

# Exploring School Counselor Multicultural Competence: A Multidimensional Concept

Cheryl C. Holcomb-McCoy and Norma Day-Vines

*Two hundred and nine members of the American School Counselor Association completed the Multicultural Counseling Competence and Training Survey-Revised (C. C. Holcomb-McCoy & J. E. Myers, 1999). A maximum likelihood factor analysis of the survey items was implemented, and 3 factors emerged: Multicultural Terminology, Multicultural Knowledge, and Multicultural Awareness. Implications for future research are discussed.*



Multicultural competence has been referred to as a counselor's attitudes/beliefs, knowledge, and skills in working with ethnically and culturally diverse persons (Sue et al., 1998). Considering the increasingly diverse composition of school populations, the multicultural counseling competence of school counselors has received increasing attention in the counseling literature over the last decade (e.g., Carey, Reinat, & Fontes, 1990; Lee, 1995). School counselors' multicultural counseling competence has been linked to self-construals (Constantine & Yeh, 2001), student advocacy (Lee, 2001), and multicultural training (Holcomb-McCoy, 2001a).

Although several authors have delineated the components of multicultural counseling competence, there is no consensus on how to assess multicultural competence. Ponterotto, Rieger, Barrett, and Sparks (1994) reviewed four instruments designed to measure multicultural counseling competence: the Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised (CCCI-R; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Hernandez, 1991); the Multicultural Counseling Awareness Scale-Form B, Revised Self-Assessment (MCAS-B; Ponterotto, Sanchez, & Magids, 1991); the Multicultural Counseling Inventory (MCI; Sadowsky, Taffe, Gutkin, & Wise, 1994); and the Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge-and-Skills Survey (MAKSS; D'Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991). The CCCI-R is based on 11 cross-cultural counseling competencies that cover three general areas: cross-cultural counseling skill, sociopolitical awareness, and cultural sensitivity. It is a 20-item instrument with a 6-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 6 = *strongly agree*) used by supervisors in assessing counseling trainees' cross-cultural counseling competence. This instrument was developed on the basis of the cross-cultural competencies identified by the Education and Training Committee of Division 17 of the American Psychological Association (Sue et al., 1982). Scores from the CCCI-R are reported to have evidence of content, construct, and criterion-related validity (Sabnani & Ponterotto, 1992).

The MCAS-B measures multicultural knowledge/skills and awareness and is an abbreviated version of the 70-item MCAS. The MCAS-B is conceptually based on Sue et al.'s (1982) multicultural counseling competencies. The MCAS was initially developed from a general literature review, which focused on primarily select authors (Pope-Davis & Dings, 1995). Factor analysis findings of the MCAS-B have indicated a two-factor solution: Knowledge/Skill and Awareness. The MCAS-B has 45 items and uses a Likert-type scale that ranges from 1 (*not at all true*) to 7 (*totally true*); 10 items are reversed scored, and 3 are social desirability items.

Like the CCCI-R and the MCAS-B, the MCI is based on Sue et al.'s (1982) competencies and, similarly, has the following subscales: Multicultural Skills, Multicultural Awareness, Multicultural Counseling Knowledge, and Multicultural Counseling Relationship. The fourth



*Cheryl C. Holcomb-McCoy, Department of Counseling and Personnel Services, University of Maryland at College Park; Norma Day-Vines, Counseling Department, The College of William and Mary. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Cheryl C. Holcomb-McCoy, Department of Counseling and Personnel Services, University of Maryland, 3214 Benjamin Building, College Park, MD 20742 (e-mail: ch193@umail.umd.edu).*

subscale, Multicultural Counseling Relationship, refers to the aspects of the counselor's interpersonal processes with minority clients, including "counselor trustworthiness, comfort level, stereotypes of minority clients and worldview" (Sodowsky et al., 1994, p. 142). The MCI is a 40-item, 4-point Likert-type scale (1 = *very inaccurate* to 4 = *very accurate*) that is designed to "operationalize some of the proposed constructs of multicultural counseling competencies" (Sodowsky et al., 1994, p. 139). Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses and tests of factor congruence provided evidence of construct validity of scores (Pope-Davis & Dings, 1995; Sodowsky, 1996).

