSJAS and to provide information regarding external validity.
CHAPTER 4

Results

This chapter presents the results of the statistical procedures, described in
Chapter 3, used to test the research questions under investigation. All analyses were run using
STATA statistical software. In addressing the first research question, “Do all of the questions in
the CSJAS seem to measure social justice action?” an exploratory factor analysis of participants’
CSJAS scores was used to identify items that seemed to align with theory. For research question
2, “Is the CSJAS a reliable measure?” Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for the CSJAS and its
subscales were calculated, establishing estimates of internal reliability.

Exploratory Factor Analysis of the CSJAS

Preliminary analysis. Prior to engaging in main analyses, preliminary analyses were run
to determine the appropriateness of exploratory factor analysis (EFA) on the data set. Descriptive
summaries showed correlation coefficients ranging from 0.39 to 0.91, with the vast majority of
correlation coefficients between 0.60 and 0.80. All correlation coefficients fell above the
suggested 0.30 marker, thus suggesting the use of EFA (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

Additionally, Worthington and Whittaker (2007) proposed the use of the Kaiser-Meyer-
Olkin’s (KMO) test of sampling adequacy. The KMO can help a researcher determine
factorability of a correlation matrix prior to analyses. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy
for the dataset in this study was 0.86, well above the minimum recommended value of .60
(Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). This further confirmed the data suitable for an EFA.

Factor Extraction. The first step in an exploratory factor analysis is to determine the
number of factors, or factor structure, that the data best represent (Pett et al., 2003). These factors
are then extracted and the data are subjected to re-analysis, or “rotation”, to determine item
dispersion onto the factors, also known as “loading”. In the initial step in EFA, STATA uses statistical analyses to provide estimates of significance from 1-N number of factors, where N = the number of items under investigation. In our study, there were 33 items in the CSJAS. Results are presented as Eigenvalues and correspond to the variance contributed by that factor (Green & Salkind, 2011). The higher the variance or the Eigenvalue, the more that factor accounts for the spread amongst responses.

There are various methods for determining the number of factors to include in scale construction. The most common practice is to exclude factors with eigenvalues less than 1.00 (Green & Salkind, 2011). Researchers also suggest factor determination by evaluating the percentage of variance extracted (Pett et al., 2003). Often, but not always, this corresponds to the suggested extraction based on Eigenvalue. The recommendation is to stop extracting when the last factor accounts for less than 5% of the variance (Pett et al., 2003). Lastly, a scree plot of the eigenvalues, a representation of the data, can be used to visually detect where the factors no longer contribute significantly to the variance of the data, thus indicating that they should not be included in the factor structure (Dimitrov, 2012; Pett et al., 2003). This is determined by identifying where the slope of the line connecting the factors appears to level off. The number of factors accounted for before the slope levels off are included in the factor structure (Green and Salkind, 2011).

In the present study, EFA results suggested the extraction of three factors. Table 2 depicts the factors with Eigenvalues higher than 1.00, the last of which accounts for less than 5% (or .05) of the variance. Additionally, examining a scree plot of the data, shown in Figure 1, confirmed the suggestion to extract three factors. The slope is steepest between the first and second factor. It then continues to slope downward between the second and third factor. It then decreases
greatly between the third and fourth factor and appears completely flat between the fourth and fifth factor. This suggests a three factor structure.

**Table 2. Factor Extraction of CSJAS Scores (N = 100).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Factor Variance</th>
<th>Total Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>23.68</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. Scree plot of the eigenvalues from the exploratory factor analysis of the CSJAS.*
**Factor Rotation.** After the number of factors to extract is decided upon using the methods previously discussed, the data are rotated along the factor structure in order to determine item dispersion. There are two common methods for factor rotation; orthogonal and oblique. Each approach offers advantages and disadvantages (Cabrera-Nguyen, 2010). When correlation is suspected among the variables, as in the case with an assessment for a single construct, oblique rotation is recommended. The high correlations reported in the correlation matrix for this particular study, indicate a single construct, and, thus, use of oblique rotation (Fabrigar & Wegener, 2012). For this study, the default method of oblique rotation in STATA, promax rotation, was used.

**Factor Loading.** Once the data have been rotated, a loading matrix is presented. This provides estimates of the strength of each item to be represented by the included factors. A loading is considered sufficiently strong when the absolute value of its loading coefficient is equal to or above .40 (Pett et al., 2003). Thus, that item would be said to “load onto” that factor. The researcher examines the loading matrix, determines which items are usable, and groups loaded items together onto a factor. Next, the groupings of items are compared to each other and to other factors to determine theme and to identify names for subscales.

Overall, the three-factor model in this study accounted for 83% of the variance in CSJAS scores. Twenty-three of the 33 items (70%) loaded cleanly onto a single factor. These items were grouped together and a theme was identified (see subsequent section). Ten items (30%) were determined unusable. Six of the items (18%) loaded strongly on more than one factor. Four items (12%) did not load strongly on any factor.
Table 3. Results from Preliminary Exploratory Factor Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor1</th>
<th>Factor2</th>
<th>Factor3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor1</th>
<th>Factor2</th>
<th>Factor3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dashes indicate the loading coefficient did not meet the .40 cut-off for significance.

Bolded items represent those retained for assessment creation.

**Factor Themes**

Once the results of the factor analyses have been derived, the researcher investigates the grouped items further in hopes of identifying a theme for that factor. The themes will be used to create subscales for the assessment (Fabrigar & Wegener, 2012). The themes can also be used to identify items that need to be reworded for final construction.

