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Much has been written in the counseling literature on the importance of training counselors to respond to the needs of culturally diverse individuals. The multicultural counseling education literature reflects a vast amount of work involving ethnic identity development. Many counselor education programs offer counselor students opportunities to raise self-awareness through reflection, introspection, and feedback. This process is considered particularly important in helping counseling students understand their own ethnic identity and its effects on counseling relationships.

Counselor education is replete with methods of encouraging self-awareness and ethnic identity development. Furthermore, the advent of multicultural counseling competencies has provided counselor education programs with guidelines for training. Developing multicultural competence is complicated because counseling students must first face their own biases, prejudices, attitudes, and worldview perceptions. This process also involves raising awareness, increasing multicultural knowledge, and building a repertoire of counseling skills. Additionally, ethnic identity development has been correlated with multicultural counseling competency.

The use of group process as a method of promoting ethnic identity development is important as groups offer an interpersonal component to personal growth. Groups present an opportunity for counseling students to understand their relational problems and receive feedback from others. The use of groups as a means of promoting and supporting ethnic
identity growth is a growing trend in counselor education. Personal growth groups seem particularly suited to stimulate this type of reflection, which may lead to positive ethnic identity development.

A review of related literature found no study conducted on the efficacy of using personal growth groups in multicultural counseling courses to stimulate counseling students’ ethnic identity development. This research was designed to examine the relationship between personal growth group experiences in multicultural counseling courses and counseling students’ ethnic identity development. Differences in ethnic identity development between 83 counseling students involved in a personal growth group experience as part of a multicultural counseling course and 98 students not involved in such a group were compared. This study revealed that counseling students participating in personal growth groups as part of a multicultural counseling course experienced significantly greater ethnic identity development than did students not involved in such a group.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Multicultural counseling competence continues to grow in importance in counseling and counselor education. Much has been written in the counseling literature on the importance of training counselors to respond to the needs of culturally diverse individuals. Projected demographic data show that by the year 2020, members of ethnic or racial minorities will comprise 55% of the population in the United States (Ponterotto & Casas, 1991; Sue & Sue, 1990). Coupled with a growing awareness that traditional counseling theories and training approaches do not meet the needs of many culturally diverse persons, this demographic forecast continues to drive the development of multicultural counselor education models and methodologies (Christensen, 1989; D'Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991; Fukuyama, 1990). Also responding to this need, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) developed accreditation standards related to diversity (CACREP, 2001). Furthermore, the American Counseling Association (ACA) and its member associations have adopted multicultural themes for recent annual conferences.

Much of the multicultural counseling education literature reflects a vast amount of work involving racial/ethnic identity development. Many counselor education programs offer counselors-in-training opportunities to raise self-awareness through reflection, introspection, and feedback. This process is considered particularly important in helping
counseling students understand their own racial/ethnic identity and its effects on counseling relationships (Helms, 1990). Managing culturally biased decision-making and effectively managing countertransference are two reasons that counselors need to better understand themselves as cultural beings. Without examining and increasing awareness of one’s own attitudes and beliefs, personal prejudices can affect a counselor’s ability to work effectively in multicultural counseling relationships (ACA, 1995; Baruth & Manning, 1999; Matthews, Robinson-Kurpius, & Burke, 2001).

Although attitudes, beliefs, and prejudices are components of many racial/ethnic identity models, several definitions of racial/ethnic identity are found in the literature (Cross, 1995; Helms, 1995; Phinney, 1990; Thompson & Carter, 1997). Even though race and ethnicity may represent two separate constructs, they erroneously have been treated as indistinguishable at times in the literature (Sodowsky, Kwan, & Pannu, 1995). Racial identity has been defined as one’s sense of group identity based on perceptions of a shared racial background with a specific racial group (Helms, 1990). Racial identity is based in socially constructed ideas of race and is concerned with how people develop attitudes about their own and other racial groups (Helms, 1995). Similarly, ethnic identity has been defined as an abstract set of ideals, values, behaviors, and attitudes regarding ethnic group membership, which allows individuals to distinguish themselves as different from members of other ethnic groups (Phinney, 1990).

Ethnic identity is a social psychological experience that provides individuals with a sense of belonging to a community shared by those with a similar ethnic heritage (Isajiw, 1990). Seemingly, it expands the notion of racial identity by incorporating
cultural concepts and socialized attitudes. By including macro-societal stereotypes on the individual level, ethnic identity becomes a phenomenon that can change given certain critical incidents and self-discovery (Phinney, 1992). Furthermore, if socialized attitudes are part of one’s ethnic identity, they may affect cross-cultural counseling relationships and dynamics (Helms, 1990). Therefore, counselors should strive to better understand their own socialized attitudes about their own and other ethnic groups (Helms).

The role of socialization is important in developing one’s ethnic identity (Erikson, 1968). People internalize socialized attitudes through teaching and modeling (Bandura, 1986), and societal and cultural institutions reinforce these beliefs. This internalization prompts the individual to adopt these attitudes as absolute truths (Vontress & Epp, 1997). When attitudes and beliefs are internalized and acculturated, they become a part of the self that might go unrecognized. Often, this lack of awareness goes unchallenged in relational encounters, and its effects impede understanding and acceptance in counseling relationships (Vontress & Epp).

Counselor education is replete with methods of encouraging self-awareness and ethnic identity development (Dinsmore & England, 1996). Furthermore, the advent of multicultural counseling competencies (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992) has provided counselor education programs with guidelines for training. Developing multicultural competence is complicated because counseling students must first face their own biases, prejudices, attitudes, and worldview perceptions (Hartung, 1996). This process also involves raising awareness, increasing multicultural knowledge, and building a repertoire of counseling skills (McRae & Johnson, 1991; Pedersen, 1994). Additionally, ethnic
identity development has been correlated with multicultural counseling competency (Vinson & Neimeyer, 2003). Several methods for promoting racial/ethnic identity development have been used by counselor educators. These include experiential activities (Arthur & Achenbach, 2002), use of critical incidents to expound on the role of social forces in cultural differences (Arminio, 2001; Sabnani, Ponterotto, & Borodovsky, 1991), and the use of small-group process to allow counseling students to share their stories with peers (Watt, 1999).

The use of group process as a method of promoting ethnic identity development is important as groups offer an interpersonal component to personal growth (Yalom, 1995). Group work, however, offers a variety of opportunities and challenges for culturally biased interactions. Viewing group work as a microcosm of everyday life helps group members focus on the here-and-now and generalize to the outside world (Yalom). Furthermore, group work is particularly suited to meet the needs of counseling students in our current society (Trotzer, 1999). As advances in technology seemingly isolate people from each other, groups provide a humanizing element to everyday life (Dies, 1985) by offering feelings of universality, cohesion, and interpersonal learning (Yalom, 1995). Groups present an opportunity for counselors-in-training to understand their relational problems and receive feedback from others. Groups also allow students to experience their problems and try different ways of dealing with them. The use of groups as a means of promoting and supporting ethnic identity growth may be effective.

An integration of multicultural education and group work training is emerging in counselor education (DeLucia-Waack & Donigian, 2004; DeLucia-Waack, Gerrity,
Kalodner, & Riva, 2004; Merta, 1995). The counselor education literature reveals countless methods of multicultural education components (Arthur & Achenbach, 2002; Hartung, 1996; Hill, 2003). The most popular has been the requirement of a multicultural counseling course (Ridley, Mendoza, & Kanitz, 1994). The primary focus of these courses, based on the tripartite model of multicultural counseling, has been increasing knowledge, skills, and awareness of cultural issues that might arise in multicultural counseling (Sue et al., 1998). Another approach that focuses on increasing counseling students’ self-awareness related to their own cultures and cultural biases, has produced more multicultural course components (Arthur & Achenbach, 2002). Still another approach centers on unlearning oppression and sensitizes students to the realities of racism, sexism, heterosexism, and other forms of oppression (Reynolds, 1995).

Although approaches and course designs vary, Reynolds (1995) identified six central design elements important in teaching multicultural courses: (a) content oriented, (b) cognitive and worldview, (c) affective, (d) experiential, (e) skills, and (f) personal growth groups (interpersonal dynamics oriented and focused on here-and-now). Each element offers important learning experiences for counseling students. According to some multicultural experts, no single component seems effective enough to promote personal change and multicultural counseling competence (McRae & Johnson, 1991). Recent attention to pedagogy in counselor education programs has addressed the methods of preparing future counselors for a multicultural world (Smaby, 1998). Although content dissemination, cognitive exercises, and skills practice have been traditional methods of teaching multicultural counseling courses, experiential learning—coupled with group
processing—has gained more consideration in multicultural counseling pedagogy (Arthur & Achenbach, 2002).

The primary goal of experiential learning is to increase students’ self-awareness in order to help students bridge learning theories with practicing competencies (Ridley, Espelage, & Rubenstein, 1997). Additionally, counselor educators using experiential learning in multicultural counseling classes might consider small-group process as a means of enhancing self-awareness and personal growth (Arthur & Achenbach, 2002). Having a group outlet to process multicultural experiences is vital because students may have strong emotional reactions to their experiences and may need a group of peers to help manage new levels of self-awareness (Arthur & Achenbach).

Statement of the Problem

Because the counseling profession has embraced diversity education, considerable research has been focused on different aspects of diversity and multicultural issues. One such area of research is the impact of ethnic identity and its importance in human growth, the counseling process, and the counseling relationship (Carter, 1990; Helms & Carter, 1991; Pomales, Claiborn, & LaFromboise, 1986; Richardson, & Helms, 1999). Theoretically, it is believed that ethnic identity processes directly influence social and relational attitudes and behaviors (Helms, 1984). In investigating these effects, researchers have examined racial/ethnic identity with many other variables in individual counseling relationships, including racism (Carter, 1990), multicultural counseling competence (Ottavi, Pope-Davis, & Dings, 1994), defense mechanisms (Utsey & Gernat, 2002), clients’ preference for ethnically similar or different counselors (Coleman,
Furthermore, the importance of progressing through various levels of ethnic identity development is a vital experience for counselors-in-training (Cross, 1995; Helms, 1990; Richardson & Molinaro, 1996). The ego identity literature stresses the importance of a moratorium phase, in which critical incidents spark personal reflection about childhood influences and values, beliefs, and interests (Erikson, 1968; Marcia, Waterman, Matteson, Archer, & Orlofsky, 1993). Counselor educators have applied various educational models and techniques hoping to stimulate this type of reflection and help counseling students develop a stronger ethnic identity (Carter & Qureshi, 1995). One growing trend in multicultural counseling courses is the requirement of personal growth groups designed to promote counseling students’ development (Arthur & Achenbach, 2002). Though it intuitively may appear that using personal growth groups would promote ethnic identity development, empirical evidence of such effects is nonexistent. To date, no research has been conducted on the efficacy of using personal growth groups in multicultural counseling courses to stimulate counseling students’ ethnic identity development.

Need for the Study

Ethnic identity development has been recognized as having important implications for counseling and other fields (Atkinson & Thompson, 1992). It has been suggested that ethnic identity is key to multicultural counseling competence (Helms, 1995). Furthermore, ethnic identity development has been described as one of the most
influential theoretical constructs in multicultural counseling and research (Atkinson & Thompson).

Because ethnic identity includes prejudicial attitudes, counselors’ management of culturally biased assessments and decisions may be based in part on the counselor’s level of ethnic identity (Helms, 1990). When counselors and clients are of different races or ethnicities, misunderstanding, rejection, distrust, and negativity are more likely to occur because of perceived ethnic differences (Pedersen, 1994). For example, White counselors should realize that African American clients may operate under the principle that one does not disclose personal or family business (Priest, 1991). This cultural norm may be ardently invoked when the counselor does not share a common ethnic background or when the counselor appears to be a member of an oppressive racial group (Priest). Furthermore, since ethnic identity includes socialized attitudes about ethnic groups, stereotypes, notions of racial/ethnic superiority, the inability to effectively communicate with clients, and lack of a proactive perspective all have the potential of negatively influencing counseling relationships (Priest). Therefore, counselors should identify their own personal viewpoints that may negatively affect their ability to interact with cross-racial/ethnic clients (Priest). Continued awareness of these viewpoints may promote counseling students’ ethnic identity development (Helms, 1995; Phinney, 1996)

Personal growth groups seem particularly suited to stimulate this type of reflection, which may lead to positive ethnic identity development. Conducting research on groups is a complicated task, however, because many characteristics of group work affect individual development and group outcomes (Yalom, 1995). Although many
components of group work have been researched, one of the most significant contributions to the study of group work is Yalom’s (1995) therapeutic factors typology. Yalom claimed that 11 distinct phenomena affect outcomes of group work. These therapeutic factors are instillation of hope, universality, imparting information, altruism, corrective recapitulation of primary family group, development of socializing techniques, catharsis, imitative behavior, existential factors, group cohesiveness, and interpersonal learning (Yalom, 1998). The therapeutic factors are thought to be interdependent and cannot occur or function separately. Moreover, these factors may represent different portions of the change process. Some therapeutic factors refer to actual methods of change, while others represent certain conditions for change.

Because ethnic identity development is a multidimensional construct, a multidimensional rating system of therapeutic factors seems particularly salient to the study of the effects of therapeutic factors on counseling students’ ethnic identity development in personal growth groups. To date, no research has been conducted on the effects of the use of group work in multicultural counseling courses on ethnic identity development. Additionally, no researchers have examined the relationship between specific therapeutic factors in personal growth groups with counseling students’ ethnic identity development.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between personal growth group experiences in multicultural counseling courses and counseling students’ ethnic identity development. Specifically, this study will examine the participants’ perceptions
of important group-session impacts that lead to changes in counseling students’ ethnic identity development. Finally, participants’ lists of the most important components of their multicultural courses will be examined to determine the overall significance of a personal growth group component on students’ ethnic identity development.

Research Questions

This research is driven by several questions in need of attention.

R1: Is there a significant mean difference between ethnic identity pretest and posttest scores for counseling students participating in a personal growth group, as part of a multicultural counseling course?

R2: Is there a significant difference in ethnic identity development between counseling students involved in a personal growth group, as part of a multicultural counseling course, and counseling students not involved in a personal growth group?

R3: In a personal growth group component of a multicultural counseling course, do the 4 factors (Emotional Awareness-Insight, Relationship Climate, Other vs. Self Focus, and Problem Definition-Change), as measured by the Group Counseling Helpful Impacts Scale (Kivlighan, Multon, & Brossart, 1996), affect counseling students’ ethnic identity development?

R4: In a personal growth group component of a multicultural counseling course, which of the 4 factors of the GCHIS affect counseling students’ ethnic identity development?

R5: In a personal growth group component of a multicultural counseling course, what other factors affect counseling students’ ethnic identity development?
R6: With what frequency do counseling students report that participating in the personal growth groups had a significant impact on their personal or ethnic identity development?

Significance of the Study

Although the designs of multicultural counseling courses vary, many agree that the importance of consciousness raising and ethnic identity development is paramount to cross-cultural approaches (Carter, 1995; Helms, 1990; Katz, 1985; McRae & Johnson, 1991). Furthermore, the implementation of experiences to promote counseling students’ growth through various levels of ethnic identity has been identified as a key component of counselor education and multicultural counseling courses (DeLucia-Waack & Donigian, 2004; Helms, 1990; Regan & Huber, 1997). Since ethnic identity development has been identified as a key component in multicultural counseling education, further research to broaden the perspective of this construct is important. Additionally, it is imperative for counselor educators to increase their understanding of the effectiveness of their methods of promoting development through various stages of ethnic identity. This study will provide empirical evidence on the effects of personal growth groups in multicultural counseling courses on counseling students’ ethnic identity development. Furthermore, the study of group members’ perceptions of therapeutic impacts occurring during group sessions will offer evidence of other group processes and/or dynamics affecting ethnic identity development.
Definition of Terms

*Racial Identity*

Racial identity has been defined as a person’s self-classification with a specific racial group in which that person senses a shared racial heritage (Helms, 1995).

*Ethnic Identity*

Ethnic identity has been defined as an abstract set of ideals, values, behaviors, and attitudes regarding ethnic group membership, which allows individuals to distinguish themselves as different from members of other ethnic groups (Phinney, 1992). The development of ethnic identity involves emotions, cognitions, and perceptions relating to one’s ethnic awareness (Cuellar, Nyberg, Maldonado, & Roberts, 1997) and is part of an individual’s self-concept that derives from her or his knowledge of membership to an ethnic group (Tajfel, 1981).

*Personal Growth Group*

Personal growth groups provide group members an opportunity to discuss important personal issues with others undergoing similar experiences. These experiences are typically defined as developmental issues and usually are not similar to personal problems encountered in psychotherapy groups. Personal growth groups offer group members the chance to develop through interpersonal learning and encouragement from others.

*Acculturation*

Acculturation is defined as the product of culture-learning that occurs because of contact between the members of two or more culturally distinct groups. It is a process of
attitudinal and behavioral change undergone, willingly or unwillingly, by individuals residing in multicultural societies.