Finally, the MAKSS (D'Andrea et al., 1991) measures the effect of instructional strategies on counseling trainees' multicultural counseling development. The items on the MAKSS reflect three main areas: awareness of one's attitudes toward ethnic minorities, knowledge about minority populations, and cross-cultural communication skills. The MAKSS was initially developed from instructional objectives and training programs. Criterion-related validity was assessed for the MAKSS by comparing pre- and posttest results for experimental and control groups. There were significant differences for the experimental groups at pre- and posttest measurements, whereas there were no differences for the control group on pre- and posttest measurements (Ponterotto et al., 1994). The MAKSS has 60 items, all scored on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree/very limited*) to 4 (*strongly agree/very aware/very good*), with 5 items that were reverse scored. Initial reliability and validity of scores were supportive of the Knowledge and Skills subscales; however, the Awareness subscale score has questionable reliability (Pope-Davis & Dings, 1995).

After critically reviewing each multicultural counseling competence instrument, Ponterotto et al. (1994) concluded that multicultural-focused instrumentation is in its infancy when compared with other counseling areas such as career development and personality. More recently, Kocarek, Talbot, Batka, and Anderson (2001) examined the reliability and validity of scores from the MCAS, MAKSS, and the Survey of Graduate Students' Experiences With Diversity (GSEDS; Talbot, 1992), an instrument that measures graduate students' knowledge; skills; behavior; and comfort with issues of diversity regarding women, people of color, and people who are gay, lesbian, and bisexual. Kocarek et al. found that the reliability and validity of scores yielded by the instruments varied and that many of the subscales seem to measure different aspects of the constructs or slightly different constructs.

It is interesting that none of the previously mentioned instruments are based on the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development's (AMCD's) Multicultural Competencies and none focus on aspects of multicultural counseling in the school setting. In 1999, Holcomb-McCoy and Myers developed the Multicultural Counseling Competence and Training Survey (MCCTS) for assessing counselors' perceived multicultural counseling competence and training based on AMCD's Multicultural Competencies and Explanatory Statements. The MCCTS was revised in 2001 by Holcomb-McCoy (2001b) to assess the perceived multicultural competence of school counselors. At this time, the MCCTS-R is the only instrument used to measure school counselors' perceived multicultural counseling competence specifically. This is surprising given the significant attention to the integration of cultural knowledge, sensitivity, and awareness into existing school counseling training programs (e.g., Lewis & Hayes, 1991). Likewise, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) recently included additional multicultural content into the School Counseling Preparation Standards (CACREP, 1994). The CACREP standards specify that school counseling trainees should have curricular experiences that explore the implications of sociocultural, demographic, and lifestyle diversity relevant to school counseling.

Although more attention is being given to training issues in developing school counselors' multicultural competence, there is no adequate instrument for assessing the multicultural counseling competence of school counselors. Therefore, the primary goals of this study were to delineate the dimensions of the MCCTS-R and to determine whether school counselors' multicultural counseling competence is a multifactor or unidimensional phenomenon.

## METHOD

### Instrument Development

The MCCTS (Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999) was initially developed to measure the perceived multicultural competence of professional counselors based on the AMCD Multicultural Competencies. The MCCTS is a self-report instrument containing 32 behaviorally stated items. In 1999, Holcomb-McCoy and Myers implemented a principal component analysis on the MCCTS, and five components emerged: Multicultural Knowledge, Multicultural Awareness, Definitions of Terms, Knowledge of Racial Identity Development Theories, and Multicultural Skills. In calculating reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) for the component scores, alphas of .92, .92, .79, .66, and .91 for the Multicultural Knowledge, Multicultural Awareness, Definitions of Terms, Racial Identity, and Multicultural Skills subscales, respectively, were derived (the somewhat lower reliability estimates for the Racial Identity subscale score may be a result of the small number of items included on that subscale).