**Factor 1.** Factor 1 accounted for 75% of the variance in CSJAS scores. Eleven items loaded onto Factor 1, representing 33.33% of the 33-item survey. This factor had the largest
loading. Items that loaded onto the factor, listed below in Table 4, directly or indirectly point to work together in session that relates to the counseling relationship.

**Table 4.** Items that loaded onto Factor 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item#</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Engage in discourse about how historical events shape the worldview, cultural background, values, beliefs, biases, and experiences of privileged clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Engage in discourse about how current issues shape the worldview, cultural background, values, beliefs, biases, and experiences of privileged clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Be able to effectively explain how clients’ privileged statuses influence their culture, worldview, experiences, and presenting problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Be able to effectively explain how clients’ privileged statuses influence their presenting problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Collaborate with clients to identify individual, group, and universal dimensions of human existence that shape the identities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Initiate conversations with clients to determine how culture, worldview, values, beliefs, and biases held by counselor and client influence the counseling relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Collaborate with clients to identify the ways that identity development influence the counseling relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Explore how counselor and clients’ marginalized statuses influence the counseling relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Explore how counselor and clients’ privileged statuses influence the counseling relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Invite conversations about how oppression influences the counseling relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Invite conversations about how privilege influences the counseling relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Collaborate with clients to determine whether individual counseling or systems advocacy is needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Factor 2.** Factor 2 accounted for 5% of the variance in scores on the CSJAS. Eight of the 33 items (25.88%) loaded on Factor 2. Most of them seem to relate to gaining awareness of issues of social justice, specifically privilege and marginalization. However, a few of them seem to relate to practical application. This made an impact on researcher’s decision making and will further be discussed in this chapter.

Table 5. Items that loaded onto Factor 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item#</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Learn about myself and my culture as a member of a privileged group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Learn about myself and my culture as a member of a marginalized group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Learn about how power, privilege, and oppression influence experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Learn how my communication style is influenced by my marginalized statuses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Engage in discourse about how historical events shape the worldview, cultural background, values, beliefs, biases, and experiences of marginalized clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Apply multicultural and social justice theories and models to one’s work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Be able to effectively explain how clients’ marginalized statuses influence their culture, worldview, experiences, and presenting problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Be able to effectively explain how clients’ marginalized statuses influence their presenting problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 3.** Four items (12.44%) loaded onto factor 3. It accounted for 3% of the variance. All of the items seemed to relate to actions the counselor engages in that require going out of the office setting and interacting in the community. This is an important part of social justice and refers to parts of the model that were added via the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies. Table 6 shows the items that loaded onto Factor 3.
Table 6. Items that loading onto Factor 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Immerse myself in the community to learn more about my culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Immerse myself in the community to learn more about other cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Attend professional development trainings to learn how oppression influences privileged clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Attend professional development trainings to learn how privilege influences privileged clients.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items with No Factor Loading. Using the guidelines defined by Pett et al. (2003), three of the 33 items on the CSJCAS (9%) did not load onto any factor and therefore were removed in the final construction. While each item is certainly relevant to multicultural counseling, they appear to pertain to self-awareness as opposed to action. Therefore, their exclusion seems appropriate. Table 7 shows these items.

Table 7. Items with No Factor Loading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item#</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Learn about my personal assumptions, worldviews, values, and beliefs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Learn about any stereotypes or biases I have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Assess my limitations and strengths when working with privileged clients.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items with Double Factor Loadings. Six of the 33 items on the CSJAS (18%) loaded onto more than one factor and therefore were removed in the final construction. As with those that did not load onto any factor, some of the items appear to be appropriately excluded because they don’t seem to relate to action. One of the items (#14) did not seem to fit the same reasoning for exclusion, and thus confounded the findings. This will be discussed in subsequent sections. Table 8 shows the items with double loadings.
Table 8. Items with Double Factor Loading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Learn how my communication style is influenced by my privileged statuses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Engage in discourse about how current issues that shape the worldview, cultural background, values, beliefs, biases, and experiences of marginalized clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Attend professional development trainings to learn how privilege and oppression influence marginalized clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Assess my limitations and strengths when working with marginalized clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Identify any discomfort that comes with learning about privileged clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Identify any discomfort that comes with learning about marginalized clients.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Creating CSJAS Subscales

Examining the results of the oblique rotation, there was some difficulty in attempting to create names for the subscales. This was due in part to seemingly similar questions loading onto different factors. For example, questions 22 and 24 loaded onto factor 1 while questions 23 and 25 loaded onto factor 2. Questions 22, “Be able to effectively explain how clients’ privileged statuses influence their culture, worldview, experiences, and presenting problem”, and 23 are worded exactly the same, with one exception; the word “marginalized” is replaced with “privileged” in question 23. The same concept applies to questions 24, and 25.

With this discrepancy, it was difficult to name the factors. One might suggest that the difference lies in the terms “privileged” and “marginalized”. However, following that theme yielded incongruent results. For example, questions 22 and 24 loaded onto factor 1 and both relate to privileged statuses. However, question 29, also loading onto factor 1, relates to marginalized statuses. The themes identified in the previous section of this paper seemed to fit
most of the items in the factor. However, they did not pertain to all of the items loading onto that factor. Additionally, the logic that seemed to exclude some items, did not apply to other items (e.g., items 8 and 9).

Therefore, to better understand factor loading, and to create a more accurate assessment, the results were further reduced with orthogonal, varimax rotation. Orthogonal rotation is the most common form of rotation in EFA because it provides the most stringent results (Fabrigar & Wegener, 2012). It is for this reason, oblique rotation was initially selected, to allow leniency in correlation of factors. However, given the lack of clarity with the less stringent approach, it was decided to submit the data to orthogonal rotation for further analysis.