*Multicultural Counseling*

A review of the literature reveals that a debate over the definition of multicultural counseling is ongoing. The exclusive definition views multicultural counseling as taking place between members of different racial or ethnic groups. The inclusive definition argues for expansion beyond race and ethnicity to include other variables such as social class, gender, physical ability, sexual orientation, etc. Since this study is concerned with the racial/ethnic identity development of counseling students, the exclusive definition will be used.

*Therapeutic Factors*

Therapeutic factors represent the intricate interplay of complex processes occurring in group work that lead to positive group member growth (Yalom, 1998).

*Organization of the Study*

This study is presented in 5 chapters. Chapter I offers a brief introduction to the literature and findings on the need for research on the outcomes of the use of group work in multicultural counseling course to promote counseling students’ ethnic identity development. The purpose of the study, need for the study, research questions, definition of terms, and organization of the study are also described.

Chapter II provides a complete review of related literature. The first section describes a brief history of key identity development literature. In section two, racial/ethnic identity is introduced. The two most researched racial identities—Black and
White—are discussed in sections three and four, respectively. Ethnic identity is examined in section five. Section six introduces the evolution of multicultural counseling education. Philosophies and designs of multicultural counseling courses are presented in section seven, while specific multicultural counseling teaching techniques are elucidated in section eight. Section nine explains the importance of counseling students’ heightened self-awareness and ethnic identity development. Section ten introduces group work. Group therapeutic factors and corresponding research is described in section eleven. Section twelve presents limitations of research on therapeutic factors. The concept of personal growth groups in counselor education is discussed in section thirteen.

Chapter III presents the methodology used in the study. It includes hypotheses, instrumentation, participants, procedures, data analysis, and limitations of the study. Chapter IV explains the results of the study. Presentation and discussion of the results parallel the research questions and hypotheses. Chapter V includes a summary of the study and a discussion of the conclusions. An examination of the limitations of the study, recommendations for future research, and implications for counselor education and counseling are also included.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter provides a critical review and summary of the literature relevant to the study of the effects of personal growth groups in a multicultural counseling course on counseling students’ ethnic identity development. The literature is organized as follows: (a) racial and ethnic identity development, including an overview of relevant identity development models; (b) issues in multicultural counselor education, including different philosophies and techniques related to teaching multicultural counseling; and, (c) an overview of group work, including Yalom's therapeutic factors and the role of personal growth groups in multicultural training experiences.

Identity Development

The concept of identity and identity development was originally offered by Freud (1938). Freud referred to identity as a person’s connection with unique values, fostered by a distinctive history of her or his people. According to Freud, identity is the integration of an individual within the group and how he or she learns to interact within that group as well as how he or she interacts with other groups.

Based on this theory, Erikson (1959) attempted to define the qualities that create a healthy identity or personality. He stated that someone with a healthy identity “actively masters his [sic] environment, shows a certain unity of personality, and is able to perceive the world and himself [sic] correctly” (Erikson, 1959, p.51). Furthermore, he stated that
developing a healthy identity is directly related to cognitive and social growth. A healthy identity is established during a series of significant developmental stages and interactions. While the number and quality of interactions vary from culture to culture, healthy identity is governed by a series of developmental tasks that must be accomplished in order for the individual to be cognitively and socially healthy.

**Racial/Ethnic Identity**

One particular dimension of identity is racial/ethnic identity. The development of a wide array of racial and ethnic identity models continues to drive the study of specific racial, ethnic, and cultural groups and their racial/ethnic development. Sue and Sue (1971) posited a model of Chinese-American personality types based on the individual’s level of acculturation. A Japanese-American model of role behaviors, developed by Kitano (1982), depicted four types of conflict between the dominant White-American culture and Japanese cultural heritage. A more general model of Asian racial identity (Kim, 1981) was developed to describe the interplay between acculturation, experience with and reactions to cultural differences, management of race-related conflicts, and the effects of social movements on Asian Americans. Ruiz (1990) proposed a five-stage model of Latino identity development that presents the progression, transformation, and resolution of racial identity conflicts. Finally, LaFromboise, Trimble, and Mohatt (1990), classified Native American identity development according to residential patterns, level of tribal affiliation, and extent of commitment to maintaining their tribal heritage. Although these examples provide evidence of the vast array of racial/ethnic identity
models, Black racial identity and White racial identity are the two racial identities most written about and researched.

**Black Racial Identity**

In a revision of his theory, Erikson (1968) acknowledged the intriguing dichotomy of Black identity. After reading several Black authors’ writings, he stated that African-Americans had mutual experiences of imperceptibleness, invisibility, and separation. Erikson reported that both history and experience influence the identity and development of African-Americans and other minority groups. He elaborated by stating that African-Americans’ identity development was an adaptive coping method used for protection against potentially disturbing situations.

In an attempt to broaden his understanding of Black identity, Erikson (1968) proposed a more inclusive model. This model included historical realities and the influence of cultural and group values. He considered these variables influential in positive Black identity development. Erikson (1959) considered identity to be a construct involving several factors, one of which is racial identity. Racial identity has been defined as a person’s self-classification within a specific racial group with which that person senses a shared racial heritage (Helms, 1984). Racial classifications are socially defined by inclusion criteria (e.g., skin color) and are not based on biological distinctions (Helms, 1995). Racial identity then is a construct rooted in the socially constructed perception of self and others based on privilege or endurance of domination and oppression (Helms, 1995).
In the early 1970s, Black identity development models (e.g., Cross, 1971; Thomas, 1971; Milliones, 1973; Jackson, 1976) emerged to represent the psychology of becoming Black, referred to as Nigrescence (Cross, 1995). Nigrescence models tend to have four or five stages and depict the identity state to be changed, rather than the change process itself (Cross, Parham, & Helms, 1991). These stage models presented researchers with a framework to track Black identity development from a self-hating to a self-healing and culturally affirming identity (Cross, 1995).

Cross’s theory of Nigrescence (1971; 1995) is the most widely known and researched of these theories. Cross (1971) claimed that Black self-concept consists of both personal and group identity. Personal identity is an individual personality characteristic that is shared across gender, race, ethnicity, culture, and class. Group identity consists of the cultural norms that connect groups of people together.

According to Cross (1995), Black racial identity arises through a developmental pattern within which African-Americans experience four stages. The first stage, Pre-Encounter, is characterized by connection with the dominant White culture and a rejection of the African-American culture. In the Encounter stage, individuals reconsider their previous identification with White culture and seek to identify with their own culture. During the Immersion-Emersion stage, African-Americans are absorbed totally in African-American culture while completely rejecting White culture. In the fourth stage of Cross’ Black racial identity model, Internalization, individuals internalize their African-American culture and rise above racism while challenging all forms of racial and cultural oppression.
The model was later operationalized with the development of the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RIAS: Parham & Helms, 1981). Researchers using this scale identified associations between racial identity development and various counseling-related variables. In many of these studies using the RIAS, the role of racial identity attitudes on psychosocial functioning has been investigated. These variables include preference for counselor race (Helms & Carter, 1991; Parham & Helms, 1981), self-esteem (Parham & Helms, 1986), coping (Neville, Heppner, & Wang, 1997), depression (Munford, 1994), general psychological functioning and well-being (Pyant & Yanico, 1991), self-actualization and affective states (Parham & Helms, 1985), and perceived sensitivity of counselor (Pomales, Claiborn, & LaFromboise, 1986). Additionally, Richardson and Helms (1999) found that the emotional reactions of African-American men to cross-racial counseling dyads were predictive of racial identity attitudes. Black racial identity development also has been correlated with maturity of psychological defense mechanisms (Nghe & Mahalik, 2001). Nghe and Mahalik found that immature and neurotic defenses were positively correlated with early stages of racial identity and that mature and healthy defenses were positively correlated with later stages of racial identity development.

White Racial Identity

Racial identity gained theoretical and research prevalence throughout the 1980s (Phinney, 1990). Although Cross’ model of Nigrescence (1971; 1995) has been studied for some time, White racial identity development was not theorized and studied until more recently (Helms, 1984; Ponterotto, 1988). Several White racial identity models have
been developed (e.g., Helms, 1995; Ponterotto, 1988; Sabnani, Ponterotto, & Borodovsky, 1991). Some models describe states of identity and characteristics that compose those states (White & Burke, 1987; Katz & Hass, 1988), while other models are comprised of specific stages of racial identity (Hardiman, 1982; Helms, 1995).

Carney and Kahn (1984) proposed a model of White racial identity that involved 5 stages of development. In Stage 1, an individual’s knowledge of racially or ethnically dissimilar people is based on stereotypes. Individuals in Stage 2 recognize their own cultural background but deal with other groups in a detached scholarly manner. People in Stage 3 are characterized by a denial of the importance of race or anger toward their own racial/ethnic groups. In Stage 4, individuals begin merging cultural aspects from various racial/ethnic groups to form a new identity. Finally, Stage 5 individuals attempt to promote social equality and cultural pluralism (Carney & Kahn).

Based on observations from years of teaching a multicultural counseling course, Ponterotto (1988) proposed a White racial identity model for counseling students consisting of 4 stages of development. White students in the first stage, Pre-exposure, have given little thought to multicultural issues or to their role as a White people in a racist society. During Stage 2, labeled Exposure, students are confronted with the realities of racism and are forced to examine their role in an oppressive society. White students are led to examine their own cultural values and how these Eurocentric values are entrenched in American society. White students in the exposure stage often experience anger or guilt because of this new awareness. Dealing with this anger or guilt catapults White students into the third stage, labeled Zealot-Defensive. In this stage, students may
experience attitudes on a spectrum. At one end of this continuum, students direct their energies toward fostering a pro-minority perspective. On the other end of the spectrum, students withdraw, become defensive about White culture, and regress to attitudes characteristic of the Pre-exposure stage. In the final stage, Integration, the strong dichotomous feelings present in the Zealot-Defensive stage subside. Those students who experienced more of the pro-minority attitudes become more balanced in their multicultural interests. Those students who experienced more defensive attitudes become more open and develop more respect and appreciation for minority cultures (Ponterotto).

These models provide examples of the commonalities of the stages of White racial/ethnic identity proposed by most authors. Of these models of White racial identity development, Helms’ model (1995) has been used most frequently in research explaining cross-racial events. Helms (1984) developed a model designed to predict the interactions between various potential racial pairings in counseling (e.g., White counselor/Black client, Black counselor/White client). This model was based on the premise that people go through various stages of racial identity development, regardless of race. Helms’ original White racial identity model consisted of five developmental stages marked by cognitive attitudes toward one’s own race and toward the Black race.

During the Contact stage of racial identity, the individual is unaware of her or his own racial group membership and ignores the race of others. One avoids African-Americans or befriends them out of curiosity (Helms, 1984). In the second stage, Disintegration, Whiteness becomes a salient characteristic. Ambivalence and conflict between one’s internal moral standards and society’s norms about interracial
relationships occur (Helms). Solutions to the conflicts of the disintegration stage include over-identifying with African-Americans, becoming paternalistic toward them, or retreating into White society. Since African-Americans usually reject White Americans’ over-identification or paternalistic attitudes, development proceeds to the Reintegration stage (Helms). This level of White racial identity development is marked by stereotypic thinking involving feelings of anger or fear toward African-Americans. At this level, one maintains distance from African-Americans or accepts the personal implications of being White (Helms). Acceptance sparks the Pseudo-independent stage of racial identity development. The individual in this stage is likely to intellectualize about racial issues before he or she develops an emotional understanding of race relations (Helms). Interpersonal interactions are limited to a few African-Americans. Nevertheless, as these interactions increase, the White American is likely to move into the Autonomy stage, the final stage of White racial identity development (Helms). At this level, one has internalized a positive White racial identity and has integrated emotional and intellectual appreciation as well as respect for racial differences and similarities. Secure in her or his own racial identity, the autonomous White American seeks opportunities that involve cross-racial interactions (Helms).

In response to investigation and criticism, Helms updated the model in two ways (1995). First, the stages of the model had been described as mutually exclusive (Tokar & Swanson, 1991). The term *stage* often denotes the connotation that one progresses through development in a linear fashion and does not exhibit characteristics of multiple stages at a given time. Helms addressed this notion by changing the word *stage* to *status*
and reiterated that statuses are dynamic, interactive processes and that individuals may exhibit emotions, attitudes, and behaviors characteristic of more than one status (Helms). Secondly, Helms added a status called Immersion-Emersion. During this developmental status, White individuals reeducate themselves and search for personally defined racial standards.

Helms’ model was operationalized with the development of the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS: Helms & Carter, 1990). Research using this scale has identified associations between White racial identity and various counseling and counselor-related variables. In a sample of counseling students, early statuses of White racial identity were negatively correlated with the working alliance in cross-racial and same-racial dyads and later statuses of White racial identity were positively correlated with the working alliance in cross-racial and same-racial dyads. (Burkard, Joseph, Ponterotto, Reynolds, & Alfonso, 1999). Carter (1990) found in a sample of White men that all statuses of White racial identity were predictive of racism attitudes. There was no significant difference in racism attitudes across statuses of racial identity. In a replication of Carter’s study, Pope-Davis & Ottavi (1994) found that only the Reintegration status uniquely contributed to the prediction of higher racism attitudes. Ottavi, Pope-Davis, and Dings (1994) examined the relationship between counseling students’ White racial identity and self-reported multicultural counseling competencies. Results indicated that the positive development of White racial identity accounted for more favorable self-reported multicultural competencies’ ratings. Ladany, Inman, Constantine, & Hofheinz (1997) also found a positive relationship between counseling supervisees’ White racial
identity development and self-reported multicultural counseling competencies. Results also indicated that positive White racial identity development significantly predicted higher levels of multicultural case conceptualization ability.

*Ethnic Identity*

Differences between racial and ethnic identity are difficult to glean from the literature. It seems that a clear delineation between the two constructs does not exist, although authors take varying approaches toward studying racial and ethnic identity development (Rowe, Behrens, & Leach, 1995). Smith (1991) stated that racial and ethnic identity are related concepts that describe the development of one’s bond to a defined reference group. Racial identity has been defined as a person’s self-classification within a specific racial group with which that person senses a shared racial heritage (Helms, 1995). Both Cross’ and Helms’ models deal primarily with racial oppression and the psychological responses to oppression (Smith) or attitudes toward racial or ethnic groups other than one’s own (Phinney, 1990). These two models have been called visible racial-ethnic group models because they are based on the assumption that race is the primary determinant of one’s social identity (Goodstein & Ponterotto, 1997).

Ethnic identity has been defined as an abstract set of ideals, values, behaviors, and attitudes regarding ethnic group membership that allows individuals to distinguish themselves as different from members of other ethnic groups (Phinney, 1992). The development of ethnic identity involves emotions, cognitions, and perceptions relating to one’s ethnic awareness (Cuellar, Nyberg, Maldonado, & Roberts, 1997) and is part of an individual’s self-concept that derives from her or his knowledge of membership to an
ethnic group (Tajfel, 1981). Some ethnic identity models (Phinney, 1990; Smith, 1991) have been labeled salience models because they assume that race, ethnicity, and other reference group orientations (e.g., sexual orientation, gender, religion) may be important components in one’s social identity (Goodstein & Ponterotto, 1997). Thus, racial identity models focus on race as the key to sense of self, while ethnic identity examines various reference group memberships to determine social identity. Moreover, ethnicity entails family structure, gender roles, belief and value systems, language, and symbols (Smith).

While the study of racial identity has been limited to examining populations of specific racial groups (Smith, 1991), ethnic identity researchers have benefited from developmental models that are not ethnic group specific (Phinney, 1992). These models enable researchers to examine ethnic identity either between or within racial groups (Phelps, Taylor, & Gerard, 2001). Some authors have argued that ethnic identity development is important to the self-concept and psychological functioning of ethnic group members (Gurin & Epps, 1975; Maldonado, 1975). Issues of the degree and quality of maintained involvement in one’s own heritage or culture, dealing with disparaging views from the dominant group, and the influence of these factors on psychological well-being have been addressed by many writers (Alba, 1985; Atkinson, Morton, & Sue, 1998; Parham, 1989; Weinreich, 1988).

Ethnic identity has been conceptualized as a multifaceted construct involving a commitment and sense of belonging to one’s ethnic groups, positive evaluation of the group, interest in and knowledge about the group, and involvement in activities and traditions of the group (Phinney, 1990). Through studying the various racial identity
models, Phinney (1990) developed a model of ethnic identity development not specific to any one racial or ethnic group. She found similar processes occurring in each model and found that individuals, regardless of race or ethnicity, may progress through three stages of ethnic identity development (Phinney, 1996).