Holcomb-McCoy (2001b) revised the MCCTS to better reflect the language used by school counselors. For example, the term *students* was used rather than *clients*. Feedback on the content and format of the survey was solicited from three ethnically diverse and experienced school counselors (with 11, 10, and 5 years of counseling experience). They judged the items to be consistent with school counselors' experiences and relevant to the school setting. Two hundred and fifteen school counselors completed the MCCTS-R. A principal component analysis of the items on the MCCTS-R revealed the following multicultural counseling competence components: multicultural knowledge, multicultural terminology, multicultural awareness, and multicultural skills. Reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alphas) for the component scores were as follows: .95 (Multicultural Knowledge), .83 (Multicultural Awareness), .97 (Multicultural Terminology), and .74 (Multicultural Skills). Multicultural Terminology is the same factor as the Definitions of Terms factor in Holcomb-McCoy and Myers's (1999) study.

The MCCTS-R instrument consists of 32 behaviorally based statements assessing school counselors' perceived multicultural counseling competence (e.g., "I can discuss how culture affects the help-seeking behaviors of students"). Participants assess their multicultural competence for each item by responding on a 4-point Likert-type scale (4 = *extremely competent*, 3 = *competent*, 2 = *somewhat competent*, and 1 = *not competent*).

### Participants and Procedures

A systematic stratified sample of 510 professional school counselors was drawn from the membership of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA;  $N = 11,200$ ). The sample was stratified by state to ensure representation from all geographic regions of ASCA. We believed that representation from all geographic regions was important because of the differences in diversity across regions. For instance, on the basis of experience with an ethnically diverse student population, a school counselor working in an urban district in the southwestern portion of the U.S. might respond differently to the MCCTS-R than a school counselor in a small town in Maine with very few ethnic minority students. Therefore, to ensure representation of counselors from different regions and areas of the U.S., we stratified the sample by state. This was accomplished by selecting every 10th school counselor from the state list and 10 from the remaining U.S. regions (e.g., Puerto Rico, West Indies). The MCCTS-R was mailed to 510 prospective participants, along with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the survey, the anonymous nature of the survey, and instructions for completion (e.g., circling their response and definitions of important terms used on the instrument). A self-addressed, stamped envelope was included to encourage return of the surveys. No follow-up letters or questionnaires were mailed due to lack of funds.

Of the 510 surveys mailed, usable surveys were received from 209 school counselors (a 41% return rate). Although there are differences of opinion and various ways to determine the number

of participants or cases needed in order to do a factor analysis, 209 cases is a sufficient number of cases according to Gorsuch (1983) and Bryant and Yarnold (1995). Gorsuch recommended the "Rule of 200," which states that there should be at least 200 cases. Bryant and Yarnold recommended that the subjects-to-variable ratio should be no lower than 5:1.

Thirty-seven percent ( $n = 78$ ) of the counselors had between 1 and 4 years of counseling experience, whereas 26% ( $n = 54$ ) had 5 to 10 years, 22% ( $n = 46$ ) had 15 years or more, and 14% ( $n = 30$ ) had 11 to 14 years of counseling experience. Participants' self-reported race/ethnicity were as follows: 89% ( $n = 187$ ) White/European descent, 3% ( $n = 6$ ) African/Black, 1% ( $n = 3$ ) Hispanic/Latino, 2% ( $n = 5$ ) Asian, 2% ( $n = 4$ ) Native American, and 2% ( $n = 4$ ) other. Thirty-seven percent ( $n = 79$ ) of the participants worked in elementary schools, 23% ( $n = 49$ ) in middle schools, 31% ( $n = 65$ ) in high schools, and 7% ( $n = 16$ ) in other types of school settings (e.g., elementary/middle and schools with all grades). All regions of ASCA were represented in the sample: Midwestern, 16% ( $n = 33$ ); North Atlantic, 23% ( $n = 48$ ); Southern, 46% ( $n = 96$ ); and Western, 15% ( $n = 31$ ). Eighty-three percent ( $n = 172$ ) of the counselors were female. There are no data currently available regarding the demographics of ASCA membership, so it is unclear how representative this sample is of school counselors who are members of ASCA. However, ASCA is a predominantly White, female organization that is similar to the demographics of this study's sample (M. Smith, personal communication, February 9, 2004).