**Orthogonal Rotation.** With this second rotation, the CSJAS was reduced to 10 items. The results are depicted in Table 9.

**Table 9.** Items Rotated with Orthogonal (Varimax) Rotation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor1</th>
<th>Factor2</th>
<th>Factor3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor1</th>
<th>Factor2</th>
<th>Factor3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td><strong>0.80</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td><strong>0.74</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27</td>
<td><strong>0.84</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28</td>
<td><strong>0.82</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30</td>
<td><strong>0.88</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td><strong>0.80</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32</td>
<td><strong>0.81</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor1</th>
<th>Factor2</th>
<th>Factor3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q33</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Dashes indicate the loading coefficient did not meet the .40 cut-off for significance. Bolded items represent those retained for assessment creation.

The results of the orthogonal rotation narrowed the CSJAS scales and allowed for more concise naming of the subscales: Social Justice in the Counseling Relationship, Social Justice Self-Awareness, and Community Engagement. Each scale included all of the items that loaded on the corresponding factor.

**Factor 1: Social Justice in the Counseling Relationship.** Table 10 shows the results of the items that loaded onto Factor 1 after the orthogonal rotation. Six items loaded onto Factor 1.

The theme identified was social justice in the counseling relationship.

### Table 10. Items that loaded onto Factor 1- Orthogonal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Be able to effectively explain how clients’ privileged statuses influence their culture, worldview, experiences, and presenting problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Initiate conversations with clients to determine how culture, worldview, values, beliefs, and biases held by counselor and client influence the counseling relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Collaborate with clients to identify the ways that identity development influences the counseling relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Explore how counselor and clients’ privileged statuses influence the counseling relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Invite conversations about how oppression influences the counseling relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Invite conversations about how privilege influences the counseling relationship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Factor 2: Social Justice Self-Awareness.** Table 11 shows the results of the items that loaded onto Factor 2 after the orthogonal rotation. Two items loaded onto Factor 2. The theme identified was social justice self-awareness.

**Table 11. Items that loaded onto Factor 2- Orthogonal.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Learn about myself and my culture as a member of a privileged group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Learn about myself and my culture as a member of a marginalized group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 3: Community Engagement.** Table 12 shows the results of the items that loaded onto Factor 3 after the orthogonal rotation. Two items loaded onto Factor 3. The theme identified was community engagement.

**Table 12. Items that loaded onto Factor 3.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Immerse myself in the community to learn more about my culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Attend professional development trainings to learn how privilege influences privileged clients.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Internal Consistency Reliability of the CSJAS**

To estimate the internal consistency reliability of the CSJAS, the researcher subjected the data to statistical analysis. STATA was used to calculate Cronbach’s alpha for the entire tool as well as each of its subscales. Overall, internal consistency reliability was high for the CSJAS (.95) and two of its subscales (i.e. Social Justice in the Counseling Relationship and Community Engagement), meeting the .70 cutoff. This suggests that the items in those scales are intercorrelated, measuring the same construct (BreckaLorenz, Chiang, & Laird, 2013). The third subscale reported moderate findings. Implications will be discussed further in chapter 4. Results of this analysis are shown in Table 13.
Table 13. Internal Consistency Reliability of the CSJAS and the CSJAS Scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th># of items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSJAS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice in the Counseling Relationship</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice Self-Awareness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revisions of the CSJAS

The orthogonal rotation within the exploratory factor analysis yielded more narrow results. However, it excluded items which appeared to be closely related to other items that were included. For example, “Immerse myself in the community to learn more about my culture” was retained while “Immerse myself in the community to learn more about other cultures” was not. Because of this, the researcher decided to re-word the retained items to be more inclusive. Items were also reworded to better fit the Likert-scale.

From the original iteration of the CSJAS, item 30, which reads “Explore how counselor and clients’ privileged statuses influence the counseling relationship” was divided into two items; one that pertains to clients and one that pertains to counselors.

Non-loading Items that were Retained. Three items that were initially removed due to statistical analysis were retained. These items mirrored ones statistically retained. The items retained addressed one side of the counseling dyad, while the excluded items addressed the other side. For example, “Immerse myself in the community to learn more about my culture” and “Immerse myself in the community to learn more about other cultures”. The item initially removed was included so that both partners of the dyad were addressed in the assessment.

Removed Items. Item 22, “Be able to effectively explain how clients’ privileged statuses influence their culture, worldview, experiences, and presenting problem” was removed from the
final iteration of the assessment. Despite having strong loading coefficients with each method of analysis completed, the item appears to speak more towards a knowledge competency versus one of social justice action.

**Reworded Items.** One question was reworded to include its counterpart, that was initially excluded as a result of the findings. “Attend professional development trainings to learn how privilege influences privileged clients”, which was retained, was changed to say, “Attend professional development trainings to learn how privilege and marginalization influence both privileged and marginalized clients”. Stating it this way opens the question up to include an original item that was excluded in the more stringent rotation. The decision was made to create a single item vs separating it into two items, as it was originally created to address the intersection of privilege and marginalization. The original items inferred that privilege only affects privileged clients, and vice versa. To address all of the iterations, the options were to reduce to one or to increase to four items. Reducing to one item was chosen.