In the first stage—unexamined ethnic identity—individuals have given little thought to their own ethnicity and its implications to their lives. Values and attitudes experienced in individuals’ environments are internalized. Consequently, attitudes about one’s own group, self, and other groups are unexamined products of socialization (Phinney, 1996). Phinney does not claim that these attitudes and values are positive or negative; rather, they can be positive, negative, or mixed depending on attitudes and values of the socializing agents (i.e., family, community, schools, etc.). The key component of stage one is a lack of examination of one’s ethnicity and accompanying attitudes and values (Phinney, 1992).

Similar to Marcia’s (1980) moratorium status, the second stage—ethnic identity search—is characterized by an interest in learning more about one’s own ethnic group. Individuals experience more diverse people and are exposed to prejudices, discrimination, and opposing worldviews (Phinney, 1989). An enhanced awareness of ethnicity produces an exploration and immersion into one’s own cultural heritage (Phinney, 1996). Often, this stage involves intense emotional reactions by members of minority groups as they gain a better sense of the nature and consequences of oppression and privilege (Phinney, 1996). Ethnicity is presumed to be highly salient in this stage, and attitudes toward one’s own group highly positive (Phinney, 1996). The significant
aspect of this stage is that ethnicity has become more personal—rather than abstract—and emotions are congruent with behaviors (Ponterotto, 2002).

The exploration characteristic of stage two leads to a secure, confident sense of ethnic identity called ethnic identity achievement (Phinney, 1996). In this third stage, individuals have a positive yet realistic view of their own ethnic group and have abandoned any strong negative feelings toward other ethnic groups. Those in stage three, however, may not make ethnicity a highly prominent part of their lives (Phinney, 1992). They may have a strong, positive ethnic identity without practicing their group’s customs (Phinney, 1992).

Since Phinney’s model (1992) of ethnic identity is not ethnic-group specific, it is an ideal framework for studying groups when the racial and ethnic makeup of the group is unknown. This has aided researchers in studying both between-group and within-group differences in several studies. Phinney, Cantu, and Kurtz (1997) examined the relationship between ethnic identity and self-esteem among African-American, Latino, and White adolescents. Results supported Phinney et al.’s hypothesis that ethnic identity was an important predictor in self-esteem. In an investigation of the effects of ethnic identity on intergroup attitudes, Phinney, Ferguson, and Tate (1997) found that ethnic identity did not have a direct effect on attitudes about other ethnic groups. This finding supports Phinney’s argument that ethnic identity is more about self-concept than about attitudes toward other ethnic groups.
Multicultural Counseling Education

Counselor education has incorporated a growing focus on multicultural education over the past several decades. Interest in multiculturalism rapidly increased in the 1970s with the emergence of many Black theorists and researchers (Reynolds & Pope, 1991). During this period, counseling terms such as “culturally different” and “culturally disadvantaged” were common in the literature (Jackson, 1995). Two major contributors to the rise of multicultural counseling concerns were the establishment of the Association for Non-White Concerns in Personnel and Guidance (ANWC) (now the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development) and the Journal of Non-White Concerns (now the Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development) (Jackson). In addition, models of Black racial identity were developed (Cross, 1971; Thomas, 1971) and used in research.

The 1980s saw a dramatic increase in multicultural counseling writing, research, and teaching (Jackson, 1995). Continued interest in racial identity sparked new models and research for many racial/ethnic groups (e.g., Helms, 1984; Kim, 1981; LaFromboise, Trimble, & Mohatt, 1990; Ruiz, 1990). In a sample of Japanese women, Kim found that the process of Asian identity development involves five different sequential and progressive developmental stages. The first stage marks an awareness of ethnicity and involves either a positive or a neutral attitude toward being Asian American (Ponterotto & Pedersen, 1993). In the second stage, Asian American children identify with the majority White culture. The shredding of this majority culture identification begins the third stage. Asian Americans’ self-concept becomes more positive and more centered on
being in the minority population (Kim, 1981). In the fourth stage, individuals embrace their Asian-American heritage and immerse themselves in Asian culture. In the final stage, individuals achieve a healthy, secure feeling about their own identity and an appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups (Kim).

Building on the work of various researchers, LaFromboise, Trimble, and Mohatt (1990) developed 5 categories of Native American identity. In the first category, Traditional, Native Americans use their native language and observe their own tribe’s traditional values. They know little or no English and do not participate in cultural customs of the majority. In the second category, Transitional, Native Americans speak both English and their native language. They question their traditional tribal customs, yet they do not fully accept the majority culture. In the third, labeled Marginal, individuals may be conflicted between their own heritage and majority culture. This category may represent those individuals who do not actively participate in—and are not fully accepted by—either culture. Those individuals in the fourth category, Assimilation, are accepted by the dominant culture and have embraced that culture’s values and customs. Finally, individuals in the Bicultural category can easily vacillate between the majority and their traditional cultures because they understand and accept both ways of living (LaFromboise et al.).

In a similar developmental fashion, Ruiz (1990) identified 5 stages of racial/ethnic identity for Chicano, Mexican American, and Latino individuals. In the first stage, Causal, societal messages either affirm, ignore, negate, or disparage the individual’s ethnicity. These messages may cause confusion or uncertainty about one’s ethnicity.
Faulty beliefs about one’s ethnicity are demonstrated in the second stage, labeled Cognitive. These include associating ethnic group membership with prejudice and poverty and the belief that only assimilation will curtail poverty and prejudice and, ultimately, lead to success. Characterized by a fragmented ethnic identity, individuals in the third stage (Consequences) may avoid an unwanted ethnic self-image by attempting to assimilate into the majority culture. During the fourth stage, the Working-through stage, individuals experience distress over their inability to cope with ethnic identity conflict and realize that avoiding their ethnicity is no longer acceptable. In the final stage, Successful Resolution, individuals obtain a greater acceptance of self, culture, and ethnicity. This results in greater self-esteem and a positive view of their own ethnicity (Ruiz, 1990).

These examples of racial/ethnic identity models are indicative of the developmental process that writers claim occurs during racial/ethnic identity formation. The attention to various ethnic identity models also sparked new ideas in the development of multicultural counselor education. Additionally, writers and researchers began contributing information to the literature about racial/ethnic groups other than the ones of which they personally belonged (Jackson, 1995).

Furthermore, the influence of race and culture on human development and counseling interventions gained added attention in counselor education (Casas, 1985; Casas, Ponterotto, & Gutierrez, 1986; Copeland, 1983). Copeland pointed out that although the counseling profession was supposed to serve everyone, it actually concentrated its education efforts toward the majority White culture. Some authors took a
strong stance toward improving multicultural counseling education. For example, Casas et al. stated that stronger and more explicit ethical guidelines for counseling racially and ethnically diverse clients needed to be adopted and that “continued apathy by the counseling profession toward racial and ethnic minorities will result in a significant number of counselors working from what should be regarded as an unethical position . . .” (p. 348).

Because of this increased attention to multicultural issues, counselor education programs began incorporating specific courses to address multicultural issues in counseling and supervision (Bernal & Castro, 1994; Hills & Strozier, 1992). Key to the growth in the number of multicultural counseling courses was that professional associations, accreditation bodies, and individuals called for counseling and psychology to develop ethical guidelines and standards of multicultural counseling training (American Counseling Association, 1995; American Psychological Association, 2003; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). These guidelines include multicultural counseling competencies that offer counselor educators a framework of knowledge and skills deemed necessary of culturally competent counselors (Sue et al.). The competencies state that counseling students should learn about multicultural counseling relationships by increasing awareness, gaining knowledge, and developing skills in three areas: self-awareness of one’s own attitudes and biases, understanding the worldviews of culturally different clients, and developing appropriate intervention strategies (Sue et al.).

Developing awareness includes being actively involved in the process of becoming aware of one’s own assumptions about human behavior, values, biases,
preconceived notions, personal limitations, and prejudices. Furthermore, understanding that worldviews are a result of cultural socialization and affect multicultural counseling relationships is vital to becoming a culturally competent counselor (Sue et al., 1992). Developing knowledge requires that counselors be able to understand the worldviews of culturally different clients without negative prejudices influencing their judgments. Counselors should understand and approach the worldviews of their culturally different clients with respect and appreciation. This does not mean that counselors should adjust their worldviews to match those of their client’s; rather, they can accept client worldviews as other legitimate perspectives (Sue et al.). Finally, counselor educators should help counseling students actively engage in developing and practicing appropriate, relevant, and sensitive intervention strategies and skills in working with culturally different clients. Studies consistently show that counseling effectiveness is improved when counselors use modalities and define goals consistent with the life experiences and cultural values of clients (Sue et al.).

*Philosophies and Designs of Multicultural Counseling Courses*

Although the Multicultural Counseling Competencies (Sue et al., 1992) have enhanced the foci of multicultural counseling courses, overall philosophies and designs of courses vary greatly. Examination of the literature suggests that multicultural counseling courses have five types of philosophical assumptions (Carter & Qureshi, 1995). These different types of philosophical assumptions include Universal (Fukuyama, 1990; Ivey, 1987), Ubiquitous (Pedersen, 1977; Ponterotto, 1988), Traditional (Christensen, 1989;

**Universal approach.** In the Universal approach, all people are viewed as basically the same and intragroup differences are greater than intergroup differences (Carter & Qureshi, 1995). The goal is to teach counseling students to affirm similarities by focusing on universal constructs. This approach is meant to help counseling students avoid and not attend to cultural differences. Fukuyama (1990) suggested that “affirmation of human similarities through universal constructs” (p. 12) is the goal of counseling. Additionally, Lloyd (1987) stated that training about specific cultures is counterproductive because such knowledge produces a homogeneous view of cultures, thus perpetuating stereotypes.

The main assumption of the Universal approach is that there is a human bond that supercedes all experience. Therefore, culture is secondary to the uniqueness of the individual person. In this approach, counselors should not focus on their clients’ cultural differences because this leads to stereotyping and the use of separate standards based on those stereotypes (Fukuyama, 1990). Multicultural counseling education would then teach students about various cultures from a unifying perspective. This approach is advantageous because it espouses that all people have commonalities and yet are unique individuals. A disadvantage of the Universal approach is that it downplays sociopolitical history and the effects of macro-societal oppression.

**Ubiquitous approach.** In contrast, the Ubiquitous approach assumes that all forms of social or group identity constitute culture (Carter & Qureshi), including such variables as race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, religion, and social class. The view is that
people can belong to multiple groups or cultures. Therefore, people can develop certain social identities based on group affiliations. For example, there can be fundamental cultural differences between a gay White man and a straight White man to the point that sexual orientation group affiliation supersedes racial group membership. The goal of this approach is to help counseling students become more comfortable with cultural differences and to increase awareness of other cultures by exposing stereotypes (Carter & Qureshi).

The direct focus on helping counseling students become comfortable with cultural differences is an advantage of the Ubiquitous approach to multicultural education. Pedersen’s triad training model (1977) attempts to increase counseling students’ ability to understand their clients’ cultural identity, thus fostering cultural sensitivity and increasing constructive change in the counseling process. Similarly, Paradis (1981) proposed multicultural education objectives that aim to increase students’ awareness of their own and others’ cultures and prejudicial attitudes associated with cultural differences. The Ubiquitous approach, however, can minimize the role and influence of the superordinate American culture by focusing solely on individual’s subordinate cultural identities (Carter & Qureshi).

*Traditional approach.* The Traditional approach is anthropological in that culture is seen as the collection of shared birthplaces, socializations, and environments (Carter & Qureshi). Culture, then, is not a set of social differences but a matter of country and shared background. Central to this definition of culture is common experience as a function of socialization and environment. Culture provides and limits the range of
possible experiences. A person’s cultural identity is, therefore, a function of the interpretation of these possibilities and limits. For example, the view of homosexuality greatly differs in terms of definition, status, and identity in accordance with the particular superordinate culture. This view directly contrasts with the Ubiquitous approach in which subordinate cultural identities are viewed as more important than the superordinate or dominant culture.

With the Traditional approach, counseling students learn that superordinate cultural membership is more important than personality characteristics. In this approach, counseling students increase their knowledge about other cultures and are exposed to individuals from other cultures (Christensen, 1989). This approach teaches students that societies’ institutions reinforce the meanings of behaviors, cognitions, and emotions. The Traditional approach, however, minimizes subordinate processes that occur within a country and it does not address intergroup power dynamics (Carter & Qureshi, 1995).

*Race-Based approach.* The Race-Based view of culture is characterized by the belief that race supersedes all other experiences (Carter & Qureshi). Culture is considered to be a function of the values of the racial group and of the reactions by the dominant society (McRae & Johnson, 1991). The Race-Based perspective defines culture according to race and racist practices in the United States. Proponents of the Race-Based approach believe that the definitive aspects of culture (e.g., cultural values) vary according to racial identity and socially grounded racial categories (Carter, 1995). Race-Based theorists also propose that sociopolitical experiences and interactions between White Americans and
members of other races are important determinants of each minority-race individuals’ psychosocial development (Carter; Helms, 1990).

Racism is viewed as the largest barrier to effective cross-cultural counseling (Carney & Kahn, 1986; Corvin & Wiggins, 1989; Helms, 1990). From this perspective, the goal for counseling students is to be able to recognize the effects of racism and oppression and learn about their own racial identity development (Carter & Qureshi). Although attention may be paid to the specifics of cultural knowledge, proponents of the Race-Based approach views this as secondary to counseling students’ racial identity development.

**Pan-National approach.** Finally, the Pan-National approach views race in a global context. Whereas the Race-Based approach views race within the context of the American sociopolitical history, the Pan-National approach is concerned with origins of cultures. This approach has been developed primarily by those who are not members of the White racial group. In fact, proponents of the Pan-National philosophy view the dominant European and American cultures as antithetical to non-European culture (Azibo, 1991; Myers et al., 1991)

From the Pan-National perspective, counseling students should learn the history of race-based cultures (Azibo, 1991). Students learn about the psychology of oppression and focus on the imposed role of European social theory on all non-European people (Bulhan, 1985). Focusing on rejecting the racial/ethnic power dynamics inherent in European psychology, a Pan-National multicultural counseling course would attempt to help students understand and release themselves from Eurocentric psychology. The Pan-
National approach has the advantage of allowing for a broad and global understanding of race as it relates to oppression throughout the world. The disadvantage is that viewing racial oppression as the primary construct for cultural difference may cause one to overlook the role of other important reference groups such as social class and gender (Carter & Qureshi, 1995).

Each of these 5 philosophical assumptions has important ramifications for multicultural counseling education. Although the views of group culture membership and sociopolitical power dynamics differ between the philosophies, each of them does place significant importance on raising counseling students’ awareness (Carter & Qureshi, 1995).

Multicultural course design. While the philosophical assumptions underlying teaching multicultural counseling courses may be categorized into one or more of these five categories, course designs and techniques are abundant. A review of the literature provides evidence of multiple methods of structuring multicultural counseling education.

Copeland (1982) identified several multicultural program designs: (a) required separate course, (b) area of concentration, (c) interdisciplinary approach, and (d) integration. There are advantages and disadvantages to each method. The required separate course method assures that counseling students are exposed to multicultural counseling education and it is relatively easy to find faculty with expertise in the area. The required separate course method, however, does not require total faculty involvement or commitment, which may trigger a greater possibility of multicultural education becoming secondary to other educational components. The area of concentration method
provides more in-depth study and offers students the possibility of practice and experience with diverse populations. The area of concentration method is voluntary, however, and may not reach counseling students who could potentially work with diverse populations. The interdisciplinary method encourages students to take courses in other related disciplines providing broader experiences. Similar to the area of concentration approach, the interdisciplinary method is voluntary and may not be utilized by all counseling students. Finally, the integration method infuses multicultural education in all courses, which involves all faculty and students in the program. This approach does require considerable faculty time and effort and will not work effectively without the faculty’s commitment (Copeland).

Each of these methods may be used individually or in combination with one another. A comprehensive multicultural counseling education program may incorporate all 4 methods (Copeland, 1982). These program designs offer many choices for counselor educators to consider when designing their training programs. Although there is no empirical evidence to support favoring one design over another, it is widely held that most counselor education programs address multicultural counseling issues in a separate course (Dinsmore & England, 1996).

Research on Multicultural Counseling Teaching Techniques

Regardless of philosophical base and course design, counselor educators may utilize various techniques to help counseling students become more culturally competent. Teaching techniques and course components vary greatly across multicultural counseling courses (Reynolds, 1995). According to Ridley, Mendoza, and Kanitz (1994), the range
of teaching strategies includes didactic methods, experiential exercises, supervised practica/internships, reading assignments, writing assignments, participatory learning, modeling/observational learning, technology-assisted learning, introspection, and research. Because little empirical research has been conducted on multicultural counseling training techniques, many counselor education programs rely on untested training methods (Guanipa, 2003; Reynolds, 1995). Further complicating faculty’s design choice is the lack of empirical evidence to guide course developers in making teaching decisions (Ridley, Mendoza, Kanitz, Angermeier, & Zenck, 1994). Most published research focuses on the entire course as a change agent, and all components of an entire course may not be as effective in other counselor education programs (Reynolds, 1995).