## RESULTS

The factor analysis for the study was conducted in two stages: factor extraction and factor rotation. Before proceeding with factor extraction, however, a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) statistic was generated to predict sampling adequacy (i.e., if the data are likely to factor well). According to Hutcheson and Sofroniou (1999), an overall KMO should be .60 or higher to proceed with a factor analysis. The KMO statistic for the data in this study was .94.

As part of the first stage to determine the number of extracted factors, we obtained eigenvalues and a scree plot based on a principal component solution. Three criteria were used to determine the number of components to rotate: the "Kaiser Rule" (i.e., eigenvalues greater than 1), the scree test, and the interpretability of the factor solution (Green & Salkind, 2003). Although there were six components with eigenvalues greater than 1, the scree plot indicated three components with eigenvalues in the sharp descent part of the plot. The Kaiser Rule, although widely used for the retention of factors or components, has been reported as resulting in the retention of too many factors (Velicer, Eaton, & Fava, 2000). Therefore, based on the scree plot, three factors were rotated using a maximum likelihood factor analysis with an oblimin rotation procedure (i.e., nonorthogonal rotation). The oblimin rotation was conducted because the items on the survey are related to each other. Also, after examining the factor correlation matrix, it was determined that orthogonality in the model cannot be assumed. According to Bryant and Yarnold (1995), if the factor correlations are small (less than .32), the orthogonality can be assumed. If the correlations are larger, then covariance between factors should be assumed. Because all of the factor correlations in this model are greater than .32, covariance between factors was assumed and an oblimin rotation was used (see Table 1).

The rotated solution, as shown in Table 2, yielded three interpretable factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 and accounted for 55.12% of the variance. Only those items with a structure coefficient of an absolute value of .4 or above on a given factor were considered to be included as an item on that factor. Item 5 did not meet this criterion. Of the four items on Factor 1, the items with the highest structure coefficients were 10 ("I can define prejudice") and 11 ("I can define discrimination"). Items on this factor were related to terms used in the field of multicultural counseling. Therefore, Factor 1 was named Multicultural Terminology.

All of the items on Factor 2 had structure coefficients greater than .50. Because the items referred primarily to knowledge of cultural groups and multicultural concepts, Factor 2 was named Multicultural Knowledge. Items 27 ("I can discuss how the counseling process may conflict with the cultural values of at least two ethnic groups") and 28 ("I can list at least three barriers that prevent ethnic minority students from using counseling services") were among the highest structure coefficients on Factor 2.

TABLE 1

**Multicultural Counseling Competence and Training Summary-Revised Factor Correlation Matrix**

Factor	1	2	3
1 (Multicultural Terminology)	—	.47	.61
2 (Multicultural Knowledge)		—	.44
3 (Multicultural Awareness)			—

Of the nine items on Factor 3, the items with the highest structure coefficients were Item 3 (“I am able to discuss how my culture has influenced the way I think”) and Item 2 (“I am aware of how my cultural background and experience have influenced my attitudes about psychological processes”). It is important to note that Items 5 and 6 do not accurately reflect multicultural awareness. Instead, these items are more indicative of one’s multicultural performance or skill. For instance, Item 5 (“I verbally communicate my acceptance of culturally different students”) reflects a counselor’s perceived communication with culturally different students (skill) rather than the counselor’s cultural self-awareness (“I am aware of diverse ways of communicating with students”). However, because seven of the nine items on this factor focused on cultural self-awareness, this factor was labeled Multicultural Awareness.