For brevity and simplicity, items 29 and 30 on the original CSJAS, reading, "Explore how counselor and clients’ privileged statuses influence the counseling relationship” and "Explore how counselor and clients’ marginalized statuses influence the counseling relationship”, were reworded. The new items read "Explore how clients’ statuses influence the counseling relationship” and “Explore how counselors’ statuses influence the counseling relationship”. The focal point of the original items is the type of status (e.g. privileged). By rewording the items, the focal point becomes the person (e.g. counselor). In this way, the question allows more flexibility in status designation. One person in the dyad may have both privileged and marginalized status designations. It also provides a simplified method of inquiry, as to address all the various movable parts would require four separate questions (i.e. counselor’s
privileged status, counselor’s marginalized status, client’s privileged status, client’s marginalized status).

**Final Assessment**

For the final construction of the CSJAS, the researcher made the decision to condense all of the items into a single scale. This decision was made in an attempt to simplify the construct. This has been done previously in research, for example the Extraversion scale. It was actually a measure of two related constructs impulsivity and sociability, each of which had important correlates in its own right. They were combined into a single construct at researcher discretion (Rocklin & Revelle, 1981). One rule of thumb suggests that a single construct scale can be considered if the main factor accounts for more than 50% of the variance (Revelle & Wilt, 2012). This was the case in the present research study.

Additionally, combining all items into a single factor assists in final scoring of the assessment. For example, the potential range of scores for the entire assessment is 0-165. The potential range of scores for each subscale differs. For example, the potential range of scores for Social Justice in the Counseling Relationship is 0-30 (possible score of 0-5 on six items). For Social Justice Self-Awareness and Community Engagement, the range is 0-10 (two items, each). To assess an overall score for each subscale, one would divide the total score by the number of items in that subscale.

This indicates that the weight of each item varies. Items in the Social Justice in the Counseling Relationship subscale impact the score for that scale to a smaller degree than items in the Community Engagement subscale of the Social Justice Self-Awareness scale. This can skew perception of competence, both on the individual scale and overall. However, each item weighs the same for the entire scale and may give a better depiction of overall competence.
The final version of the Competence in Social Justice Action Scale is below.

Please rate your (your supervisee or student’s) cultural competency on the following scale:

0 = No Experience (e.g. “I have no idea how I would do this, what the first step would be in completing this, where I would go to do this”)

1 = Fundamental Awareness (e.g. “I possess basic knowledge about how to do this”)

2 = Novice (e.g. “I have some limited experience in this area; practiced in class, supervision, or during my internship; I have engaged in this action in a non-counseling setting)

3 = Intermediate (e.g. “I have some practical application using this concept/idea/theory”)

4 = Advanced (e.g. “I have connected my actions in this area to specific theory”)

5 = Expert (e.g. “I am recognized as proficient in this area by my peers and colleagues”)

1. Explore how counselor’s statuses influence the counseling relationship.
2. Explore how clients’ statuses influence the counseling relationship.
3. Initiate conversations with clients to determine how culture, worldview, values, beliefs, and biases held by counselor and client influence the counseling relationship.
4. Collaborate with clients to identify the ways that identity development influences the counseling relationship.
5. Invite conversations about how oppression influences the counseling relationship.
6. Invite conversations about how privilege influences the counseling relationship.
7. Learn about myself and my culture as a member of a privileged group.
8. Learn about myself and my culture as a member of a marginalized group.
9. Immerse myself in the community to learn more about my culture.
10. Immerse myself in the community to learn more about other cultures.

11. Attend professional development trainings to learn how privilege and marginalization influences both privileged and marginalized clients.

Summary

In order to address the research questions within the present study, the CSJAS was administered to 100 participants. An exploratory factor analysis, with an oblique rotation was used to examine Research Question 1. The hypothesized structure of a single construct was not supported by the data. Instead, the data supported a three-factor structure. However, because of a lack of clarity with regard to naming each factor and a seemingly inconsistent method of loading, the data were re-analyzed using an orthogonal rotation. This reduced the dataset to 10 items.

After further exploration, the items retained were altered in a way that allowed for a single construct to be measured. Nine items with strong loadings were retained. One was removed. Of the nine retained, two were reworded. Two items that were initially excluded based on analysis results were reworded and added back for the purpose of mirroring items that were included.

The reliability of the CSJAS was explored in Research Question 2. Cronbach alphas were calculated for the entire scale and each of its subscales prior to item reduction. Overall, the CSJAS has a Cronbach’s alpha of .95 which indicates good reliability. The reliability coefficients for the subscales ranged from .62-.96, moderate to good reliability (BrekaLorenz, Chiang, & Laird, 2013). These findings represent the items as they were presented to participants. Further reports of reliability for the reduced and reworded items will require
administration of the revised CSJAS and analysis of subsequent data. For the purposes of this research study, that was not completed. This will be addressed further in chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5

Discussion

The goal of the present study was to create an assessment that measures social justice action. The action competencies from the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies were used to operationalize the construct, resulting in a 33 item assessment called the Competency in Social Justice Action Scale. The scale was distributed to 100 participants. Results were subjected to analysis with the aim of answering two research questions. The primary research question, “Do all of the questions in the CSJAS seem to measure social justice action?”, and the secondary research question “Is the CSJAS a reliable measure?” were explored using appropriate statistical inquiry. Chapter 4 presented the results of such inquiry. This chapter will discuss the implications of the results, including whether the hypotheses presented in Chapter 1 were supported. It will also provide limitations of the study and suggestions for further research.

Discussion of the Results

**Patient Demographics.** The desired sample size of 300 participants for the present study was not obtained ($N = 100$). However, according to Preacher and MacCallum (2002), a smaller sample size may be suitable for EFA in behavioral research. They state that general rules of thumb regarding sample size are not valid and instead, adequate sample size for a study is dependent on other factors. They suggest that a lower sample size is acceptable if few factors are retained and communality is high, both conditions which were met in this study. However, a small sample size has other implications, specifically, on external validity.