Although specific teaching components in multicultural courses remain empirically untested, the development of counseling students’ racial/ethnic identity remains an important goal of multicultural counseling courses. Parker, Moore, and Neimeyer (1998) studied White racial identity development and the interracial comfort of White counseling students enrolled in a multicultural counseling course that focused on personal awareness, cultural knowledge, and cross-cultural skills. Results of the study showed that White counseling students’ racial identity positively developed from the beginning of the semester to the end (Parker et al.). Although several methods used in the course were described, individual methods were not evaluated; only the overall course was used for purposes of analysis.

Constantine (2002) found that the amount of multicultural training correlated positively with self-reported multicultural competence and higher levels of White racial
identity in school counselor trainees. Results of this study are called into question, however, because the two instruments used had low internal consistency coefficients. Furthermore, because only school counseling students were used, results may not be similar with other types of counseling students. In addition, the relatively small sample size of 99 could affect external validity.

Another study (D’Andrea, Daniels, & Heck, 1991) with the same criterion variable evaluated the effects of a multicultural training model—implemented in an entire course—on self-reported multicultural counseling competence. Although the authors stated the goals and objectives of the course, they identified only one particular course component that was used. The technique—36 direct training hours—was not evaluated as an independent variable. The researchers were testing the overall effectiveness of their entire training model and did not examine specific course components. Research findings suggested that the authors’ training model was effective in enhancing counseling students’ perceptions of their own multicultural counseling competence.

Manese, Wu, and Nepomuceno (2001) conducted a similar study with counseling psychology students. This study, however, examined students’ multicultural competence development during a semester of internship with integrated multicultural training components. The training components were neither specifically identified nor evaluated—only the development of multicultural competence over time was measured.

Clearly, research examining specific teaching methods used in multicultural counseling courses is needed. In fact, many authors have argued for more research on multicultural counseling training components (D’Andrea et al., 1991; McRae & Johnson,
Research on multicultural counseling education seemingly has focused on the effects of an entire course on such variables as multicultural competence and racial/ethnic identity. More studies examining specific components of a multicultural counseling course seem warranted since studying the effects of an entire course provides little guidance for identifying which components of a course have the most impact on outcomes such as multicultural competence or racial/ethnic identity.

Regardless of strategies used, however, the primary focus of multicultural counseling courses should be on students and not the content (Reynolds, 1995). Though some culture-specific content and information is needed, course designs should attempt to utilize a great learning resource, the learners themselves (Reynolds). This perspective is consistent with the philosophies of many counselor education programs that emphasize the importance of counselors better understanding themselves before they can help others. Accordingly, the literature suggests that personal awareness is one of the major components of multicultural counseling (Pope-Davis & Coleman, 1997; Sue & Sue, 1999).

Counseling Students’ Personal Awareness

Several authors have made recommendations about the foci of multicultural counselor training (D’Ardenne & Mahtani, 1989; Lago & Thompson, 1989; Pedersen, 1994; Ponterotto & Pedersen, 1993) and there is considerable agreement about the elements required in multicultural counseling training. Sue et al. (1992) went a step further by developing the Multicultural Counseling Competencies, which have been
endorsed by the American Counseling Association and adopted by many in counselor education as standards for multicultural counseling training. These competencies contain three main areas of concentration: (a) beliefs and attitudes, (b) knowledge, and (c) skills. There also are three subcategories of the areas of concentration: (a) counselor awareness of own assumptions, biases, and values; (b) understanding worldviews of the culturally different client; and (c) developing appropriate intervention strategies and techniques (Sue et al.).

The beliefs and attitudes section of the competencies highlights the importance of counseling students’ awareness of who they are culturally and racially, and what this means in terms of their beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors (Lago, 1996). This awareness encompasses an understanding and appreciation of the cultural context in which they were raised and in which they now live (Arredondo & Arciniega, 2001). Furthermore, counseling students’ heightened awareness also enhances their understanding of stereotypes, prejudices, and assumptions they hold, and helps them to appreciate various worldviews and behaviors by which culturally different people live (Sue et al., 1992). This increased awareness also can inform students’ own processes of self-monitoring in relation to negative attitudes that may affect multicultural counseling relationships and help them avoid imposing their own worldviews on their clients (Largo, 1996).

Thus, it is widely recognized that counselor educators should strive to promote personal awareness of counselors-in-training (Torres-Rivera, Phan, Maddux, Wilbur, & Garrett, 2001). One of the most commonly used methods of increasing counseling students’ personal awareness is through exposure to racial/ethnic identity development
models (Carter & Qureshi, 1995). Counseling students’ racial/ethnic identity
development is important because understanding how one’s own racial/ethnic identity
affects multicultural counseling relationships plays a key role in attaining multicultural
counseling competence (Pope-Davis & Dings, 1995). This importance is suggested in
counselor training models (Sabnani, Ponterotto, & Borodovsky, 1991) and in research
findings (Constantine, 2002; Ottavi, Pope-Davis, & Dings, 1994).

Although the importance of counseling students’ racial and ethnic identity
development has been addressed and researched, a review of the literature reveals that the
distinction between definitions of racial and ethnic identity is slight at best (Fischer &
Moradi, 2001). Helms (1996) noted that racial identity models describe reactions to
societal dynamics of racial oppression based on racial physical characteristics and that
ethnic identity models focus on the acquisition or maintenance of cultural characteristics
(e.g., language, religious expression) as defining principles of identity. Helms’ (1996)
description of ethnic identity seems closely related to the concept of acculturation
(Fischer & Moradi). Acculturation is defined as the product of cultural learning that
occurs as a result of contact between the members of two or more culturally distinct
groups. It is a process of attitudinal and behavioral change undergone, willingly or
unwillingly, by individuals residing in multicultural societies (Casas & Pytluk, 1995).
Phinney (1990) urged researchers to distinguish between acculturation as a group-level
process and ethnic identity as a focus on individuals and how they relate to their own
group.
Phinney further identified three foci of ethnic identity theory and research: (a) those arising from social identity theory that address a sense of belonging (e.g., Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998); (b) those focusing on identity development (e.g., Cross & Vandiver, 2001; Phinney & Alipuia, 1990), which assumes that identity formation takes place over time; and, (c) those concentrating on acculturation (e.g., Oetting & Beauvais, 1991), which centers on ethnic involvement and the development and maintenance of cultural characteristics.

Although some research has been conducted on the effects of multicultural counseling courses on counseling students’ racial/ethnic identity (e.g., Constantine, 2002), little is known about the effects of specific elements and experiences of those courses. One growing trend in multicultural counseling courses is the use of ongoing process/personal growth groups as a means to use group dynamics in the development of counseling students’ racial/ethnic identity (Arthur & Achenbach, 2002). According to Reynolds (1995), the use of personal growth groups is one of six central design elements used in multicultural counseling courses. These groups focus on interpersonal dynamics often centering on here-and-now processes (Reynolds).

Interpersonal awareness has been identified as an important component of multicultural counselor education (Atkinson, Kim, & Caldwell, 1998; Bowman, 1996; DeLucia-Waack & Donigian, 2004). Interpersonal awareness begins with a heightened understanding of oneself (Bowman) and the specific examination of one’s racial/ethnic identity is paramount to effective multicultural counseling (Helms, 1990). Because everyone has a racial/ethnic identity, it is important for counseling students to examine
the impact of their racial/ethnic identity on counseling processes and dynamics (DeLucia-Waack & Donigian).

Since racial/ethnic identity development is based on an individual’s self-perceptions as a member of a racial or ethnic group and because group work has been found to enhance self-awareness, then the use of personal growth groups in multicultural counseling courses may generate more opportunities for counseling students to experience racial/ethnic identity growth. Furthermore, the use of groups in many settings has offered evidence of counselors’ effectiveness in group work with diverse populations (Kalodner, 2004).

Group Work

Many of the issues that clients bring to counseling are entrenched in interpersonal problems involving struggles with creating and maintaining relationships (Corey & Corey, 1997). Relationships between members of different cultural groups may be replete with competing worldviews, values, communication styles, gender-role norms, and other aspects of socialization (Sue & Sue, 1990). Thus, the importance of counseling students’ becoming more self-aware and developing rapport-building skills applicable to various relationships is readily apparent and widely accepted (Atkinson, Kim, & Caldwell, 1998; Bowman, 1996; DeLucia-Waack & Donigian, 2004). Furthermore, because counseling students’ ethnic identity development is a key component of their growing self-awareness (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995), it is a primary goal in many multicultural counseling courses (Carter & Qureshi, 1995). Because group work offers a setting that may foster a sense of belonging and may provide the necessary climate to help people grow in
inventive and inspired ways (Corey & Corey), group experiences frequently are used in multicultural counseling courses to provide counseling students with the necessary elements to stimulate heightened self-awareness and ongoing ethnic identity development (Reynolds, 1995).

Research on groups continues to increase and provides insight into such areas as effective group leadership behavior, the measurement of group progress, and the effective components of group processes and dynamics (DeLucia-Waack, Gerrity, Kalodner, & Riva, 2004). Researchers have explored numerous avenues in group work including group development (Butler, 1981; Kivlighan & Mullison, 1988; MacKenzie, 1987), group leadership (Dies, 1994; Riva, Lippert, & Tackett, 2000; Stockton, Rohde, & Haughey, 1992), group member outcomes (Hartman, Herzog, & Drinkmann, 1992; Lieberman, Yalom, & Miles, 1973; Wykes, Parr, & Landau, 1999), and special topics groups (Piper & McCallum, 1991; Robinson, Berman, Neimeyer, & Haykal, 1990). Although these areas and others depict a dense amount of group research, some of the most studied constructs of group work are Yalom’s therapeutic factors (1995).

Therapeutic Factors

Of Yalom’s many contributions to the field of group work, his paradigm of therapeutic factors is perhaps the most influential (Kivlighan & Holmes, 2004). Yalom stated that these factors provide a complex and thorough group experience that offers individuals the greatest opportunities for significant positive change (Yalom, 1995). The concept of therapeutic group factors rests on the idea that there are a number of features or dynamics inherent in group processes that lead to significant group member change.
(Bloch & Crouch, 1985). These group processes are a function of the behaviors of the group leader, group members, and/or the group as a whole (Bloch & Crouch).

Although not the first to work with the concept of group therapeutic factors (e.g., Corsini & Rosenberg, 1955), Yalom (1995) dramatically advanced the field by defining 11 distinct factors that enhance positive member outcomes in group work. Yalom developed this framework through years of clinical observation, theoretical formulation, and systematic research. Yalom (1998) stated that these factors constitute the best available basis for group counseling and therapy. These therapeutic factors are instillation of hope, universality, imparting information, altruism, corrective recapitulation of primary family group, development of socializing techniques, catharsis, imitative behavior, existential factors, group cohesiveness, and interpersonal learning (Yalom, 1998).

**Instillation of hope.** Instillation of hope refers to a group member developing optimism for her/his own improvement by recognizing improvement in other group members (Yalom, 1995). Group members’ increased optimism about the efficacy of the group directly translates to feelings of hope for future positive gain. The importance of this therapeutic factor has been consistently cited in therapeutic factors research. This factor seems particularly important in psychotherapy and self-help groups.

Cheung and Sun (2001) examined the importance of therapeutic factors in group psychotherapy with participants at a mental health institution classified as emotionally disturbed. The results indicated that the instillation of hope was one of the most valued therapeutic factors. Gonzalez de Chavez, Gutierrez, Ducaju, and Fraile (2000) found
similar ratings of this therapeutic factor in group therapy with participants diagnosed with schizophrenia. The instillation of hope also was highly valued by members of cancer support groups (Magen & Glajchen, 1999).

**Universality.** Universality refers to the realization that other group members share similar feelings, problems, or situations. This perception reduces group members’ sense of uniqueness helps create a feeling of support (Bloch & Crouch, 1985). Universality helps to normalize group members’ experiences, which decreases feelings of oddness or being different from the norm (Yalom, 1995).

The emphasis on universality in the self-help group movement best illustrates the power of this therapeutic factor. Members are universally undergoing some common experience, and the feeling of universality helps bring relief from a previously held negative self-image (Lieberman, 1980). Feelings of shame and guilt, often associated with the reasons for joining self-help groups, may subside from the support connected with universality (Bloch & Crouch, 1985). For example, researchers have found that universality is a key factor in the development of positive outcomes for groups conducted for women with eating disorders (Bogdamiak & Piercy, 1987; Moreno, 1990).

**Imparting information.** Imparting information occurs when the group leader or a group member offers advice. Group counselors and psychotherapists may consider this didactic instruction (Yalom, 1995) or guidance (Bloch & Crouch, 1985). This therapeutic factor operates when a group member receives useful information from the group leader or other group members or when a group member gains explicit advice, suggestions, or guidance about her or his problems from the group leader or other group members.
Flowers (1979) studied the effects of imparting information on achievement of group members’ goals. The experiment consisted of treatment and control groups of convicted sex offenders. Flowers found that those group members who received information from trained group leaders achieved greater improvement than those in the control group who did not receive advice from trained group leaders. Though more research is needed on the effects of imparting information, Flowers’ study suggests that specific ways of giving advice may positively affect group members’ behaviors.

*Corrective recapitulation of the family.* The corrective recapitulation of the primary family group refers to a member’s experience of reenacting some critical family incident in a different, positive way with group members. A large number of people who enter group counseling or psychotherapy have had unsatisfactory experiences with their primary family (Yalom, 1995). The composition of groups and group work may resemble a family because there are authority figures (representing parents), peers (representing siblings), strong emotions of intimacy and competitiveness, and personal revelations. Yalom stated that it is inevitable that group members will interact with group leaders and other members in ways they have with parents and siblings. Group work offers group members a chance to better understand their interactions with others based on their roles and experiences with their families.

*Socialization.* Socialization refers to the group providing an environment that allows positive group interaction. Social learning occurs in all groups (Yalom, 1995). Some groups provide explicit rules of behavior, while others impart more indirect social learning processes. Some group leaders refer to the process of socially developing and
learning the rules of group work as norming. Norms develop through the complexity of interactions occurring within the group and become the structure of the group process. An effective group leader is attuned to the group process and can help group members better understand the socializing forces that govern the interactions occurring in the group (Yalom). This awareness may help group members with their daily social interactions.

Catharsis. Catharsis is a complex therapeutic factor, entailing members’ release of feelings about past or here-and-now experiences, which leads to members feeling better about a certain issue (Bloch & Crouch, 1985). Releasing previously unreleased emotions, such as anger, sorrow, grief, or affection, causes group members to experience new insights. Many theorists believe that the value of the new insight is primary to the catharsis itself (Slavson, 1969; Yalom, 1995). Other believe that the direct experience of releasing emotions is of the utmost importance (Bach, 1974; Janov, 1970; Perls, Hefferline, & Goodman, 1958).

Interpersonal learning. Members learn through the observation of others’ learning experiences (Yalom, 1995). In addition, members gain personal insight through other members’ perceptions of the member (Kivlighan & Holmes, 2004). Groups act as a microcosm of the group members’ social world (Yalom, 1995). Often, group members begin to behave in the same ways as they do in their everyday lives: they will interact with other group members in ways that they interact with people outside of the group, and they will attempt to create in the group the same interpersonal world they have outside of the group (Yalom). In other words, group members often display their everyday interpersonal behavior within the group setting. This social microcosm theory
(Yalom) is important because Yalom stated that this phenomenon would occur regardless of the type of group and group leaders’ intervention strategies.

**Existential factors.** Existential factors refer to the ultimate obligation of a group member to take responsibility for her/his own life (Yalom, 1995). These factors consist of the recognition that life is sometimes unfair or unjust and that there is no escape from some of life’s pain and from death. Existential factors also consist of the understanding that individuals must face life alone no matter how close they get to others. The category of existential factors often is ranked by group members at a higher level than any of the other therapeutic factors (Yalom, 1995). Some research findings indicate that existential factors rank among the top 3 therapeutic factors in groups with prison inmates (Steinfeld & Mabli, 1974), at psychiatric hospitals (Schaffer & Dreyer, 1982), and at alcohol treatment facilities (Rugal & Barry, 1990).

**Altruism.** Altruism is achieved when a group member has a positive view of self by offering help to other group members. In an effort to be helpful to others, group members discover their potential to be of value to others, which in turn improves their self-image (Bloch & Crouch, 1985). Like universality, altruism has achieved a degree of importance in the context of self-help groups. It is likely that altruism plays such an important role in self-help groups because of universality and because self-help groups typically have no designated leader. Group members must give of themselves in order to make the group effective.

Yalom and Greaves (1977) studied group therapy participants with terminal cancer in an open group that ran for 4 years. The therapeutic factor of altruism played an
important role in the group (Yalom, 1998). Since these group members were terminally ill, they entered the group overcome with a sense of powerlessness and uselessness. Altruism roused a sense of self-worth and group members experienced a greater sense of personal fulfillment (Yalom & Greaves).