This three-factor solution contrasts with the five-factor solution found in Holcomb-McCoy and Myers’s (1999) and Holcomb-McCoy’s (2001b) previous principal component analyses on the MCCTS and MCCTS-R, respectively. The difference is that the current factor analysis did not identify Knowledge of Racial Identity Development and Multicultural Skills as factors. Items from these two previous factors had higher structure coefficients on the Multicultural Knowledge and Awareness factors. For instance, Items 8 (“I can discuss models of White Racial Identity Development”) and 19 (“I can discuss the counseling implications for at least two models of racial/ethnic identity development”) previously were on the Knowledge of Racial Identity Development factor, and, for this study, they had high structure coefficients on Factor 2, Multicultural Knowledge. In addition, Items 5 (“I verbally communicate my acceptance of culturally different students”) and 6 (“I nonverbally communicate my acceptance of culturally different students”) previously had higher structure coefficients on the Multicultural Skills factor and, for the current study, had higher structure coefficients on Factor 3, Multicultural Awareness. The mean, standard deviation, and Cronbach’s alpha for each subscale (factor) were as follows: Multicultural Terminology ( $M = 3.40, SD = .61, \alpha = .97$ ), Multicultural Knowledge ( $M = 2.45, SD = .81, \alpha = .95$ ), and Multicultural Awareness ( $M = 3.36, SD = .61, \alpha = .85$ ).

## DISCUSSION

The results of this study suggest that the MCCTS-R is a multifactor measure composed of three factors or dimensions of school counselors’ perceived multicultural counseling competence: Multicultural Terminology, Multicultural Knowledge, and Multicultural Awareness. This finding differs from the first author’s previous studies that indicated there were four and five factors of perceived multicultural counseling competence on the original MCCTS and MCCTS-R, respectively. The first factor, Multicultural Terminology, is consistent with Johnson’s (1990) claim that counselors should be able to define and understand concepts related to race and culture. The second factor, Multicultural Knowledge, reflects previous findings that counselors should be aware of cultural information or have knowledge of various cultural groups (Mio & Morris, 1990). The third factor, Multicultural Awareness, is consistent with literature that focuses on the counselor’s cultural and self-awareness as part of acquiring multicultural counseling competence (Parker & McDavis, 1979). These three domains are consistent with two of the three domains suggested by Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis (1992) and Sue et al.’s (1998) knowledge, awareness, and skills.

The lack of a Multicultural Skills factor in this current study is of great concern given the emphasis placed in the literature (e.g., Locke, 2003) on school counselors’ attainment of the neces-

**TABLE 2**

**Structure Coefficients, Community Estimates, Eigenvalues, and Variance Accounted for From Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis for Multicultural Counseling Competence Items With Direct Oblimin Three-Factor Solution and Coefficient Alphas (*N* = 209)**

