

Measuring multicultural training reactance: Initial instrument psychometrics

By: Robin Crowell Lowery, [L. DiAnne Borders](#), and Terry A. Ackerman

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Lowery, R. C., Borders, L. D., & Ackerman, T. A. (2020). Measuring multicultural training reactance: Initial instrument psychometrics. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 48(3), 191-205. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12177>

which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12177>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with [Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions](#). This article may not be enhanced, enriched or otherwise transformed into a derivative work, without express permission from Wiley or by statutory rights under applicable legislation. Copyright notices must not be removed, obscured or modified. The article must be linked to Wiley's version of record on Wiley Online Library and any embedding, framing or otherwise making available the article or pages thereof by third parties from platforms, services and websites other than Wiley Online Library must be prohibited. © 2020 American Counseling Association.

Abstract:

Resistant behaviors in multicultural courses are a common dilemma within counselor education. On the basis of psychological reactance theory (J. W. Brehm, 1966), the authors created a multicultural training reactance scale to measure the construct. Exploratory factor analysis and initial reliability and validity data are presented, followed by suggestions that address course reactions.

Los comportamientos resistentes en los cursos multiculturales son un dilema frecuente en la educación de consejeros. Basándose en la teoría de reactancia psicológica (J. W. Brehm, 1966), los autores crearon una escala de reactancia en la capacitación multicultural para medir el constructo. Se presenta un análisis factorial exploratorio, así como datos iniciales de fiabilidad y validez, seguidos por sugerencias que abordan las reacciones al curso.

Keywords: multicultural resistance | reactance | multicultural education | multicultural counseling competence | counselor education | resistencia multicultural | reactancia | educación multicultural | competencia en consejería multicultural | educación de consejeros

Article:

The need for multicultural counseling competence is increasingly obvious, given the growth of racial and ethnic minority groups in the United States, coupled with the dissatisfaction with counseling often expressed by culturally diverse clients (e.g., Constantine, 2002; Tidwell, 2004). Professional accreditation standards in counseling (Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs [CACREP], 2015) outline required content for instruction in social and cultural diversity, including attention to “the impact of heritage, attitudes, beliefs,

understandings, and acculturative experiences on an individual's views of others” and “the effects of power and privilege for counselors and clients” (p. 10). However, effectively addressing these topics in the classroom can be a huge challenge given that discussions of privilege and oppression are often emotionally charged and conflictual (e.g., Burton & Furr, 2014; Reynolds, 2011) for both White students and students of color (Coleman, Collings, & McDonald, 1999; Jackson, 1999; Seward, 2014). As a result, instructors of multicultural counseling courses invariably must deal with student resistance as students’ established ways of thinking, values, and attitudes are challenged. Numerous authors (e.g., Burton & Furr, 2014; Jones, Sander, & Booker, 2013; Kim & Lyons, 2003; Mio & Barker-Hackett, 2003) have described teaching approaches intended to mitigate student resistance, and sometimes these authors provided anecdotal support, but empirical results of multicultural training interventions have been mixed (e.g., Chao, Okazaki, & Hong, 2011; Paone, Malott, & Barr, 2015; Smith, Constantine, Dunn, Dinehart, & Montoya, 2006). No researchers have directly measured resistance as an outcome or mediating variable.

Mio and Awakuni (2000) conceptualized resistance to multicultural training as *reactance*, suggesting that some training methods “might result in a reactance, causing those [students] who are resistant to hold onto their original beliefs much more strongly” (p. xiv). This concept is supported by psychological reactance theory (PRT; J. W. Brehm, 1966; S. S. Brehm & Brehm, 1981). In brief, PRT posits that individuals believe they possess certain freedoms, including the freedom to act in accordance with their beliefs and convictions. When a perceived freedom is challenged, the individual perceives this as a threat and is motivated to act to preserve or restore that freedom. That motivation is reactance, manifested most often as anxiety, anger, aggression, or hostility (Zhang & Sapp, 2013). Thus, from a PRT perspective, resistance is a natural instinct, an attempt at self-preservation rather than opposition. Actions for restoring a freedom can be direct (e.g., rejecting the message) or indirect (e.g., derogating the source of the threat) and will vary in intensity based on how much importance the individual places on the threatened freedom. Reactance thus acts as a mediator between antecedents and outcomes (Dillard & Shen, 2005; Zhang & Sapp, 2013). Applying the theory to the multicultural classroom, students often learn that their personal biases and stereotypes of different cultural groups are discouraged by the profession; their right to hold these beliefs, then, is threatened, and they react to protect those beliefs. For example, reading about White privilege for the first time (antecedent) could threaten White students’ beliefs that they are not prejudiced and do not think or act in ways that reflect White privilege. As a result, their reactance might lead them to reject this new idea, rationalize their beliefs, intellectualize the multicultural content, verbally criticize the course, or display hostility toward the instructor. Such student reactions—manifested as resistance—have been documented by numerous researchers across several disciplines (e.g., Arredondo, 2003; Coleman et al., 1999; Reynolds, 2011; Sue et al., 2011; Watt et al., 2009) but have not yet been investigated from a PRT perspective (Rosenberg & Siegel, 2017).