Demographic data showed that the sample in this study was representative of the United States population in some ways and varied in others. The website DataUSA, presents
demographic data taken from various surveys collected by the US Census Bureau, compiling them by topic, (e.g. counselors). This information was used to glean information about demographics from the present study (2018). The percentage of participants in this study who identified as Caucasian (62%) was smaller than the national report (70.2%). At 17%, the sample was also smaller for those who identified as African American (19.7%). Those identifying as Asian (5%), Hispanic/Latino/Latina (4%), Inter-raced (4%) and Native American (1%) were all over-represented in the sample, though some by less than 1%. One participant (1%) identified as Caribbean. This ethnicity was not represented in the data available by DataUSA. Six participants did not provide a response to the prompt regarding ethnicity.

With regard to other variables, variations occur. The study’s sample had a ratio of 79 to 16, female to male counselor (5 participants refused to answer demographic information regarding sex. Compared to the national ratio of 73.3% female, our sample was overrepresented by females (79%). The average age of participants in the study is 37.8 years, slightly lower than the national average (41.2). In terms of education, participants were asked to report the highest degree they’ve received. Thirteen percent of the sample reported having a bachelor’s degree. Fifty-four percent reported having a master’s degree, and 31% reported having a doctoral degree. In comparison to the national average (38.3%, 34.5%, and 27.1%, respectively), the sample in the present study has rather wide variations.

The sample’s small size and differentiation with regard to age, race/ethnicity, and education call into question its external validity and generalizability of the results (Heppner et al., 2008). Additionally, the demographic background collected in this study did not include geographical location. This information would have been interesting in investigating national trends in terms of perceived competence in social justice action.
Research Question 1. Research question 1, states “Do all of the questions in the CSJAS seem to measure social justice action?” In Chapter 3, it was hypothesized that the items on the CSJAS would include factors that correspond to social justice action as defined by the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies. It was anticipated that an exploratory factor analysis of participants’ CSJAS scores would reveal a single factor related to social justice action. Data from the present study did not support this hypothesis. Instead, the factor analysis revealed three factors that were named Social Justice in the Counseling Relationship, Social Justice Self-Awareness, and Community Engagement.

The factors that emerged were not anticipated, and were not easily interpretable. Additionally, they lacked consistency of theme both within each factor and between them. While having separate factors for social justice action could help users differentiate the ways in which competence is achieved and enhanced, items in each category were few.

It’s not unsurprising that the factors were reminiscent of the categories in the model from which they came (e.g. counselor self-awareness, client worldview). The goal of the study was to identify items related to the construct of action.

Wording of the items. A large limitation to this study is the operationalization of the abstract concept of action. Many of the original items, though taken from sections of the MSJCC’s entitled “action” competencies, seemed to relate to other pertinent categories (e.g. attitudes and beliefs). Additionally, it is generally believed that action refers to something someone does. However, several of the items pulled from the action competencies, while ultimately pointing to an action, literally refer to a characteristic (e.g. “Be able to effectively explain how clients’ privileged statuses influence their culture, worldview, experiences, and presenting problem”). This may or may not have thrown participants off. For example, I am able
to explain how to make a peanut butter and jelly sandwich if someone asks me, but do I actually explain it to anyone on a regular basis? Items such as this straddle the border between a knowledge competency and an action competency and thus, isn’t very clear. It was the researcher’s decision to keep the wording exactly as found in the MSJCC model for the study. In hindsight, a different approach, altering the wording prior to administration, might have yielded better results statistically. At the very least, it would have produced a higher degree of confidence in the results. The researcher ended up changing the wording for many of the items in the final iteration of the scale, limiting the conclusions that can be drawn with respect to validity and reliability.

**Comprehensive assessment.** The final version of the CSJAS includes 11 items, a number, in the opinion of this researcher, far too small to fully cover the concept. So, while statistical reports of the items that remain suggest that the answer to research question one “Do all items in the CSJAS seem to measure social justice action?” appears to be yes, the follow-up question remains, “Does it cover every aspect of social justice action?” In order to accurately measure a variable, the items of an assessment need to cover the concept from every angle. In the case of social justice, the breadth and depth of the concept are so profound, that it is difficult to say how many items would thoroughly cover the topic. Additionally, several competencies from the MSJCC’s are not represented in the CSJAS. These competencies are seen as representing social justice action. If an assessment is missing key pieces of that construction, then it can’t claim to measure the construct in its entirety.

This reduces its usability. However, it doesn’t eliminate it. Because abstract concepts such as social justice are subjective by nature, this assessment represents an important tool in driving discussion. The seemingly small number of items used to measure social justice is one
such line of inquiry that can be explored (e.g. “In what other ways are you pursuing social justice that may not be represented in this assessment?”). The original Multicultural Competencies started out with 11 items. Those 11 items shed light on an important topic and created interest in perfecting it.

Creating an objective assessment. Likely the greatest limitation of this research is in the nature of the endeavor. In behavioral sciences, assessments are created in an attempt to make concrete the abstract. For example, the Meyer’s Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) attempts to categorize personality. It does so by creating its items according to Carl Jung’s theory of personality types (Meyers, 2016). The goal when creating an assessment, such as the MBTI, as well as the CSJAS, is to provide means of objective measurement. In this way, the administrator can confidently say that the participant was accurately identified in the results. This is important for various intended uses (e.g. diagnosis, evaluation). It also provides guidance for what to do in order to score differently.