Item	Factor Structure Coefficients			<i>h</i> <sup>2</sup>
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	
9 I can define racism.	.89	.53	.62	.82
10 I can define prejudice.	.97	.45	.59	.95
11 I can define discrimination.	.97	.43	.57	.94
12 I can define stereotype.	.94	.43	.58	.89
8 I can discuss models of White Racial Identity Development.	.41	.58	.36	.36
13 I can identify the cultural basis of my communication style.	.38	.59	.53	.44
16 I can give examples of how stereotypical beliefs about culturally different persons impact the counseling relationship.	.48	.70	.49	.54
17 I can articulate the possible differences between the nonverbal behavior of the five major ethnic groups (i.e., African/Black, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native American, European/White).	.32	.73	.34	.53
18 I can articulate possible differences between the verbal behavior of the five major ethnic groups.	.38	.78	.37	.61
19 I can discuss the counseling implications for at least two models of racial/ethnic identity development.	.29	.69	.26	.48
20 I can discuss within-group differences among ethnic groups (i.e., African American, Latino/Hispanic, Asian American, Native American).	.31	.64	.33	.41
21 I can discuss how culture affects a student's vocational choices.	.34	.72	.38	.53
22 I can discuss how culture affects the help-seeking behaviors of students.	.37	.80	.37	.64
23 I can discuss how culture affects the manifestations of psychological disorders.	.35	.75	.34	.56
24 I can describe the degree to which a counseling approach is appropriate for a specific group of people.	.34	.80	.33	.64
25 I can explain how factors such as poverty and powerlessness have influenced the current conditions of at least two ethnic groups.	.44	.80	.43	.65
26 I can list at least three barriers that prevent ethnic minority students from using counseling services.	.26	.74	.19	.57
27 I can discuss how the counseling process may conflict with the cultural values of at least two ethnic groups.	.31	.80	.26	.65
28 I can list at least three barriers that prevent ethnic minority students from using counseling services.	.35	.80	.31	.65
29 I can discuss the potential bias of two assessment instruments frequently used in the schools.	.30	.68	.23	.47
30 I can discuss family counseling from a cultural/ethnic perspective.	.40	.79	.35	.62
31 I can anticipate when my helping style is inappropriate for culturally different students.	.40	.62	.38	.41
32 I can help students determine whether a problem stems from racism or biases in others.	.45	.65	.43	.46
1 I can discuss my own ethnic/cultural heritage.	.47	.32	.77	.60
2 I am aware of how my cultural background and experiences have influenced my attitudes about psychological processes.	.48	.34	.85	.73

(Continued on next page)

**TABLE 2 (Continued)**

**Structure Coefficients, Community Estimates, Eigenvalues, and Variance Accounted for From Maximum Likelihood Factor Analysis for Multicultural Counseling Competence Items With Direct Oblimin Three-Factor Solution and Coefficient Alphas ( $N = 209$ )**

Item	Factor Structure Coefficients			$h^2$
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	
3 I am able to discuss how my culture has influenced the way I think.	.57	.38	<b>.91</b>	.83
4 I can recognize when my attitudes, beliefs, and values are interfering with providing the best services to my students.	.44	.44	<b>.53</b>	.34
5 I verbally communicate my acceptance of culturally different students.	.34	.32	<b>.36</b>	.17
6 I nonverbally communicate my acceptance of culturally different students.	.32	.32	<b>.42</b>	.20
7 I can discuss my family's perspective regarding acceptable and non-acceptable codes of conduct.	.40	.18	<b>.47</b>	.25
14 I can identify my negative and positive emotional reactions toward persons of other racial and ethnic groups.	.53	.41	<b>.56</b>	.39
15 I can identify my reactions that are based on stereotypical beliefs about different ethnic groups.	.47	.38	<b>.54</b>	.33
Eigenvalue	13.54	3.71	1.49	
Variance accounted for	33.67	16.43	5.02	

*Note.* These results were obtained using a maximum likelihood factor analysis with a direct oblimin rotation ( $N = 209$ ). Bold-faced structural coefficients indicate the highest coefficient for each item.

sary and effective skills to work with ethnically and culturally diverse students. Based on the results of this current factor analysis, it appears that the MCCTS-R measures three domains of school counselors' perceived multicultural counseling competence rather than the four and five that were previously indicated (e.g., Holcomb-McCoy, 2001b; Holcomb-McCoy & Myers, 1999). Therefore, the MCCTS-R might be an appropriate instrument to use when assessing a school counselor's perceived multicultural knowledge, awareness, and multicultural terminology.