*Imitative behavior.* This therapeutic factor is similar to Bandura’s (1986) idea of modeling. In group work, it is not uncommon for members to benefit by imitating the behaviors of the group leader or other group members (Yalom, 1995). Imitative behavior has been found to be more important in the early stages of group work (Yalom). Even if imitative behavior is short-lived in group work, it may stimulate group members’ attempts to try new behaviors. This therapeutic factor allows members to experiment with behaviors they observe working well for other group members. Then they can determine whether these new behaviors also work well for them (Yalom)

*Cohesiveness.* Finally, cohesiveness is the feeling of togetherness or bond experienced in the group (Kivlighan & Holmes). Yalom (1995) defined cohesiveness as the combination of all the elements of the group that provide feelings of warmth, comfort, and belonging which attracts members to remain in the group. No other therapeutic factor has received as much research attention as cohesiveness. Levels of cohesiveness have been linked to positive group member outcomes (Tschuschke & Dies, 1994; Wright & Duncan, 1986), positive group process (such as more self-disclosing statements, Tschuschke & Dies; tolerance of conflict, MacKenzie, 1994; higher levels of intimacy, Kaul & Bednar, 1986), and group leader behaviors (Fromme, Dickey, & Schaefer, 1983; Karterud, 1988)
Importance of therapeutic factors over time. Research conducted to study the importance of therapeutic factors in group work has been broad (Kivlighan & Holmes, 2004). Investigators have studied differences in group members’ ratings of the importance of therapeutic factors between inpatient and outpatient groups (Crouch, Bloch, & Wanlass, 1994; Yalom, 1995), the role of therapeutic factors in clinical change (Meichenbaum, Gilmore, & Fedoravicius, 1971), and group members’ perceptions of the levels of therapeutic factors in various group stages (Kivlighan & Goldfine, 1991; Kivlighan & Mullison, 1988; MacNair-Semands & Lese, 2000). Other studies have compared therapeutic factors between group and individual counseling (Holmes & Kivlighan, 2000) and examined the impact of therapeutic factors with various populations (Bonney, Randall, & Cleveland, 1986; Hobbs, Birtchnell, & Harte, 1989; Long & Cope, 1980; Morgan, Ferrell, & Winterowd, 1999).

Results of these and other studies have validated Yalom’s (1995) claim that the relative importance of therapeutic factors varies across settings, group stages, and group member individual differences. Several studies provide examples of how the importance of therapeutic factors changes over the course of group life cycles. Kivlighan and Mullison (1988) examined group members’ ratings of the value of therapeutic factors at different group stages. Results suggested that the importance of therapeutic factors changed over time. Universality was found to be more valued in the early stages of group development, while interpersonal learning was rated more important in the latter stages (Kivlighan & Mullison). The authors did not report, however, on whether group members perceived the strength of the existence of each therapeutic factor throughout the group
life cycle. Therefore, validity of the results is questionable because members may not have believed certain therapeutic factors were present during portions of the group life cycle, making value judgment choices skewed.

MacNair-Semands and Lese (2000) studied the shift in ratings of the existence and value of therapeutic factors over time. They found that existence levels of all therapeutic factors increased over time, but that only changes in levels of universality, instillation of hope, imparting information, recapitulation of the family, cohesiveness, and catharsis were statistically significant (MacNair-Semands & Lese). Furthermore, the researchers examined the relationship between the value of therapeutic factors and influenced group members’ interpersonal difficulties. Consistent with Yalom’s (1995) social microcosm concept, group members tended to perceive others in ways that were consistent with their own everyday interpersonal problems (MacNair-Semands & Lese). Previously, researchers had demonstrated that interpersonal issues affected the perceived value of therapeutic factors (Kivlighan & Goldfine, 1991). MacNair-Semands and Lese replicated this finding and found that interpersonal problems also affected group members’ perceptions of the levels of therapeutic factors present in their groups.

Variance of therapeutic factors between group types. Although results of research on group stage development and therapeutic factors have contributed to the field, most of the therapeutic factor research has focused on therapeutic factor differences as a function of group type (Kivlighan, Coleman, & Anderson, 2000). Although these studies varied on how therapeutic factors were assessed, outpatient group members often rated self-understanding, interpersonal learning, and self-disclosure as most important (Bloch &
Reibstein, 1980; Shectman, Barel, & Hadar, 1997). Conversely, inpatient group members often rated cohesiveness, altruism, instillation of hope, and universality as most important (Kahn, Webster, & Storch, 1986; Macaskill, 1982). By focusing on therapeutic factor variations between group types, these researchers highlight the difficulties in examining the comparative value of therapeutic factors. Inconsistencies in research results make it difficult to identify reliable patterns of therapeutic factor ratings between outpatient and inpatient group members (Kivlighan et al.).

In a recent review of therapeutic factor research, Kivlighan et al. (2000) argued that if more sensitive research techniques were used, researchers might find more significant differences among members within groups than among members between groups. They stated that researchers seemed to rely on an assumption of group member universality and that little attention has been paid to the variations in member experiences within groups. Using cluster analysis, Shaughnessy and Kivlighan (1995) found significant differences in respondents’ rankings of the importance of therapeutic factors between four subgroups of participants within the groups studied. These results suggest that group member ratings of therapeutic factors should be studied with other within-group difference variables (Kivlighan et al.).

Limitations of research on therapeutic factors

Although some researchers have studied individual therapeutic factors, others have attempted to categorize the factors into various group impacts. Therapeutic impact has been defined as the client’s sense of how he or she has been helped (Elliott & James, 1989). Therapeutic impact can be measured at different levels (i.e., an event within a
session, an entire session, or the entire group process), from different viewpoints (i.e.,
group leader, group member, or an observer), and with various methodologies (e.g.,
prepared questionnaire or open-ended questionnaire) (Elliott & James). Authors using
open-ended questionnaires often employ the critical incident technique (Neimeyer &
Resnikoff, 1982).

When critical incidents are used to obtain group members’ perceptions of helpful
therapeutic impacts, researchers need a system of translating these ratings into categories
(Kivlighan, Multon, and Brossart, 1996). In an effort to simplify therapeutic factors
research, some authors developed classifying systems based on therapeutic factor
categories (e.g., Elliott, 1985). Kivlighan et al. identified three widely used, empirically
based systems for classifying or categorizing therapeutic factors. In Bloch, Reibstein,
Crouch, Holroyd, and Themens’s (1979) system, raters assign client descriptions of
important group session events to categories of therapeutic factors. This system reduces
Yalom’s (1995) therapeutic factors into ten categories: catharsis, self-disclosure, learning
from interpersonal actions, universality, acceptance, altruism, guidance, self-
understanding, vicarious learning, and instillation of hope (Bloch et al.). Additionally,
this system helps researchers classify group members’ ratings of therapeutic factors into
three subcategories: (a) cognitive (e.g., self-understanding), (b) affective (e.g., catharsis),
and (c) behavioral (e.g., learning from interpersonal actions) (Bloch et al.).

Using this system to classify group members’ perceptions of helpful therapeutic
factors, researchers have found that group members’ perceptions of the levels of the
therapeutic factors occurring in group work vary depending by group type, stage of group
development, and group member differences (e.g., Crouch, Bloch, & Wanlass, 1994; Kivlinghan & Goldfine, 1991; Morgan, Ferrell, & Winterowd, 1999).

Kivlighan and Mullison (1988) found that the importance of individual therapeutic factors varied across the course of the group life span. Some factors, such as universality and socializing techniques, were deemed by participants as more important in the early stages of the group. Other factors, such as interpersonal learning and cohesiveness, were rated more important in the later stages of the group. Still other factors, such as instillation of hope, altruism, and imparting information did not change in importance over time.

Kivlighan and Goldfine (1991) found that the importance of individual therapeutic factors differed according to group members’ varying interpersonal styles. Those participants labeled as engaged in the group process rated the more cognitive and affective therapeutic factors—such as cohesiveness, catharsis, and instillation—as most important. Those participants labeled as nonengaged reported that the more behavioral therapeutic factors—such as imparting information, imitative behavior, and interpersonal learning—were most important.

One limitation to the rating system used in these studies is that the underlying theoretical structure has not been tested empirically. Another limitation of Bloch et al.’s therapeutic factors rating system is that the forms used require critical incidents to be classified into only one therapeutic factor. Research findings suggest that it is important to have a rating system of therapeutic factors that allows for multidimensional ratings (Kivlighan et al., 1996).
Elliott (1985) analyzed the content of group members’ descriptions of helpful events and devised a taxonomy of helpful impacts. This taxonomy contains eight helpful and six hindering session impacts. The helpful session impacts include new perspective, problem solution, problem clarification, focusing awareness, understanding, client involvement, reassurance, and personal contact. The hindering session impacts include misperception, negative counselor reaction, unwanted responsibility, repetition, misdirection, and unwanted thoughts.

Elliott’s (1985) session impacts rating system was based on an empirically derived two-factor structure: (a) task impacts, in which clients experienced growth related to their presenting issues, and (b) relationship impacts, in which clients reported some positive bond with their counselor. In examining the validity of Elliott’s two-factor system, Elliott and Wexler (1994) developed and factor analyzed the Session Impacts Scale (SIS). Findings confirmed the two-factor structure of the SIS (Elliott & Wexler). Conversely, Stiles et al. (1994) found the Task Impacts scale to be further divided into two subscales, thus providing a three-dimensional structure of helpful impacts: Understanding, Problem Solving, and Relationship.

Mahrer and Nadler (1986) developed the Good Moments System, which rates the times in therapy when positive therapeutic process, improvement, or change occurs. The Good Moments System was derived by examining the empirical and theoretical literature on specific processes that occur in positive-outcome counseling. Mahrer and Nadler proposed 11 good moments that would describe aspects of clients’ experience of session impacts. The 11 good moments include (a) provision of personal material about self and
interpersonal relationships, (b) description and exploration of the personal nature and meaning of feelings, (c) emergence of previously warded-off material, (d) expression of insight or understanding, (e) expressive communication, (f) expression of a good working relationship with the counselor, (g) expression of strong feeling toward the counselor, (h) expression of strong feelings in extratherapy contexts, (i) expression of a qualitatively different personality state, (j) expression of new ways of being and behaving, and (k) expression of a general state of well-being. Mahrer and Nadler, however, have not proposed an underlying structure for the Good Moments System (Kivlighan et al., 1996).

Problems with these types of categorizing systems include the one-dimensionality of the ratings (Kivlighan, Multon, & Brossart, 1996). Kivlighan et al., believing that individual therapeutic factors may affect more than one group dynamic, developed a multidimensional system for categorizing therapeutic factors with an accompanying instrument—the Group Counseling Helpful Impacts Scale (GCHIS). Kivlighan et al. (1996) developed the GCHIS based on the work of Bloch et al. (1979), Elliott (1985), and Mahrer and Nadler (1986). Ten items from Bloch et al.’s Therapeutic Factors rating system, 10 items from Elliott’s Taxonomy of Helpful Impacts, and 12 items from Mahrer and Nadler’s Good Moments System were used to develop the Group Counseling Helpful Impacts Scale (GCHIS) (Kivlighan et al., 1996). Minor wording changes were made to adapt the measure for use in researching therapeutic factors in group work.

To examine the psychometric properties of the GCHIS (Kivlighan et al., 1996), the authors administered the instrument to two types of groups. The first group consisted of counseling students enrolled in a group counseling course and required to participate
in a personal growth group. The second group of participants consisted of clients involved in ongoing outpatient group counseling (Kivlighan et al., 1996). A principal components factor analysis was used to determine a four-factor solution. These factors were labeled Emotional Awareness-Insight, Relationship Climate, Other vs. Self Focus, and Problem Definition-Change (Kivlighan et al., 1996).

The Emotional Awareness-Insight component contains both cognitive and affective elements because it encompasses those helpful session impacts in which group members experience notable personal insight through understanding their own feelings (Kivlighan et al., 1996). The Relationship Climate factor emphasizes a group member’s relationship with the group leader or other group members. This relationship is thought to have a strong impact on the individual and the group (Kivlighan et al., 1996). The Other vs. Self Focus component is believed to reflect a helpful impact that is unique to the group setting because it involves group members’ opportunities to receive help directly through their own work or by observing or helping another group member (Kivlighan et al., 1996). Finally, the Problem Definition-Change factor represents both cognitive and behavioral components. For positive personal growth, group members must clearly identify problems, assess progress toward target goals, and make consistent behavior changes (Kivlighan et al., 1996). Kivlighan et al.’s (1996) therapeutic factors rating system is clearly multidimensional and provides researchers an opportunity to better understand the impacts of therapeutic factors in group processes.
Personal Growth Groups in Counselor Education

Because personal qualities of counselors have been recognized as important in counselor effectiveness (Corey, 1977; Egan, 1975; Rogers, 1961), counselor education programs have attempted to provide opportunities for personal development (Brotherton, 1996). Laboratory group experiences have been found to be an effective means for the facilitation of personal growth (Dobson & Campbell, 1986; Geisler & Gillingham, 1971; O’Dell & Seiler, 1975). Of these studies, Dobson and Campbell specifically studied changes in levels of counseling students’ self-awareness after completing either a 7-week or 10-week personal growth group experience. Participants were counseling students enrolled in a group counseling course. Findings indicated that both group experiences significantly increased counseling students’ self-awareness. Results of these studies have provided an impetus for counselor educators to use personal growth groups in other counseling courses. One of these courses is the multicultural counseling course (Arthur & Achenbach, 2002).

Interpersonal awareness has been identified as an important component of multicultural counselor education (Atkinson, Kim, & Caldwell, 1998; Bowman, 1996; DeLucia-Waack & Donigian, 2004). Interpersonal awareness begins with a heightened understanding of oneself (Bowman), and the specific examination of one’s ethnic identity is paramount to effective multicultural counseling (Helms, 1990). Because everyone has an ethnic identity, it is important for counseling students to examine the impact of their ethnic identity on counseling processes and dynamics (DeLucia-Waack & Donigian). Because ethnic identity development is based on an individual’s perceptions of herself or
himself as a member of an ethnic group and because group work has been found to enhance self-awareness, the use of personal growth groups in multicultural counseling courses may generate more opportunities for counseling students to experience ethnic identity growth.

Conclusion

Investigations of racial/ethnic identity have contributed to the literature for several decades. Particularly salient in this body of research have been examinations of the effects of counseling students’ racial/ethnic identity on various counseling process and relationship dynamics. Research findings consistently support the efficacy of counseling students’ positive ethnic identity growth. Researchers and theorists continue to urge counselor educators to create experiences aimed at generating such development.

Although researchers suggest that multicultural counseling courses offer counseling students significant opportunities to examine their ethnic identity and make strides toward personal development, no studies have examined the effects of specific pedagogical methods designed for self-exploration and ethnic identity development. Multicultural counseling teaching strategies vary greatly and educators create classroom environments and learning experiences directed toward students’ greater understanding of themselves and others. One such experience that is gaining favor is the use of personal growth groups in multicultural counseling courses.

Personal growth groups expose individuals to interpersonal learning and provide environments that could promote change. A review of the group work literature demonstrates that the group approach provides unique contributions to individuals’
growth and established that core conditions exist that are necessary to promote the
effective use of groups. These core conditions, known as therapeutic factors, illuminate
the processes and dynamics used to study the helpful impacts of group work. This study
will attempt to add to the literature of racial/ethnic identity development and multicultural
counselor education by investigating helpful impacts in personal growth groups used in
multicultural counseling courses and their effects on counseling students’ ethnic identity
development.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the methodology for the study is described, including research questions and hypotheses, participants, instruments, procedures, data analyses, and limitations of the study. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between personal growth group experiences in multicultural counseling courses and counseling students’ ethnic identity development. Specifically, this study examined student participants’ perceptions of important group-session impacts that lead to changes in counseling students’ ethnic identity development. Finally, participants’ lists of the most important components of their multicultural courses were examined to determine the participants’ perceptions of the elements/experiences of the course that contributed the most substantially to their development.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

R1: Is there a significant mean difference between ethnic identity pretest and posttest scores for counseling students participating in a personal growth group, as part of a multicultural counseling course?

H1: Participation in a personal growth group, as part of a multicultural counseling course, will promote a significant mean difference between ethnic identity pretest and posttest scores for counseling students.
R2: Is there a significant difference in ethnic identity development between counseling students involved in a personal growth group, as part of a multicultural counseling course, and counseling students not involved in a personal growth group?

H2: Participants involved in a personal growth group as part of a multicultural counseling course will experience a significant difference in ethnic identity development than those who participate in a multicultural counseling course that does not include a personal growth group component.

R3: In a personal growth group component of a multicultural counseling course, what proportion of variance in counseling students’ ethnic identity posttest scores do the four factors (Emotional Awareness-Insight, Relationship Climate, Other vs. Self Focus, and Problem Definition-Change), as measured by the Group Counseling Helpful Impacts Scale (Kivlighan, Multon, & Brossart, 1996), account for?