However, the assessment itself is subject to bias. An assessment is only as good as the operationalization of the construct. When it uses theory as basis for that operationalization, issues in validity arise, especially if the theory has not been subjected to testing and has not become widely known as the gold standard for definition of the construct. For example, the MBTI identifies people according to what Carl Jung thought personality was made up of. Over the years, his theory has gained support, however, it isn’t without is dissenters (Pittenger, 1993). Criticisms of the theory that an assessment is based on naturally extend to the assessment itself.

While the CSJAS scores high on reliability and appears, at face value, to measure the construct of social justice action, a more accurate description would be that the CSJAS measures social justice action as it was defined by the MSJCC’s. In order to validate the CSJAS, there
needs to be strong validation of the theoretical basis for item construction. The theory is a new one. Suggested used of the competencies exist (Carrola & Brown, 2018; Ratts & Greenleaf, 2018). However, the competencies are currently untested and lack rigorous review of use. They have not become widely known as definitively measuring social justice competence. Currently, they represent one version of social justice action. Therefore assessments based on them cannot be considered purely objective.

The items for the CSJAS were pulled from the action competencies embedded within the MSJCC model. This was the first attempt by the profession to operationalize social justice action as a standalone domain. To make a truly objective scale, the items, first, need to speak to observable actions. Secondly, the basis for item construction needs to be generally believed to be the basic definition of the construct.

**Research Question 2.** It was hypothesized that the CSJAS would have high internal consistency reliability, scoring .70 or higher on Cronbach’s alpha for all scales and subscales created in the study (Lee and Lim, 2008). For the CSJAS, a Cronbach’s alpha was calculated for the entire scale (.95), as well as each subscale (.96, .62, .83). As hypothesized, the overall scale met the .70 cut-off, demonstrating high reliability.

One subscale did not meet the cut-off for high reliability. This subscale, Social Justice Self-Awareness, consisted of two items, specifically, “Learn about myself and my culture as a member of a privileged group” and “Learn about myself and my culture as a member of a marginalized group”. Cronbach’s alpha for this theme was (.68). These subpar findings could indicate a lack of understanding in the items. It could mean that the items didn’t seem to fit the concept of social justice action. It could also just mean that the items weren’t coherent for the assessment.
It was assumed that participants had an understanding of the terms “privilege” and “marginalization” at the time of data collection. It was also assumed that participants understood and the various demographic variables to which those terms could apply. However, this was not verified by the researcher and therefore could account for issues with internal reliability.

I suspect that people tend to assume designation to one of the two categorizations (i.e. marginalized, privileged). It is a fairly new concept (Shin et al., 2017). Also, it was not specifically mentioned by the researcher at the beginning of participant engagement. Therefore, the ability to confidently speak to the mindfulness of intersectionality for participants when they filled out the survey is hindered. If a participant identified themselves in only one designation, they might have been able to respond to the item that refers to whichever designation they adhere to, but had trouble answering the other.

**Searching for themes.** The decision when creating the final version of the scale was to compress the results into a single-factor construct. This decision was made at the researcher’s discretion and was an attempt to align the tool with previous assessments for use as supplemental to those, much as the action set of competencies was added to existing sets (e.g. knowledge, skills) in the MSJCC’s. For example, the MCKAS, could be turned into the MCKAS+.

As mentioned previously, the themes that appeared to best fit the factors that emerged were Social Justice in the Counseling Relationship, Social Justice Self-Awareness, and Community Engagement. Findings these themes were not surprising at all. The action competencies in the MSJCC model are embedded within three domains: Counselor Self-Awareness, Client Worldview, and Counseling Relationship. The newer pieces of social justice include movement out of the counseling room and interacting with the community. The only
theme that seemed to make sense at face value was the community engagement factor, which specifically speaks to the concept of social justice action.

However, theme identification for the other two factors was difficult. This could mean that there is something outside of the social justice action purview guiding their categorization that isn’t readily present upon superficial review. For example, perhaps despite best efforts, social desirability found its way into the assessment. Or perhaps, participants adhered to their own set of stereotypes, such as the belief that marginalized populations have a distinct culture while privileged cultures do not, making it difficult to answer questions that speak to awareness or understand of a privileged culture.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

The largest issue with regard to this research study was a small sample size, and its implications in terms of validity. A larger sample size needs to be used to ensure generalizability of the findings. Additionally, the sample size in the study didn’t accurately depict the national report of counselors with respect to education. Our study most glaringly missed a large percent of those working with a bachelor’s level education. The method of data collection, through Qualtrics, does little to target participants based on education levels. Future research should pay close attention to the respondent pool and add in methods of collection that hit all targets of the population.

The panel included three helping professionals (i.e. LPC, LCAS, LCSW). They were chosen because of interest in the topic, similarity to the intended participant, and convenience of proximity to the researcher. However, because of the lack of expertise in the topic under investigation, proposed items were not reviewed with the scrutiny that one would expect from an expert panel. An expert panel is comprised of professionals in the field who have practical
application of the construct, in this case social justice action, and who are educated enough to teach others about the concept. Future research should compile an expert panel with a history of work in social justice action. This may lead to a different approach with respect to item construction.

Additionally, given the incongruent factor placement of similar items during factor loading, qualitative research should accompany future attempts at construction. Participants can be asked to identify any items that were difficult to answer and to provide an explanation. With this information, it would be easier to decide which items to include, exclude, change, or combine for final construction. Attention needs to be paid to assessment administration as well, ensuring that participants understand the key constructs and related variables (e.g. intersectionality).