Several important limitations should be considered when interpreting the results of this study. Perhaps the primary limitation is the small sample size when comparing it to the entire ASCA population. The population ( $N = 11,200$ ) from which the sample was drawn is quite large, and 209 school counselors is only a 2% sample. Nevertheless, the characteristics of the sample are representative of the ASCA population in general (M. Smith, personal communication, February 9, 2004). A second potential limitation concerns the volunteer nature of the sample. Only school counselors who volunteered or were willing to return completed surveys were included in the sample. Clearly, the participants in this sample could be biased based on their views regarding diversity and multiculturalism. Finally, this study is limited by the fact that only school counselors who are members of ASCA were included in the sample. It is possible that school counselors who choose not to join ASCA differ from counselors who join ASCA. Although these concerns limit the generalizability of the results, this study may still serve as the beginning of an empirically supported measure of school counselor multicultural counseling competence.

## IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

There are several implications for counseling research that are evident from this study. First, a replication of this study should be implemented with a larger, more diverse sample in order to con-

firm the findings. For instance, if a larger, more racially and ethnically diverse sample were obtained, one would be able to examine racial/ethnic factors in relation to perceived multicultural counseling competence of school counselors. In addition, a replication of this study that included practicing school counselors who are not members of the ASCA would be beneficial, because the sample would be inclusive of all school counselors, not just those who choose to join a professional organization.

Second, qualitative research studies are needed to further explore the self-perceived multicultural competence of school counselors. Interviews would be a useful tool for understanding how school counselors define multicultural competence and, better yet, to examine the relationships between school counselors and ethnic minority students. For instance, school counselors might be asked to describe how they accommodate the various help-seeking behaviors of culturally diverse students. Also, by implementing interviews and observations of school counselors, a researcher will be able to gather data regarding the diversity of counselors' caseloads as well as cultural and environmental influences on school counselors' work with culturally diverse students.

Third, more research on the relationship between school counselors' perceived multicultural counseling competence and their actual practice should be implemented. The scores on the MCCTS-R captures only the perceptions of school counselors' multicultural competence rather than what they actually do and how they intervene with culturally diverse students. Perhaps the actual practice of school counselors is related to the multicultural counseling skill dimension of multicultural counseling competence; therefore, the MCCTS-R, as suggested by the current study's results, does not cover this aspect of multicultural counseling competence.

Finally, more extensive research on the validity and reliability of the scores on the MCCTS-R should be implemented to identify the dimensional nature of the school counselors' perceived multicultural counseling competence construct. Large-scale factor analytic studies are needed to validate the presence of more than one underlying factor. In fact, item analyses (e.g., bivariate correlation procedure, correlations between items and total scores) of the factor items found in this study should be implemented to assess the convergent and discriminant validity of these newly derived factors or scales of the MCCTS-R. In addition, an item analysis procedure is warranted to evaluate the appropriateness of MCCTS-R factor items. Research is also needed to compare the reliability of the scores yielded by the MCCTS-R and other measures of perceived multicultural counseling competence.

## SUMMARY

The results of this study provide additional information on the MCCTS-R and its capability to measure the perceived multicultural competence of school counselors. Although there have been voluminous materials published about multicultural counseling, little has been based on counseling in the school setting. In addition, there is no instrument to measure perceived multicultural counseling competence based on the AMCD Multicultural Counseling Competencies. This current research is a first step in the development of a multicultural counseling competence measure for school counselors.

## REFERENCES

- Bryant, F. B., & Yarnold, P. R. (1995). Principal components analysis and exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. In L. G. Grimm & P. R. Yarnold (Eds.), *Reading and understanding multivariate analysis* (pp. 99-136). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Carey, J. C., Reinat, M., & Fontes, L. (1990). School counselor's perceptions of training needs in multicultural counseling. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 29*, 155-170.
- Constantine, M. G., & Yeh, C. J. (2001). Multicultural training, self-construals, and multicultural competence of school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 4*, 202-207.
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (1994). *Accreditation and procedures manual and application*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- D'Andrea, M., Daniels, J., & Heck, R. (1991). Evaluating the impact of multicultural counseling training. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*, 143-150.