H3: The four factors of the GCHIS will account for a significant proportion of variance of counseling students’ ethnic identity posttest scores.

R4: In a personal growth group component of a multicultural counseling course, what proportion of variance in counseling students’ ethnic identity posttest scores do each of the four factors of the GCHIS account for? ?

H4: Each of the four factors of the GCHIS will account for a significant proportion of variance on counseling students’ ethnic identity posttest scores.

R5: In a personal growth group component of a multicultural counseling course, what other factors account for variance in counseling students’ ethnic identity posttest scores?
H5a: Each of the student participants’ four demographic variables obtained from the demographics form (ethnicity, gender, age, and counselor education hours completed) will account for significant variance of ethnic identity posttest scores.

H5b: Instructor ethnicity and gender and group leader ethnicity and gender will each account for significant variance of ethnic identity posttest scores.

R6: With what frequency do counseling students report that participating in the personal growth groups had a significant impact on their personal or ethnic identity development?

H6: Counseling students will report that the personal growth groups had a significant impact on their personal or ethnic identity development at a rate of 50% or greater.

Participants

Participants consisted of 183 counselors-in-training enrolled in a multicultural counseling class in counselor education programs, 19 group leaders, and nine instructors. Two different types of groups were compared for the main analyses. These groups included students in multicultural counseling courses that required a personal growth group (n = 83) and students in multicultural counseling courses that did not require a personal growth group component (n = 98). Contact was made with counselor education programs across the United States to determine which programs used or did not use a personal growth group component in their multicultural counseling class. Because this study was concerned with the ethnic identity development of individual students and not the development of the group itself, the unit of analysis was individual counselors-in-training rather than groups.
Demographic information on participants is presented in Appendices A, B, and C. Of the student participants, 148 were female (81.8%), 31 were male (17.1%) and 2 did not report their gender. Student participants’ ages ranged from 22 to 62 with a mean age of 29.15 and a standard deviation of 8.90. Student participants’ counselor education hours completed ranged from 0 to 67 with a mean of 22.62 and a standard deviation of 16.40. Of the group leaders, 11 were female (57.9%) and 8 were male (42.1%). Group leaders’ ages ranged from 25 to 43 with a mean age of 29.58 and a standard deviation of 4.63. Group leaders’ counselor education hours completed ranged from 57 to 120 with a mean of 73 and a standard deviation of 13.85. Four of the instructors were female and 5 were male.

Instrumentation

*Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM)*

Phinney (1992) developed the MEIM to measure levels of ethnic identity common to all ethnicities. The MEIM is a 15-item instrument designed to measure ethnic identity across two factors: 1) ethnic identity search (a developmental and cognitive component); and 2) affirmation, belonging, and commitment (an affective component). Items 13, 14, and 15 ask the respondent to identify the ethnicity of each parent. These items are used for categorization purposes. The other 12 items are rated on a Likert-type scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree.

The initial version of the MEIM followed the model of the Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (Adams, Bennion, & Huh, 1987). The MEIM was developed to assess ethnic identity search and commitment and was administered as a trial measure to 60
college undergraduates (Phinney & Ambarsoom, 1987). After expansive revision, it was administered to 196 American-born undergraduates, 18–23 years old, representing one of four ethnic groups: African American, Asian American, Caucasian American, or Mexican American. Reliability for the exploration and commitment yielded Cronbach’s alpha scores of .69 and .59, respectively (Phinney & Alipuria, 1990). The survey was again revised and administered to 206 Caucasian and Hispanic students from different university campuses (Phinney & Alipuria, 1990). Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients of .80 for ethnic identity exploration and .66 for ethnic identity commitment were attained.

In an effort to broaden the MEIM, Phinney (1990) conducted an ethnic identity literature review and performed a series of interview studies to examine adolescents’ impromptu remarks indicative of ethnic identity (Phinney, 1989; Phinney & Tarver, 1988). The ethnic identity measure was then revised another time. Items were added to assess ethnic identity attitudes (belonging, affirmation, and denial) and ethnic behaviors. The language of the items was changed to reflect the natural wording of statements made by participants in the interview studies. The instrument was then administered to 134 college students at an ethnically diverse campus.

The newer version of the MEIM contained 14 items that were rated on a four-point scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (4) strongly agree. An ethnic identity score was derived by reversing negative items, summing across the 14 items, and obtaining a mean. A high score indicated stronger ethnic identity achievement. Roberts et al. (1999) conducted a factor analysis of the MEIM and concluded that the measure can
best be thought of as comprising 2 factors: (a) ethnic identity search (a developmental and cognitive component) and (b) affirmation, belonging, and commitment (an affective component). In addition, the response scale currently contains 5 items because a neutral midpoint was added (J. S. Phinney, personal communication, October 13, 2004). This version contains 15 items. The last 3 items, however, are demographic questions, making the other 12 items the basis for determining the ethnic identity score. The researcher took the mean of the 12 item scores to determine an overall ethnic identity score and calculate subscale scores.

*Group Counseling Helpful Impacts Scale (GCHIS)*

The GCHIS was used to examine group members’ perceptions of the important group impacts occurring in group sessions. The GCHIS (Kivlighan, Multon, & Brossart, 1996) was designed to examine a wide array of group session factors that have been described as helpful to outcomes in both the group and individual counseling literatures. The GCHIS began as a 32-item scale that combines items from three separate evaluation systems: Bloch and Reibstein’s (1980) Therapeutic Factors Rating System, Elliott’s (1985) Taxonomy of Helpful Impacts, and Mahrer and Nadler’s (1986) Good Moments System. Specifically, the GCHIS uses 10 items from Bloch and Reibstein’s system, 10 items from Elliott’s taxonomy, and 12 items from Mahrer and Nadler’s system. The GCHIS uses a 5-point rating scale (0 = not at all to 5 = very much) to assess group members’ perceptions of the impact of a broad range of group-session factors.

Through principle-component factor analysis (Kivlighan et al., 1996), the GCHIS was found to have four factors (Emotional Awareness-Insight, Relationship-Climate,
Other-Focus vs. Self-Focus, and Problem Definition-Change) accounting for 59.2% of the total item variance. Two a priori criteria were used to determine which items loaded on which component. First, an item had to have a .50 or higher loading on a specific component. Secondly, an item had to load at least .15 higher on the designated component than on any other component. Using these criteria, four items did not load on any of the factors and were subsequently dropped to form a 28-item scale.

Interrater reliability for the four dimensions (Emotional Awareness-Insight, Relationship-Climate, Other-Focus vs. Self-Focus, and Problem Definition-Change) has ranged from .61 to .99 respectively (Holmes & Kivlighan, 2000). In their initial psychometric evaluation, Kivlighan et al. (1996) reported coefficient alphas for the four scales as follows: Emotional Awareness-Insight (.88), Relationship-Climate (.86), Other-Focus vs. Self-Focus (.61), and Problem Definition-Change (.78). Validity was established by assessing the relationship between the four factors and group members’ ratings of group leadership dimensions (Kivlighan et al.). Leadership that was more technical was related to the Emotional Awareness-Insight and Problem Definition-Change factors, and leadership that was more personal was related to the Relationship-Climate and Other-Focus vs. Self-focus dimensions. Additionally, a more engaged group environment was connected to the Problem Definition-Change component (Holmes & Kivlighan). Since the GCHIS has been factor analyzed only once, the version of the GCHIS still in use is the original 32-item questionnaire (D. M. Kivlighan, personal communication, December 9, 2004).
Multicultural Counseling Course Component Measure (MCCCM)

The MCCCM (Rowell, 2005) contains one item that asks respondents to list the three most important elements/experiences of their multicultural counseling course that led to their most significant personal change. The MCCCM also contains two items that ask participants to list any experiences in the course they believe either contributed to or hindered their ethnic identity development. This open-ended questionnaire will provide data for future research.

Demographic Questionnaire

The researcher used a short questionnaire to collect demographic information from participating counseling students and group leaders. (e.g., participants’ gender, age range, and range of counseling credit hours completed).

Instructor Questionnaire

Instructors were given a brief questionnaire asking them to list their ethnicity, gender, percentage of course devoted to counseling students’ ethnic identity development, and percentage of course utilizing experiential activities other than personal growth groups.

Procedures

An email was sent to two counseling listservs (CESNET for counselor educators and supervisors) and the Multicultural Interest Network of the Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision). This email (Appendix M), addressed to counselor educators teaching a multicultural counseling course, requested their participation in the study. Participating counselor education programs were mailed packets of inventories and
informed consent forms for counselors-in-training at the beginning of the semester. Self-addressed, postage paid envelopes also were mailed to participating counselor educators. All participants signed informed consent forms (see Appendices F and G) prior to administration of the instruments. Teachers were provided administration instructions (see Appendix L). Since the ethnic makeup of the groups was unknown, the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) (Phinney, 1992) was used because it is not ethnicity specific. Participants not in personal growth groups took the MEIM at approximately the same times in the semester as participants in personal growth groups. The MEIM was administered at the beginning and end of the semester. Participants in the personal growth groups completed the Group Counseling Helpful Impacts Scale (GCHIS) (Kivlighan et al., 1996) after each group session. Participants not in personal growth groups did not complete the GCHIS. All participants completed the Multicultural Counseling Course Component Measure (MCCCM) at approximately the same time towards the end of the semester. To control for group leader differences, pretest and posttest MEIM scores were collected from the group leaders. Finally, to control for course instructor differences, teachers were given a brief questionnaire (Appendix K) asking them to list their ethnicity, gender, percentage of course devoted to counseling students’ ethnic identity development, and percentage of course utilizing experiential activities other than personal growth groups.

Syllabi were collected from each participating counselor educator. The schedule of events from each syllabi was used to monitor personal growth group sessions. Emails reminding the counselor educator to administer the GCHIS after each group session were
sent based on the scheduled time for each group. Counselor educators collected and returned instruments to the researcher after each administration.

Data Analysis

This study used a regression/correlational analysis design to investigate the relationship between group process and dynamics and ethnic identity development. Data were analyzed using SPSS for Windows. A summary of the demographic data describing the sample used in this study can be found in Appendix A. The following analyses were used to test the hypotheses.

H1: A paired-sample t-test was used on pretest and posttest MEIM total scores of counseling students involved in a personal growth group to determine if significant ethnic identity development occurred.

H2: A one-way analysis of covariance was conducted on pretest and posttest scores of the MEIM to determine if involvement in a personal growth group affects counseling students’ ethnic identity development more significantly than no involvement in a personal growth group.

H3: A two-way within-subjects repeated measures analysis of variance was conducted to examine the effects of the within-subjects manipulations of 6 group sessions, the 4 subscales (group impacts) of the GCHIS, and session by impacts interaction effects on counseling students ethnic identity posttest scores.

H4: Using the Enter method, a linear regression was conducted to determine the effects of group-session impacts on counseling students’ ethnic identity development. Means of the 4 subscales of the GCHIS (Emotional Awareness-Insight, Relationship Climate,
Other vs. Self Focus, and Problem Definition-Change) across the 6 group sessions were entered in the regression analysis.

H5a: Using the Enter method, a linear regression was conducted to examine the effects of student participant demographics (ethnicity, gender, age, and counselor education hours completed) on ethnic identity posttest scores.

H5b: Using the Enter method, two linear regressions were run to examine the effects of ethnicity and gender of instructors and the group leaders.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the data analyses for this study. First, the reliability of the MEIM and GCHIS were examined. Second, the results of the paired-sample t-test and one-way analysis of covariance are presented. Also included is the two-way repeated measures analysis of variance examining the effects of the within-subjects factors of group session and group impacts and the session by impacts interaction on counseling students ethnic identity development. Finally, results of multiple linear regression analyses of the group-session impacts and demographic independent variables on counseling students’ ethnic identity development are discussed.

Instrument Reliabilities

Reliabilities of the MEIM and the GCHIS were examined for each administration. Cronbach’s alphas for the MEIM pretest and posttest were .87 (M = 40.50, SD = 8.36) and .83 (M = 41.47, SD = 6.77), respectively. These results suggest evidence of reasonable reliability for the MEIM. Additionally, the GCHIS Cronbach’s alpha coefficients showed evidence of reliability. Table 1 provides Cronbach’s alphas, scale means, and standard deviations for each of the 6 administrations. Possible scale range scores are from 0 to 128.

Cronbach’s alphas for the Emotional Awareness-Insight, Relationship Climate, Other vs. Self Focus, and Problem Definition-Change subscales of the GCHIS were .71,
.83, .63, and .77, indicating that the subscales had acceptable internal consistency.

Scale means were 12.591 (SD = 1.95) for Emotional Awareness-Insight, 13.11 (SD = 2.80) for Relationship Climate, 12.35 (SD = 1.69) for Other vs. Self Focus, and 12.30 (SD = 1.77) for Problem Definition-Change.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>65.05</td>
<td>14.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>68.06</td>
<td>12.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>67.04</td>
<td>13.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>67.32</td>
<td>14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>68.37</td>
<td>14.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>73.84</td>
<td>17.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T-test Analysis

Hypothesis 1 of this study stated that participation in a personal growth group, as part of a multicultural counseling course, would promote a significant mean difference between ethnic identity pretest and posttest scores for counseling students. To test this hypothesis, a paired-sample t-test was conducted to determine whether or not there was a significant increase in counseling students’ ethnic identity. For this study, 199 counseling students were given the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992) as pretest and posttest measures. Of that sample, 85 participants were involved in personal growth groups and 98 were not in personal growth groups. Because 16 participants (all not in personal growth groups) did not complete the posttest, their results were excluded from all analyses. The paired-sample t-test was conducted on the pretest and posttest scores of
the participants in personal growth groups. Results of the two-tailed paired-sample t-test are displayed in Table 2. Hypothesis 1 was supported by the results of the paired-sample t-test, t (84) = -1.97, p < .05, $\eta^2 = .20$.

Table 2

Results of t-test for Paired Samples (n = 85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-1.97</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 1, there was a statistically significant increase in the means of the pretest and posttest scores suggesting significant positive ethnic identity development for counseling students involved in personal growth group experiences.

Analysis of Covariance

A one-way analysis of covariance was conducted to test Hypothesis 2, which stated that participants involved in a personal growth group as part of a multicultural counseling course would experience a greater difference in ethnic identity development than those who participate in a multicultural counseling course that does not include a personal growth group component. Pretest ethnic identity scores were entered in the analysis as a covariate in order to control for differences in those pretest scores. Before conducting the ANCOVA, the homogeneity-of-slopes assumption was tested to evaluate the interaction between the covariate (pretest ethnic identity scores) and the factor (whether or not participants were part of a personal growth group) in the prediction of the
dependent variable (posttest ethnic identity scores). Results suggested that the interaction was not significant, \( F(1, 179) = 2.03, p = .15 \). The nonsignificant interaction indicates that the differences on the dependent variable among groups do not vary as a function of the covariate. The ANCOVA was then conducted. Adjusted means and standard deviations of ethnic identity posttest scores are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

*Adjusted Means and Standard Deviations of Ethnic Identity Posttest Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posttest (Groups)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest (No groups)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4, there was a significant difference in the means of the posttest scores between students involved in personal growth groups and students who were not in personal growth groups, \( F (1) = 5.09, p < .03, \eta^2 = .17 \). Thus Hypothesis 2 was supported.
Hypothesis 3 stated that the four factors of the Group Counseling Helpful Impacts Scale (GCHIS) (Kivlighan, Multon, & Brossart, 1996) would account for a significant proportion of variance of counseling students’ ethnic identity posttest scores.

A two-way within-subjects repeated measures analysis of variance was conducted to examine the effects of the within-subjects manipulations of 6 group sessions, the four subscales (group impacts) of the GCHIS, and session by impacts interaction effects on counseling students ethnic identity posttest scores. The GCHIS was administered to participants in personal growth groups 6 times throughout the semester. Table 5 presents the outcome of the ANOVA. The analysis revealed a significant effect on ethnic identity posttest scores for the main effect of group session $F(5) = 3.59$, $p < .004$, $\eta^2 = .22$ and the main effect of group impacts $F(3) = 4.81$, $p < .003$, $\eta^2 = .26$. The session by impacts interaction did not have a significant effect on ethnic identity.

Table 4

*Analysis of Covariance Summary Table (N = 183)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>261.58</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Analysis of Variance Summary Table (n = 85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Impacts</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session * Impacts</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Variables

A number of independent variables were examined in this study to determine the proportion of variance in student participants’ posttest scores for which they would account. These independent variables were the four subscales of the GCHIS, ethnicity and gender of students, group leaders, and instructors; and age and graduate course hours completed by students and group leaders. Multiple linear regressions were conducted to investigate the impact of these variables on student participant ethnic identity posttest scores.