Viewing student multicultural resistance from a PRT perspective is supported by recent applications of the theory to the classroom in which researchers investigated the link between instructor communication (antecedent), undergraduate student reactance (mediator), and student restoration behaviors (outcomes; e.g., Ball & Goodboy, 2014; Zhang & Sapp, 2013). Such studies provide a new approach to investigating the impact of multicultural teaching approaches on student resistance. Building on that research, however, requires measurement of the reactance

variable. In the instructional context, reactance has often been assessed by brief measures of anger and counterarguing (e.g., negative thoughts; Ball & Goodboy, 2014; Zhang & Sapp, 2013). The multicultural context, however, seems more threatening than the written scenarios used in previous studies of classroom reactance (e.g., assigning extra work, suggesting students drop their extracurricular activities to improve their grades). In addition, it seems multicultural content would engender more specific, and perhaps pointed, reactions than those measured on more general psychological reactance scales (e.g., Therapeutic Reactance Scale [TRS]; Dowd, Milne, & Wise, 1991). A measure specific to sources of potential threat within the multicultural classroom is needed to be able to explore the influence of students' reactance on their learning. Accordingly, the purpose of this study was to develop a measure specific to student reactance within the multicultural context—the Crowell Lowery Multicultural Training Reactance Scale (CL-MTRS)—and explore its initial psychometrics (e.g., reliability, factor structure, convergent and divergent validity).

Method

Instrument Development Process

A six-step test construction process (Netemeyer, Bearden, & Sharma, 2003; Walsh & Betz, 1994) was followed to develop the CL-MTRS. In Step 1, literature review, the first two authors reviewed extensive literature on multicultural training, resistance, and reactance to determine the underlying components of multicultural training reactance. The review indicated that reactance could be manifested cognitively, affectively, and behaviorally, necessitating items for each of these dimensions. In addition, reactance is directed toward the source of the threat, which we identified as course content, course instructor, and course processes (e.g., assignments, activities). A three-by-three matrix of these components was created as a blueprint for constructing items, although these were not necessarily expected to result in distinct factors during data analysis.

In Step 2, item creation, we generated an initial item list ($n = 24$) based on the literature review as well as on personal observations of student reactance from a consultant who was a highly experienced multicultural trainer and researcher and a person of color. We worded items both positively and negatively, although most were negative given the essence of the construct of reactance, and elected to use a 4-point Likert-type rating scale without a neutral response (to force agreement or disagreement). We chose two response anchors (1 = *strongly agree* to 4 = *strongly disagree* and 1 = *most like me* to 4 = *most unlike me*) and sought expert opinion about which to use in the final measure (see Step 4). In Step 3, revision of items for grammar and clarity, the first two authors met with the consultant to evaluate the items and determine whether the construct was fully addressed. Several items were reworded, and two additional items were added during this step.

In Step 4, content validity, we sought feedback from experts and students. First, we contacted 21 counselor educators and researchers in multicultural training, identified through the literature review, and asked them to review the initial items. We asked them to rate the items for appropriateness, clarity, and edginess or provocativeness using a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*not at all appropriate, not at all clear, or not at all edgy*) to 4 (*very*

appropriate, very clear, or very edgy). To fully capture the construct of multicultural training reactance, we sought to include controversial topics covered in a course that could evoke strong emotions and polarized viewpoints, yet not word items so strongly that they would elicit socially desirable responding. Next, we asked that the experts use the matrix created in Step 1 to classify the type and target of each item (e.g., cognitive reactance toward course content, affective reactance toward course facilitator). We also asked for suggestions around deleting or adding items and feedback on the two anchor options.

After multiple reminder emails, five experts returned their ratings and feedback. They were diverse by self-identified race, gender, sexual orientation, and geographic location and had taught courses on culture and diversity an average of 10 times. We calculated the mean item ratings, examined any items with ratings below 3 for appropriateness ($n = 2$) and clarity ($n = 0$) or above 3 for edginess ($n = 4$), and reworded these items as needed. Experts had high agreement about the placement of items on the matrix, with one item needing revision. They suggested retaining all items and offered a few additional topics that might be included; based on this feedback, two additional items were created (i.e., Item 8, how students use their values to justify behavior; Item 10, students' interest in learning more about racism and discrimination). Experts' feedback on the two anchor choices were mixed. We elected to use two anchors: how students believed they should behave and how closely they identified with certain behaviors. Items were separated into two groups to align with the anchor choices.

Then, a diverse group of three students completed the measure and a feedback form. They took an average of 5 minutes to complete the measure and indicated that the instructions were very clear. Additional student feedback suggested three items lacked subtlety; the original wording was retained as these items reflected edgy content.