Lastly, the new CSJAS needs to be subjected to the same method as the original CSJAS. In doing so, the items that remain and the newly worded items can be tested for factorability. The CSJAS should also be administered with existing instruments, such as those mentioned in chapter 2, that measure attitude and beliefs, knowledge, and skills. This will explore whether the items on the CSJAS measure action and not another important constructs within multicultural counseling. Confirmatory factor analysis should also be run to verify findings. This was not possible in the present study due to the low sample size. Thus, in order to ensure this, a larger sample size should be collected.

Suggestions for Counseling Practice

Despite significant limitations to the research study, valuable results were found. Most significantly, the study reduced 33 items into 11. While this greatly minimizes the breadth of social justice action, it creates a scale that can be used alongside other instruments to gain a
broad look at a counselors’ multicultural competence. It adds an important piece to existing assessments that have already withstood rigorous testing.

It is suggested that this instrument be used in training programs and in supervision as a platform to drive conversation about social justice and the difference between social justice action and other multicultural competencies, to provide an opportunity for trainees to self-evaluate and request guidance where necessary, and to emphasize the importance of these issues in every aspect of counseling.

**Conclusion**

The results of this study lead us to more questions rather than to answers. However, they provide a good place from which to start. Further research is imperative for the CSJAS to become a widely accepted instrument. For it to gain further statistical support, the CSJAS needs to be subjected to similar testing on a wider scale and with a more representative sample. However, as a means of providing direction for conversation and assessing a general sense of social justice action, it can be implemented as it is.

It has the potential to educate trainees about new standards in the field, to reconceptualize what expertise looks like, and to think of action in terms of construct development. The number of ways the CSJAS can be used in supervision, education, and research are dependent on the creativity of those who use them. In many ways, the difficulty that comes with attempting to quantify an abstract concept provides opportunities to opine upon the nuances of that subject that make it so difficult to do so. It is the hope that this assessment join a multitude of approaches to propel discussion about enhancing social justice action and that it can play a small part in effecting change within the counselor.
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APPENDIX A

Informed Consent

North Carolina State University

INFORMED CONSENT FORM for RESEARCH

Title of Study: Creating the Competence in Multicultural Counseling Action Scale (CMCAS)

Principal Investigator: Jonnie Seay Lane, M.S., LPC, LCAS, CSI, CCTP
Faculty Sponsor: Sylvia Nassar-McMillan, Ph D

What are some general things you should know about research studies?
You are being asked to take part in a research study. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You have the right to be a part of this study, to choose not to participate, or to stop participating at any time without penalty. The purpose of this research study is to create a scale that will assess counselors’ competence in multicultural counseling action. You are not guaranteed any personal benefits from being in a study. However, research studies may pose risks to those that participate. In this consent form, you will find specific details about the research in which you are being asked to participate. If you do not understand something in this form, it is your right to ask the researcher for clarification or more information. If at any time you have questions about your participation, do not hesitate to contact the researcher(s) named above.

What is the purpose of this study?
The Principal Investigator is developing a new assessment tool called the Competence in Multicultural Counseling Action Scale (CMCAS). The purpose of this study is to test the instrument. Data collected in this study will be used to revise the CMCAS and explore the relationship between counselors and multicultural counseling action. It is anticipated that your participation in this study will help increase the understanding of competence in multicultural counseling action and its assessment.

What will happen if you take part in the study?
If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete two online surveys. The first survey is the CMCAS, the instrument that the researcher is testing in this study. It has questions asking about your own multicultural counseling action skills. The second survey includes demographic questions about your background, education level, and exposure to multicultural counseling training. Completing the two surveys is expected to take 20 minutes.

You can withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. If you start the survey and decide that you do not wish to complete them, you can close your Internet browser to leave the survey early. In doing so, you will forfeit the incentive that would be provided to you had you completed the survey. Additionally, per Qualtrics guidelines, surveys that are not considered “quality” (e.g., response time) will not receive incentives. Please refer to Qualtrics policies to learn more about “quality” surveys.
Risks

The risks associated with this research are minimal. You will be asked about your multicultural counseling competence in terms of action. This can evoke thoughts and feelings associated with your own personal multicultural competence.

Benefits

Benefits from participating in this study may include: a greater value placed on multicultural counseling action; contribution to the body of knowledge about multicultural counseling competence; and improvement of the counseling profession through the development of counseling practices based on knowledge gained during this study.

Confidentiality

The information in the study records will be kept confidential to the full extent allowed by law. You will not need to enter your name on the consent form, and your name will not be requested at any time during the study. The files with your survey responses will identify you with an ID number instead of by name. Your survey responses will be stored securely on the researcher’s hard drive, which is password protected. Results from this study will be summarized in the Principal Investigator’s dissertation and related publications, but no identifying information will be included. No reference will be made in oral or written reports that could link you to the study.

Compensation

You will receive incentive as previously stated according to your panel membership.

What if you have questions about this study?
If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Jonnie Lane at jcealy@ncsu.edu, or [919.231.5931].

What if you have questions about your rights as a research participant?
If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact the NCSU IRB Office, Box 7514, NCSU Campus, by email at irb-coordinator@ncsu.edu or by phone at [1.919.515.8754].

Consent To Participate

“I have read and understand the above information. I agree to participate in this study with the understanding that I may choose not to participate or to stop participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled.”