Hypothesis 4 stated that each of the four subscales of the GCHIS would account for a significant proportion of variance on counseling students’ ethnic identity posttest scores. Using the Enter method, a linear regression was conducted to determine the effects of group-session impacts on counseling students’ ethnic identity development. Means of the four subscales of the GCHIS (Emotional Awareness-Insight, Relationship Climate, Other vs. Self Focus, and Problem Definition-Change) across the 6 group sessions were
entered in the regression analysis to test Hypothesis 4. Regression analysis revealed that
the model did not significantly predict ethnic identity posttest scores, \( F(4, 80) = 1.33, p < .27 \). \( R^2 \) for the model was .06 and adjusted \( R^2 \) was .02.

In terms of individual relationships between these independent variables and
ethnic identity posttest scores, none of these variables were significant predictors of
ethnic identity posttest scores. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was not supported because none
of the 4 factors had significant effects on posttest scores.

Table 6

**Summary of Linear Regression Analysis for GCHIS Subscale Variables Affecting Ethnic
Identity Posttest Scores** (n = 85)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Awareness-Insight</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Climate</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vs. Self Focus</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Definition-Change</td>
<td>-3.32</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 5a stated that each of the student participants’ four demographic
variables obtained from the demographics form (ethnicity, gender, age, and counselor
education hours completed) would account for significant proportion of the variance in
ethnic identity posttest scores. The variable ethnicity was collapsed into two categories
labeled White and Nonwhite. This recoding was necessitated by the composition of the sample. Of the participants, 144 identified themselves as belonging to an ethnicity within the White category. The remaining 37 participants identified with various other ethnic groups (16 identified themselves as belonging to an ethnicity within the Black category) and two did not report an ethnicity.

Another linear regression, using the Enter method, was conducted to examine the effects of student participant demographics on ethnic identity posttest scores. Regression analysis revealed that the model significantly predicted ethnic identity posttest scores, $F(4, 180) = 4.80, p < .001$. $R^2$ for the model was .10 and adjusted $R^2$ was .08. Table 7 displays the unstandardized regression coefficients (b), the standard error (SE b), the standardized regression coefficients (Beta), and the significance level (p) for each variable.

Table 7

*Summary of Linear Regression Analysis for Student Participant Demographic Variables Affecting Ethnic Identity Posttest Scores* (N = 183)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Completed</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of individual relationships between the independent variables and ethnic identity posttest scores, age ($t = 3.24, \rho < .001$), and graduate course hours completed ($t = 2.40, \rho < .02$), each significantly predicted ethnic identity posttest scores. Ethnicity ($t = 1.37, p < .17$) and gender ($t = -.51, p < .61$) did not significantly predict ethnic identity posttest scores.

Results of this regression revealed significant effects of age and graduate course hours completed on counseling students’ ethnic identity posttest scores. Hypothesis 5a was only partially supported, however, because the effects of ethnicity and gender on ethnic identity development was not significant. Together, these four variables contributed to 10% in shared variability.

Because of the small numbers of instructors and group leaders in this study, the ethnicity variable was collapsed into the same two categories used for the student participants. A linear regression was run to test hypothesis 5b, which stated that instructor ethnicity and gender and group leader ethnicity and gender would each account for significant variance of ethnic identity posttest scores. The regression was run using the Enter method. Regression analysis revealed that the model significantly predicted ethnic identity posttest scores, $F (4, 180) = 3.28, p < .0001$. $R^2$ for the model was .10 and adjusted $R^2$ was .09. Table 8 displays the unstandardized regression coefficients ($b$), the standard error (SE $b$), the standardized regression coefficients (Beta), and the significance level ($p$) for each variable.
Table 8

Summary of Linear Regression Analyses for Instructor and Group Leader Demographic Variables Affecting Ethnic Identity Posttest Scores (N = 183 for instructor variables. n = 85 for group leader variables)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE b</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Ethnicity</td>
<td>-6.90</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Gender</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Leader Ethnicity</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Leader Gender</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of individual relationships between the independent variables and ethnic identity posttest scores, instructor gender (t = 3.45, p < .001), group leader ethnicity (t = 60.40, p < .0001), and group leader gender (t = 61.25, p < .0001) each significantly predicted ethnic identity posttest scores. Instructor ethnicity did not significantly predict ethnic identity posttest scores. Together, these four variables contributed to 10% in shared variability. Hypothesis 5b was only partially supported, however, because the effect of instructor ethnicity on ethnic identity development was not found to be significant.

Frequencies

Hypothesis 6 stated that counseling students would report that the personal growth groups had a significant impact on their personal or ethnic identity development at a rate of 50% or greater. The purpose of administering the Multicultural Counseling
Course Component Measure (MCCCM) was to determine how often participants in personal growth groups listed the groups as a major impetus for personal or ethnic identity development. Of 85 participants in personal growth groups, 42 listed the group as a course experience that aided in their personal development. Of those same 85 participants, 57 listed the personal growth groups as a leading factor in their ethnic identity development. None of the 85 participants listed the personal growth groups as a hindrance to their ethnic identity development. Other common responses taken from the MCCCM can be found in Appendix D.

Finally, instructors of the multicultural counseling courses were asked to estimate the percentage of their courses devoted to counseling students’ ethnic identity development and the percentage of their course that utilized experiential activities other than personal growth groups. The 13 instructors surveyed reported that a mean of 39% of their course time was devoted to counseling students’ ethnic identity development, and that a mean of 52% of their course time utilized experiential activities other than personal growth groups.

Summary of Results

Results of this study provide a number of interesting findings regarding counseling students ethnic identity development. Hypothesis 2 of this study stated that participants involved in a personal growth group as part of a multicultural counseling course would experience a significant difference in ethnic identity development at a rate greater than those who participated in a multicultural counseling course that does not include a personal growth group component. For this study, 183 counseling students
completed both a pretest and posttest measure of ethnic identity. A paired-sample T-test revealed that participants in personal growth groups experienced significant positive ethnic identity development. Furthermore, results of an ANCOVA suggested that students in personal growth groups experienced significantly greater ethnic identity development than did participants not in personal growth groups.

In addition, results of a two-way repeated measures ANOVA suggested that the main effects of personal growth groups and group-session impacts on ethnic identity posttest scores were significant. Moreover, results of multiple linear regressions showed that participants’ ethnicity, age, and counselor education hours completed were significant predictors of ethnic identity posttest scores. Furthermore, instructors’ gender and group leaders’ ethnicity and gender also were significant predictors of ethnic identity posttest scores. Finally, participants’ gender, instructors’ ethnicity, and the 4 subscales of the GCHIS did not significantly predictor ethnic identity posttest scores.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

In this final chapter, the study is summarized, conclusions are drawn, limitations are identified, and recommendations for research and practice are presented. These issues are discussed within the context of the literature reviewed in Chapter Two and the research hypotheses. Results of the data analyses are interpreted and discussed.

Summary

For this study, 183 counseling students were used as participants to assess the effects of participating in a personal growth group in a multicultural counseling course on counseling students' ethnic identity development. Of those 183, 85 were in courses that required personal growth groups and 98 were in courses that did not have a personal growth group component. This resulted in 2 groups used for comparison of ethnic identity development.

Research hypothesis 1 stated that counseling students involved in personal growth groups as part of a multicultural counseling course would experience significant growth in ethnic identity. Pretest and posttest scores taken from the Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (MEIM) (Phinney, 1992) were collected at the beginning and end of the semester, respectively. A paired-sample t-test, conducted on the scores from the students in personal growth groups (n = 85), suggested that a statistically significant increase in ethnic identity was achieved. Establishing that students involved in personal growth
groups did experience significant positive ethnic identity development gives some legitimacy to the investigation of the remaining research hypotheses.

Research hypothesis 2 stated that counseling students involved in personal growth groups as part of a multicultural counseling course would experience significantly greater ethnic identity development than counseling students not involved in personal growth groups as part of a multicultural counseling course. Results of a one-way ANCOVA revealed a statistically significant greater increase in students’ ethnic identity scores involved in personal growth groups than the ethnic identity scores of students who did not participate in personal growth groups. Therefore, research hypothesis 2 was supported.

Involvement in a personal growth group experience as part of a multicultural counseling course appears to positively enhance counseling students’ ethnic identity development more than students who do not participate in such groups. This finding supports Yalom’s (1995) argument that the interpersonal nature of group work offers group members an opportunity for significant individual change.

Research hypothesis 3 stated that there would be significant effects of participants’ ratings of important group-session impacts on their ethnic identity development. A two-way within-subjects repeated measures analysis of variance was conducted to examine the effects of the within-subjects manipulations of 6 group sessions, the 4 subscales of the Group Counseling Helpful Impacts Scale (GCHIS) (Kivlighan, Multon, & Brossart, 1996), and interaction effects on counseling students ethnic identity posttest scores. Results of the ANOVA indicated a significant effect on
ethnic identity posttest scores for the main effect of group session. The session by impacts interaction did not have a significant effect on ethnic identity.

Thus, the groups themselves and the therapeutic factors as a whole played a significant role in students’ ethnic identity development. Not only does this finding support Yalom’s (1995) claim stated above, it also supports the idea that these particular groups in multicultural counseling courses improve students’ chances of experiencing positive ethnic identity development, which is a key component of many multicultural counseling courses (Reynolds, 1995).

Research hypothesis 4 stated that each of the each of the 4 factors of the GCHIS would have a significant effect on ethnic identity posttest scores. Regression analysis revealed that the model significantly predicted ethnic identity posttest scores. Individual relationships between the independent variables and ethnic identity posttest scores, however, revealed no significant predictors of ethnic identity posttest scores. Therefore, hypothesis 4 was not supported because none of the four factors had significant effects on posttest scores.

This result seems to support Yalom’s (1995) claim that all of the therapeutic factors are important for significant change to occur in a group setting. Although the individual factors did not have significant effects on ethnic identity development, results of the hypothesis 3 test did indicate that the groups themselves had a significant impact. Therefore, it is possible that other unmeasured group factors played key roles in counseling students’ ethnic identity development. Moreover, the divergent findings
between the hypotheses 3 and 4 tests, suggest the need for further measurement of group dynamics and processes.

Hypothesis 5a stated that each of the student participants’ four demographic variables (ethnicity, gender, age, and counselor education hours completed) would have a significant effect on ethnic identity posttest scores. Another linear regression was conducted to examine the effects of student participant demographics on ethnic identity posttest scores. Regression analysis revealed that the model significantly predicted ethnic identity posttest scores. In terms of individual relationships between the independent variables and ethnic identity posttest scores, age and counselor education credit hours completed, each significantly predicted ethnic identity posttest scores. Gender and ethnicity did not significantly predict ethnic identity posttest scores.

It is not surprising that students’ ethnicity was not a strong predictor of ethnic identity in this study because the MEIM has shown evidence of validity and reliability across ethnic groups. Moreover, because ethnic identity achievement is thought to be a developmental process (Phinney, 1990), the finding that students’ age was a significant predictor of ethnic identity development is not an unexpected result. Furthermore, the amount of education as a significant predictor of ethnic identity development makes intuitive sense, and therefore is not unexpected.

Finally, hypothesis 5b stated that instructor ethnicity and gender and group leader ethnicity and gender each would have significant effects on ethnic identity posttest scores. A linear regression was run to examine the effects of the ethnicity and gender of the instructors and the group leaders. Regression analysis revealed that the model
significantly predicted ethnic identity posttest scores. In terms of individual relationships between the independent variables and ethnic identity posttest scores, instructor gender and group leader gender each significantly predicted ethnic identity posttest scores. Instructor ethnicity and group leader ethnicity did not significantly predict ethnic identity posttest scores. Hypothesis 5b was only partially supported, however, because the effect of instructor ethnicity on ethnic identity development was not found to be significant.

Discussion

Results of this study indicate that participating in a personal growth group experience as part of a multicultural counseling course promotes significantly greater positive ethnic identity development for counseling students than for those not participating in such groups as a requirement in their multicultural counseling courses. Although specific influential group dynamics and processes were not identified in this study, the nature of small group dialogue offers students many opportunities for significant personal change (Yalom, 1995). First, the foci in many multicultural counseling courses are to raise awareness of counseling students’ personal worldviews and biases and to obtain a better understanding of worldview differences among groups of people. These foci offer faculty and students a license to discuss these and other multicultural issues. Therefore, students may feel more open to explore these and other differences. Furthermore, the small group atmosphere may promote a greater sense of security because of such factors as universality and cohesion. If the purpose of a multicultural counseling course is for students to understand themselves and others better,
then a personal growth group experience seems to be an excellent way to enhance this process.

Moreover, the use of small group process as a method of promoting ethnic identity development may be important because groups offer an interpersonal component to personal growth. In addition to experiencing universality, students in personal growth groups have an opportunity to observe and encounter other students’ personal and ethnic identity development because the personal growth group exposes a small group of students to each other over a period of time. Subsequently, the ethnic identity development of group members may instill hope for, and motivation to, make positive changes within other members of the group. Furthermore, the group process helps promote interest in other group members, which aids in the development of cohesion (Yalom, 1995). Strong group cohesion may encourage in members a positive feeling of obligation to the group to work on their development.

The personal growth group experience also provides a significant opportunity for students to learn about other people’s beliefs, values, and heritages. Regardless of the ethnic heterogeneity of a particular group, students may share vastly different experiences during the group process. The personal growth group gives students a chance to learn how other members’ backgrounds affect their lives and how they cope with their own biases and experiences. This seems to be a highly relevant way for counseling students to encounter the differences in others, which can lead to the development of more accurate empathy with their future clients.
Curiously, the ethnicity of course instructors did not significantly predict counseling students’ ethnic identity posttest scores. It is feasible that the ethnicity of instructors of multicultural counseling courses is irrelevant to students. Because of the nature of the course, students may be more open to the ethnicity of their instructor or they may be more aware of their own biases toward specific ethnicities. Either greater openness or awareness may mitigate the effects of instructor ethnicity on counseling students’ ethnic identity development. This also could attribute to the nonsignificant effect of group leader ethnicity on ethnic identity posttest scores. Furthermore, it seems possible that the power differential between instructors and students and group leaders and students could affect these results. Those power differentials could promote a generalized respect for instructors and group leaders that causes students to experience considerable positive feelings toward those people. This could diminish the power of any internalized negative feelings about different ethnic groups and might allow students to focus more on their own ethnic identity development.

The responses from the MCCCM also support the finding that personal growth groups aid in counseling students’ ethnic identity development more than not being in personal growth groups. Even the responses from students who were not in personal growth groups suggest this assumption is accurate. Many of those participants stated that the most important experiences in their classes consisted of open, honest dialogue with fellow students. Seemingly, their in-class discussions were memorable and powerful enough to have had some impact on students.
These discussions could be enhanced using personal growth groups in several ways. First, personal growth groups offer more than simply a place to talk. The structure and composition of the groups may promote greater security for open dialogue. Security is a component of Yalom’s (1995) definition of cohesion. Research has shown that when group members feel secure, they are more likely to experience positive growth within the group context (Tschuschke & Dies, 1994; Wright & Duncan, 1986). Second, universality has been linked with the reduction of shame and guilt, which are feelings often associated with levels of ethnic identity (Phinney, 1990). If the strength of shame and guilt can be diminished, then dialogue that is more open could ensue within the group. Finally, because ethnic identity development is based on an individual’s perceptions of herself or himself as a member of an ethnic group and because group work has been found to enhance self-awareness (Dobson & Campbell, 1986), the use of personal growth groups in multicultural counseling courses may generate more opportunities for counseling students to experience ethnic identity growth.

Limitations of the Current Study

A number of limitations of the current study are related to confounding factors and measurement issues. One of the main limitations of this study is the difference between course instructors. These differences include, but are not limited to, teaching philosophy, personality styles, pedagogical styles, worldview, and teaching experience. Although ethnicity of the instructors did not have a significant effect on the study, levels of identity for this variable were not examined and therefore cannot be ruled out as confounds.
Furthermore, of the 13 instructors surveyed, only 39% of their courses were devoted to counseling students’ ethnic identity development. Coupled with the fact that 5 different philosophies of teaching this course have been identified (Reynolds, 1995), it seems plausible that counseling students’ ethnic identity development is not a major focus in some multicultural counseling courses. This difference in foci could affect the development of ethnic identity.

Another major limitation of this study involves group leader differences. Differences among group leaders, such as competence or behavior, were not examined in the study but could confound the results. Although group leader ethnicity and gender significantly affected students’ ethnic identity development, levels of these variables were not examined. Additionally, the amount of group work training and experience was not measured, but certainly could affect the results of the study. Moreover, the group leaders were either doctoral or educational specialist students in the programs for which the student participants were enrolled. The effects of possible dual relationships were not examined and could have affected the dynamics of the groups.