- Gorsuch, R. L. (1983). *Factor analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Green, S. B., & Salkind, N. J. (2003). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and understanding data*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Holcomb-McCoy, C. (2001a). Exploring the self-perceived multicultural counseling competence elementary school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 4*, 195–201.
- Holcomb-McCoy, C. (2001b). *The MCCTS-R: Assessing school counselors' perceived multicultural counseling competence*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Holcomb-McCoy, C., & Myers, J. E. (1999). Multicultural competence and counselor training: A national survey. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 77*, 294–302.
- Hutcheson, G., & Sofroniou, N. (1999). *The multivariate social scientist: Introductory statistics using generalized linear models*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Johnson, S. J. (1990). Toward clarifying culture, race, and ethnicity in the context of multicultural counseling. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 18*, 41–50.
- Kocarek, C. E., Talbot, D. M., Batka, J. C., & Anderson, M. Z. (2001). Reliability and validity of three measures of multicultural competency. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 79*, 486–496.
- LaFromboise, T. D., Coleman, H. L. K., & Hernandez, A. (1991). Development and factor structure of the Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 22*, 380–388.
- Lee, C. C. (1995). *Counseling for diversity: A guide for school counselors and related professionals*. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Lee, C. C. (2001). Culturally responsive school counselors and programs: Addressing the needs of all students. *Professional School Counseling, 4*, 257–261.
- Lewis, A. C., & Hayes, S. (1991). Multiculturalism and the school counseling curriculum. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*, 119–125.
- Locke, D. C. (2003). Improving the multicultural competence of educators. In P. B. Pedersen & J. C. Carey (Eds.), *Multicultural counseling in schools* (pp. 171–189). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Mio, J. S., & Morris, D. R. (1990). Cross-cultural issues in psychology training programs: An invitation for discussion. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 21*, 434–441.
- Parker, W. M., & McDavis, R. J. (1979). An awareness experience: Toward counseling minorities. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 18*, 312–317.
- Ponterotto, J. G., Rieger, B. P., Barrett, A., & Sparks, R. (1994). Assessing multicultural counseling competence: A review of instrumentation. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 72*, 316–322.
- Ponterotto, J. G., Sanchez, C. M., & Magids, D. M. (1991, August). *Initial development and validation of the Multicultural Counseling Awareness Scale (MCAS)*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco.
- Pope-Davis, D. B., & Dings, J. G. (1995). The assessment of multicultural counseling competencies. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 287–311). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sabnani, H. B., & Ponterotto, J. G. (1992). Racial/ethnic minority specific instrumentation in counseling research: A review, critique, and recommendations. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 24*, 161–187.
- Sodowsky, G. R. (1996). The Multicultural Counseling Inventory: Psychometric properties and some uses in counseling training. In G. R. Sodowsky & J. C. Impara (Eds.), *Multicultural assessment in counseling and clinical psychology* (pp. 283–324). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements.
- Sodowsky, G. R., Taffe, R. C., Gutkin, T., & Wise, S. L. (1994). Development and application of the Multicultural Counseling Inventory: A self-report measure of multicultural competencies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41*, 137–148.
- Sue, D. W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. J. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*, 477–486.
- Sue, D. W., Bernier, Y., Durran, A., Feinberg, L., Pedersen, P. B., Smith, E. J., et al. (1982). Position paper: Cross-cultural counseling competencies. *The Counseling Psychologist, 10*, 45–52.
- Sue, D. W., Carter, R., Casas, J. M., Fouad, N., Ivey, A. E., Jensen, M., et al. (1998). *Multicultural counseling competencies: Individual and organizational development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Talbot, D. M. (1992). *A multimethod study of the diversity emphasis in master's degree programs in college student affairs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Velicer, W. F., Eaton, C. A., & Fava, J. L. (2000). Construct explication through factor or component analysis: A review and evaluation of alternative procedures for determining the number of factors or components. In R. D. Goffin & E. Helmes (Eds.), *Problems and solutions in human assessment* (pp. 41–71). New York: Kluwer.

Copyright of Measurement & Evaluation in Counseling & Development is the property of American Counseling Association and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.