☐ Yes, I consent to participate in this study. Date _____________

☐ No, I do not consent to participate in this study. Date _____________
APPENDIX B

The Competence in Social Justice Action Scale

**Section I:** Please answer the following demographic information.

1. **Age**
   - a. 18-25
   - b. 25-35
   - c. 35-45
   - d. 45-55
   - e. 55-65
   - f. 65+

2. **Gender**
   - a. Male
   - b. Female
   - c. Intersexed
   - d. Decline

3. **Race/Ethnicity**
   - a. Caucasian
   - b. African American
   - c. Asian
   - d. Hispanic
   - e. Native American
   - f. Middle-Eastern
   - g. Inter-raced
   - h. Decline

4. **Place of Origin**
   - a. North America
   - b. South America
   - c. Central America
   - d. Africa
   - e. Middle East
   - f. Asia
   - g. Australia
   - h. Europe

5. **Years of Experience**
   - a. 1-3
   - b. 3-5
   - c. 5-10
   - d. 10-15
   - e. 15-20
   - f. 20+

6. **Job Title (check all that apply)**
   - a. Counselor
   - b. Counselor Educator
   - c. Supervisor
   - d. Social Worker
   - e. Psychologist
   - f. Support Staff

7. **Job Functions (check all that apply)**
   - a. Counseling
   - b. Case Management
   - c. Crisis Intervention
   - d. Discharge Planning
   - f. Clinical Supervision
   - g. Administrative Supervision
   - h. Peer Support

8. **Degree**
   - a. High School Diploma
   - b. Associate’s Degree
   - c. Bachelor’s Degree
d. Master’s Degree  e. Doctoral Degree

9. Populations (check all that apply)
   a. Children  b. Adolescents  c. Adults  d. Geriatrics
   e. Mental Health  f. Substance Abuse  g. Marriage and Family Therapy
   h. Pastoral  i. Developmental Disabilities  j. Students

10. Number of Multicultural Counseling Training Course/Workshop
    a. 0-3  b. 4-7  c. 7-10  d. 10

11. Most Recent Multicultural Counseling Training Course/Workshop
    a. within 1 year  b. within 3 years  c. within 5 years
    d. within 7 years  e. within 10 years

Section II: Use the following scale to evaluate your competence in multicultural counseling competence.

0 = No Experience (e.g. “I have no idea how I would do this, what the first step would be in completing this, where I would go to learn this.”)

1 = Fundamental Awareness (e.g. “I possess basic knowledge about how to do this. I understand the terms and the concepts”)

2 = Novice (e.g. “I have some limited experience in this area. I’ve practiced in class, supervision, or during my internship; I have engaged in this action in a non-counseling setting”)

3 = Intermediate (e.g. “I have some practical application using this concept/idea/theory under the guidance of a teacher or supervisor. I can generally perform it, however I require
assistance or feedback; I am able to see how this competency relates to quality client care”

4 = Advanced (e.g. “I have connected my actions in this area to specific theory. I no longer require assistance or feedback. I am able to guide and provide feedback to others regarding this competency. I can engage in advanced dialogue regarding this skill”)

5 = Expert (e.g. “I am recognized as espousing excellence in this area by my peers and colleagues. I am able to take this competency and further it, creating new ways to engage in it. I can present on the topic and relate to it in terms of systems”)

ITEMS

1. Learn about my personal assumptions, worldviews, values, and beliefs.
2. Learn about any stereotypes or biases I have.
3. Learn about myself and my culture as a member of a privileged group.
4. Learn about myself and my culture as a member of a marginalized group.
5. Immerse myself in the community to learn more about my culture.
6. Immerse myself in the community to learn more about other cultures.
7. Learn about how power, privilege, and oppression influence experiences.
8. Learn how my communication style is influenced by my privileged statuses.
9. Learn how my communication style is influenced by my marginalized statuses.
10. Engage in discourse about how historical events shape the worldview, cultural background, values, beliefs, biases, and experiences of privileged clients.
11. Engage in discourse about how historical events shape the worldview, cultural background, values, beliefs, biases, and experiences of marginalized clients.
12. Engage in discourse about how current issues that shape the worldview, cultural background, values, beliefs, biases, and experiences of marginalized clients.

13. Engage in discourse about how current issues shape the worldview, cultural background, values, beliefs, biases, and experiences of privileged clients.

14. Attend professional development trainings to learn how privilege and oppression influence marginalized clients.

15. Attend professional development trainings to learn how oppression influences privileged clients.

16. Attend professional development trainings to learn how privilege influences privileged clients.

17. Apply multicultural and social justice theories and models to one’s work.

18. Assess my limitations and strengths when working with privileged clients.

19. Assess my limitations and strengths when working with marginalized clients.

20. Identify any discomfort that comes with learning about privileged clients.

21. Identify any discomfort that comes with learning about marginalized clients.

22. Be able to effectively explain how clients’ privileged statuses influence their culture, worldview, experiences, and presenting problem.

23. Be able to effectively explain how clients’ marginalized statuses influence their culture, worldview, experiences, and presenting problem.

24. Be able to effectively explain how clients’ privileged statuses influence their presenting problem.

25. Be able to effectively explain how clients’ marginalized statuses influence their presenting problem.
26. Collaborate with clients to identify individual, group, and universal dimensions of human existence that shape the identities.

27. Initiate conversations with clients to determine how culture, worldview, values, beliefs, and biases held by counselor and client influence the counseling relationship.

28. Collaborate with clients to identify the ways that identity development influence the counseling relationship.

29. Explore how counselor and clients’ marginalized statuses influence the counseling relationship.

30. Explore how counselor and clients’ privileged statuses influence the counseling relationship.

31. Invite conversations about how oppression influences the counseling relationship.

32. Invite conversations about how privilege influences the counseling relationship.

33. Collaborate with clients to determine whether individual counseling or systems advocacy is needed.