An additional limitation is the possibility of evaluation apprehension because the MEIM addresses racism, bias, and the relationship between student and their group. Additionally, participants may fear that the researchers will view them as racist and subsequently lean more toward providing perceived positive responses on the MEIM. Furthermore, hypothesis guessing may bias the results if participants conclude that the purpose of the study is to determine how the personal growth groups affect ethnic identity.
It is important to note that this study only examined the helpful impacts in group sessions. Research on individual and group counseling shows that sessions also can have hindering effects on client growth (e.g., Elliott & Wexler, 1994; Doxsee & Kivlighan, 1994). In addition, the results of testing hypotheses 3 and 4 suggest that the group dynamics and processes were insufficiently measured. Further, although the GCHIS (Kivlighan, Multon, & Brossart, 1996) scale reliability coefficients were acceptable, and the subscale reliabilities were moderate, the factors did not individually account for much variance in ethnic identity posttest scores.

In addition, the effects of stimuli occurring outside of the group setting cannot be known and therefore represent a threat to the validity of the results of this study. Furthermore, the results of the study may not be generalizable beyond the personal growth groups used in multicultural counseling courses. Finally, the nature and objectives of the multicultural course may actually give students the psychological authorization to explore their ethnic identity in more depth than other counselor education courses may.

Recommendations for Future Research

Some of the limitations noted here form the basis for suggestions for future empirical study. Additionally, findings from the current study have generated ideas for future research and implications for counselor education. Future investigators examining the questions in the current study should measure more of the group dynamics and processes. There are several suggestions of how to accomplish this. First, other reliable measures of the therapeutic factors (Therapeutic Factors Scale: Yalom, 1985; Therapeutic Factors Inventory: Lese & McNair-Semands, 2000) can be used to help pinpoint specific
factors within the personal growth groups that contribute to students’ ethnic identity development. The use of multiple inventories to measure a construct can also aid in the development of a structural model.

In addition, the effects of the ethnic composition of each group were not investigated in the present study. An examination of the differences between ethnically homogeneous groups and ethnically heterogeneous groups would enhance the understanding of the group dynamics that affect ethnic identity development of counseling students.

Another recommendation involves a more in-depth investigation of the effects of different group leaders. Although the group leaders’ ethnic identity and demographic variables were used as independent variables in the current study, their amount of group training and experience, their theoretical orientation, and their group skills could be examined to determine their impact on students’ ethnic identity posttest scores. Additionally, the leaders’ in-group behavior was not examined and represents a promising possibility for future study. Additionally, some potential personal growth groups may not have specified group leaders. An examination of the differences between these and groups with leaders may be incorporated into future research.

A final suggestion involves potential designs for future studies. Given that group dynamics and processes were not investigated in the current study, it seems appropriate to suggest the possibility of focusing on these within-group factors. One particular approach would incorporate more qualitative investigation in the research design. Sociometry represents a possible solution, as researchers would examine interaction patterns between
members and between members and leaders. Sociometry involves direct observation of the groups, allowing the researcher to focus more closely on the group climate, the effects of dialogue, and the effects of leader and member behavior. An example of a sociometry technique is the use of the Hill Interaction Matrix SS (HIM-SS) (Hill, 1965). The HIM-SS is a classification system for measuring the content and quality of verbal interactions in a variety of small groups. The HIM-SS and other techniques can help researchers focus on more specific group dynamics and processes.

Implications for Counselor Education and Counseling

Participants in the present study that were involved in personal growth groups as part of a multicultural counseling course experienced significantly greater positive ethnic identity development than did participants who were not involved in personal growth groups as part of their multicultural counseling course. This study can inform counselor educators about the benefits of incorporating a personal growth group experience into their multicultural counseling courses. Counselor educators should be aware that these groups offer a significant advantage in augmenting counseling students’ ethnic identity. Although other teaching methods were not examined in the current study, these results should spark an interest in examining current pedagogical practices and the feasibility of incorporating personal growth group experiences into multicultural counseling courses.

Furthermore, counseling students enrolled in multicultural counseling courses that incorporate a personal growth group, can better understand the goals and objectives of requiring such a group. They also may become more engaged or less engaged in the process, depending on their personal perspectives. For example, some students may
openly welcome the opportunity to develop their ethnic identity, while others may resist. Students frequently reported on the MCCCM that uneasiness about the course topics hindered their ethnic identity development. If counseling students understand the potential impact of a personal growth group, perhaps they will be more intentional about working on their discomfort. Minimizing the effect of these emotions will enhance their efficacy and helpfulness in multicultural counseling relationships. Furthermore, counselor educators may better identify such pre-group emotional responses of the students and intervene appropriately.

In addition to the implications for counselor education, this study may have important implications for counseling practice. Although the findings of this study may not be generalizable beyond the use of personal growth groups in multicultural counseling courses, school and college student counselors may find this study influences their intervention techniques in their work. For example, school or college student counselors may want to conduct groups to raise cultural awareness, since it is an important component in ethnic identity development (Cross, 1995; Helms, 1995; Phinney, 1990). This study can inform school and college student counselors about the potential benefits to their clients and workplace communities if they conduct personal growth groups aimed at raising cultural awareness.

Conclusion

The utilization of personal growth groups as a component of multicultural counseling courses is a growing trend in counselor education (Arthur & Achenbach, 2002; Reynolds, 1995). Unfortunately, their increased use as a method of enhancing
counseling students’ ethnic identity development has not been matched by an increase in research in this area. It is important for counselor educators to appreciate the results of this study. If developing counseling students’ ethnic identity is a goal for a multicultural counseling course, then incorporating a personal growth group into the course provides students’ with a better opportunity to do so. The present study’s results suggest that participation in a personal growth as part of a multicultural counseling course has a greater impact on counseling students’ ethnic identity development than is the case for students who complete multicultural counseling courses where a personal growth group experience is not required.
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Appendix A

Student Participants’ (N = 183) Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Black</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo, European American</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other White</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial or multiracial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Not Reported</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Group Leaders’ (N = 19) Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo, European American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial or multiracial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Instructors’ (N = 13) Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or American Indian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo, European American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Frequency of Responses on the MCCCM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please list the three experiences of this course that you believe were most important to your personal development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth Group</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class Dialogue</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion Experiences</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please list the three experiences of this course that you believe were most important to your ethnic identity development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Growth Group</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion Experiences</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest Speakers</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Projects</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please list any experiences in this course that you believe hindered your personal or ethnic identity development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shallow, Surface Dialogue</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uneasiness about Topics</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Consent to Act as a Human Participant

Date

Dear Participant:

Multicultural counseling courses are an integral component in today’s counselor education programs. For many counselor educators, counseling students’ racial/ethnic identity development is a primary goal of these courses. Furthermore, many of these courses include an ongoing group component designed to process experiences encountered during other course requirements. To date, however, no research examining the effects of the process group component on counseling students’ multicultural development has been conducted. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between process group experiences in multicultural counseling courses and counseling students’ racial/ethnic identity development.

In an effort to further understand the effects of the process group component in multicultural counseling courses, I am requesting your participation in this dissertation study. Your participation in the study will include completing a demographics form, completing one inventory before the first group session two inventories after the last group session, and one questionnaire after each group session.

All responses will remain anonymous and confidential. The data will be entered into the SPSS computer program for analysis and there will be no identifying data in the file. All data and forms will be stored for three years in a locked filing cabinet in my office; the papers will then be shredded and CD ROM and computer files will be erased. Your instructor will not receive individual results, and neither your participation nor your responses will be related to your course grade in any way. You may withdraw from the study at any time during data collection without penalty.

The research and this consent form have been approved by the University of North Carolina at Greensboro Institutional Review Board, which ensures that research involving people follow federal regulations. Questions regarding your rights as a participant in this project can by answered by calling Dr. Eric Allen at (336) 256–1482. Questions regarding the research itself will be answered by P. Clay Rowell by calling (336) 334–5112 or by emailing: crowell@triad.rr.com. Any new information that develops during the project will be provided to you if the information might affect your willingness to continue participation in the project.

Please feel free to ask any question you may have. To participate in the study, please sign the statement below and return the letter along with the instrument in your packet. There
are two copies of this letter in your packet; one is for your own records. I appreciate your participation. If you would like a summary of the results, please email me at crowell@triad.rr.com at the conclusion of the study.

Sincerely

P. Clay Rowell  
Doctoral Student

I agree to participate in the process group component study as outlined in the above letter.

_____________________________  Volunteer’s Signature

_____________________________  Date
Appendix F

Consent to Act as a Human Participant-No Group

Date

Dear Participant:

Multicultural counseling courses are an integral component in today’s counselor education programs. For many counselor educators, counseling students’ racial/ethnic identity development is a primary goal of these courses. Furthermore, many of these courses include an ongoing group component designed to process experiences encountered during other course requirements. To date, however, no research examining the effects of the process group component on counseling students’ multicultural development has been conducted. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between process group experiences in multicultural counseling courses and counseling students’ racial/ethnic identity development.

In an effort to further understand the effects of the process group component in multicultural counseling courses, I am requesting your participation in this dissertation study. Your participation in the study will include completing a demographics form, completing one inventory before during the first few weeks of the semester, and completing two inventories during the last few weeks of the semester.

All responses will remain anonymous and confidential. The data will be entered into the SPSS computer program for analysis and there will be no identifying data in the file. All data and forms will be stored for three years in a locked filing cabinet in my office; the papers will then be shredded and CD ROM and computer files will be erased. Your instructor will not receive individual results, and neither your participation nor your responses will be related to your course grade in any way. You may withdraw from the study at any time during data collection without penalty.

The research and this consent form have been approved by the University of North Carolina at Greensboro Institutional Review Board, which ensures that research involving people follow federal regulations. Questions regarding your rights as a participant in this project can be answered by calling Dr. Eric Allen at (336) 256–1482. Questions regarding the research itself will be answered by P. Clay Rowell by calling (336) 334–5112 or by emailing: pcrowell@uncg.edu. Any new information that develops during the project will be provided to you if the information might affect your willingness to continue participation in the project.

Please feel free to ask any question you may have. To participate in the study, please sign the statement below and return the letter along with the instrument in your packet. There are two copies of this letter in your packet; one is for your own records. I appreciate your
participation. If you would like a summary of the results, please email me at crowell@triad.rr.com at the conclusion of the study.

Sincerely

P. Clay Rowell
Doctoral Student

I agree to participate in the process group component study as outlined in the above letter.

_____________________________  Volunteer’s Signature

_____________________________  Date
Appendix G

The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure

In this country, people come from many different countries and cultures, and there are many different words to describe the different backgrounds or ethnic groups that people come from. Some examples of ethnic groups are Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, Asian American, Chinese, Filipino, American Indian, Mexican American, Caucasian or White, Italian American, and many others. These questions are about your ethnicity or your ethnic group and how you feel about it or react to it.

Please fill in: In terms of ethnic group, I consider myself to be ____________________

Use the numbers below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

(1) Strongly disagree  (2) Disagree  (3) Neutral  (4) Agree  (5) Strongly agree

1- I have spent time trying to find out more about my ethnic group, such as its history, traditions, and customs. _____

2- I am active in organizations or social groups that include mostly members of my own ethnic group. _____

3- I have a clear sense of my ethnic background and what it means for me. _____

4- I think a lot about how my life will be affected by my ethnic group membership. _____

5- I am happy that I am a member of the group I belong to. _____

6- I have a strong sense of belonging to my own ethnic group. _____

7- I understand pretty well what my ethnic group membership means to me. _____

8- In order to learn more about my ethnic background, I have often talked to other people about my ethnic group. _____

9- I have a lot of pride in my ethnic group. _____
10- I participate in cultural practices of my own group, such as special food, music, or customs.

11- I feel a strong attachment towards my own ethnic group.

12- I feel good about my cultural or ethnic background.

13- My ethnicity is (use the numbers below)

Asian or Asian American
1. Asian Indian
2. Chinese
3. Filipino
4. Japanese
5. Korean
6. Vietnamese
7. Cambodian
8. Hmong
9. Laotian
10. Thai
11. Other Asian

Black or African American
12. African American
13. African
14. Caribbean
15. Other Black

Hispanic or Latino
16. Mexican
17. Cuban
18. Puerto Rican
19. Central American
20. South American
21. Other Hispanic or Latino

Native American
22. Native American or American Indian
23. Alaskan Native
24. Other Native American

Pacific Native
25. Native Hawaiian
26. Guamanian or Chamorro
27. Samoan
28. Other Pacific Islander

White
29. Anglo, European American
30. British
31. Italian
32. German
33. Irish
34. Russian
35. French
36. Other White

Mixed; Parents are from two different groups
37. Biracial or multiracial

Other (write in): _____________________________________

14- My father’s ethnicity is (use numbers above)  ____

15- My mother’s ethnicity is (use numbers above)  ____
Appendix H

The Group Counseling Helpful Impacts Scale

Please rate how much you experienced each item related to this group session by using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>0=Not at all</th>
<th>1=Slightly</th>
<th>2=Somewhat</th>
<th>3=Pretty Much</th>
<th>4=Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Realized something new about myself</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Realized something new about someone else</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. More aware of or clearer about feelings, experiences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Definition of problems for me to work on</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Progress toward knowing what to do about problems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Feeling my group leader or other group members understand me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Feel supported or encouraged</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Feel relieved, more comfortable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Feel more involved in therapy or inclined to work harder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Feel closer to my group leader or other group members</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Provision of significant material about self and/or interpersonal relationships</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Description-exploration of the personal nature and meaning of feelings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Emergence of previously warded-off material</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pretty Much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Expression of insight/understanding
15. Expressive communication
16. Expression of good working relationship with the group leader or other group members
17. Expression of strong feelings towards the group leader or other group members
18. Expression of strong feelings in personal life situations
19. Manifest presence of substantially new personality state
20. Undertaking new ways of being and behaving in the imminent extra-therapy life situation
21. Expression or report of changes in target behaviors
22. Expression of a welcomed general state of well-being
23. Catharsis
24. Self-disclosure
25. Learning from Interpersonal Actions
26. Universality
27. Acceptance
28. Altruism
29. Guidance
30. Self-understanding
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>0=Not at all</th>
<th>1=Slightly</th>
<th>2=Somewhat</th>
<th>3=Pretty Much</th>
<th>4=Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Vicarious Learning</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Instillation of Hope</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I

The Multicultural Counseling Course Component Measure

Please list the three experiences of this course that you believe were most important to your personal development.

1.

2.

3.

Ethnic identity has been defined as an abstract set of ideals, values, behaviors, and attitudes regarding ethnic group membership, which allows individuals to distinguish themselves as different from members of other ethnic groups. The development of ethnic identity involves emotions, cognitions, and perceptions relating to one’s ethnic awareness and is part of an individual’s self-concept that derives from her/his knowledge of membership to an ethnic group.

Please list the three experiences of this course that you believe were most important to your ethnic identity development.

1.

2.

3.
Please list any experiences in this course that you believe hindered your personal or ethnic identity development.

1.

2.

3.
Appendix J

Demographics Form

Please respond to the following statements:

1. My gender is ____________________

2. My age ___________

3. Prior to taking this course, I have completed __________ credit hours of counselor education.
Appendix K

Instructor Questionnaire

Please respond to the following statements:

4. My ethnicity is __________________

5. My gender is __________________

6. What percentage of your multicultural counseling course focuses on counseling students’ racial/ethnic identity development?

____________

7. What percentage of your multicultural counseling course involves experiential activities (other than personal growth groups)?

____________
Appendix L

Educator Instructions for Administration of Instruments

Thank you again for agreeing to ask your students in your multicultural counseling course to participate in this study. The following instructions should provide you with the necessary details for administering the instruments.

- Give each participant a packet from the “Instruments” envelope and 2 copies of the informed consent form from the “Informed Consent Forms” envelope.
- Ask them to read the informed consent form and sign it if they are willing to participate. The second copy of the informed consent form is for their records.
- Ask the participants to write their six-digit birthday in the lower right corner of each page. As each student will take some instruments multiple times, this six-digit number will be used to match inventories only. This number will not be used in an attempt to identify any participant.
- Ask them to place their signed informed consent forms in the provided envelope marked “Informed consent forms.”
- Ask them to place their completed instruments and demographics form back in the envelope marked “Instruments.”
- Please seal the envelopes.
- Please place the sealed envelopes in the provided large, self-addressed, stamped envelope.
- Please place the larger envelope containing the packets in the mail.
- Instruments to be completed toward the end of the semester will be mailed at a later date.

If you have any questions, please contact me at crowell@triad.rr.com or (336) 668-0846.

Thank you,

P. Clay Rowell
Appendix M

Sample Recruitment Email

Dear Counselor Educator,

I am looking for counselor educators, teaching a multicultural counseling course, who are willing to ask their students to be participants in my dissertation study.

I want to study the effects of using personal growth groups in multicultural counseling courses on counseling students’ ethnic identity development. I need participants who are involved in an ongoing personal growth group component of their multicultural course and participants from classes without these groups for comparison.

I will collect data in the spring, so the course would need to be in session then. If you are willing to ask your students to participate in this study, please contact me at [email address].

Sincerely,

Clay Rowell