In Step 5, pilot study, with institutional review board approval, we administered the 28-item CL-MTRS via SurveyMonkey to a convenience sample of counseling students ($N = 55$) at two universities in the southeastern United States twice, with a 2-week interval between the administrations. Instructors of the current multicultural counseling courses, identified via program websites, were asked to distribute recruitment postcards to their students with instructions for accessing the survey. About half (45.5%) of the students were age 24 or younger; most self-identified as female (85.5%), White (81.8%), heterosexual (92.7%), and Christian (70.9%). A preliminary factor analysis was conducted, despite the small sample (see Costello & Osborne, 2005), to get a preliminary view of the structure and reliability but primarily to inform where changes were needed. A principal-components factor analysis with an unrotated solution was performed using an extraction method of three factors; the structure did not load well. A two-factor solution had a better fit. Factor 1 (16 items) accounted for 22.4% of the variance and had an internal consistency of .76; Factor 2 (five items) accounted for 12.6% of the variance and had an internal consistency of .40. The full measure had an internal consistency of .68 and a test-retest reliability of .87 ($n = 31$). Two of the original five experts provided descriptions for each factor.

Item 141 (Ackerman, 2015) was used to calculate interitem correlations. We removed six items because of poor discrimination scores, negative interitem correlations, and negative or low item-total correlations, which resulted in a 22-item scale. These analyses also flagged 10 items that

needed to be reworded to achieve greater clarity and specificity. The two response sets were retained but, due to limited variability, the rating scale was changed to a 6-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 6 = *strongly agree* and 1 = *most unlike me* to 6 = *most like me*); again, the goal was to discourage neutral responses.

Step 6, reliability and validity analyses, was completed as part of the main study, described in the following sections.

Participants

Participants were master's students ($n = 194$) who were currently enrolled in their program's multicultural counseling course or had completed it the previous semester. Most self-identified as female ($n = 168$, 86.6%; male, $n = 25$, 12.9%; transgender, $n = 1$, 0.5%). A majority were White ($n = 141$, 72.7%); others self-identified as African American ($n = 14$, 7.2%), multiracial ($n = 13$, 6.7%), Latino/Latina ($n = 11$, 5.7%), other ($n = 9$, 4.6%), Asian American ($n = 4$, 2.1%), Native American ($n = 1$, 0.5%), or international (India, $n = 1$, 0.5%). Their age groups were 18–24 ($n = 68$, 35.1%), 25–34 ($n = 95$, 49.0%), 35–44 ($n = 17$, 8.8%), 45–54 ($n = 11$, 5.7%), and 55 years or older ($n = 3$, 1.5%). Participants were primarily in the beginning ($n = 59$, 30.4%) or middle ($n = 48$, 24.7%) of their program, with a majority indicating either a clinical mental health counseling ($n = 88$, 45.4%) or a school counseling ($n = 60$, 30.9%) focus.

Instruments

CL-MTRS. The 22-item CL-MTRS was used to measure students' reactance to their multicultural training experience. Respondents used two 6-point Likert-type anchor sets. For the first group of items ($n = 10$; e.g., "I fully expect the instructor to reprimand anyone who creates hostility, tension, and uneasiness in the course"), respondents rated their level of agreement from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (6). For the second group of items ($n = 12$; e.g., "It seems like I'm always on guard in this course"), respondents indicated the degree to which the statement reflected them personally, using *most unlike me* (1) to *most like me* (6). For both groups of items, higher scores indicate greater multicultural training reactance. Internal consistency in this study was .86.

TRS. The 28-item TRS (Dowd et al., 1991) was employed as a test of convergent validity. The TRS, a measure of general psychological reactance appropriate to the counseling setting, contains subscales measuring behavioral and verbal reactance. The response format is a 4-point Likert rating scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 4 (*strongly agree*); nine items are reverse scored. Dowd et al. (1991) reported internal consistency reliability estimates of .81 for the Behavioral Reactance subscale, .75 for the Verbal Reactance subscale, and .84 for the total score, as well as test-retest correlations of .60 for the Behavioral Reactance subscale, .57 for the Verbal Reactance subscale, and .59 for the total score. Internal consistency in the present sample was .69 for the Behavioral Reactance subscale, .59 for the Verbal Reactance subscale, and .74 for the total score.

Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure–Revised (MEIM-R). In line with Arredondo's (2003) proposition that students' reactions to multicultural issues were related to their cultural identities,

we used the MEIM-R (Phinney & Ong, 2007) as a test of convergent validity and to assess ethnic identity. The six-item MEIM-R, based on factor analysis of the original 15-item MEIM (Phinney, 1992), contains two subscales: Exploration of one's ethnicity and Commitment to an ethnic group. Phinney and Ong (2007) reported Cronbach's alphas of .76 for Exploration, .78 for Commitment, and .81 for the total score. Respondents use a 5-point Likert scale with 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*. Internal consistency in this study was .88 for the Exploration subscale, .86 for the Commitment subscale, and .90 for the total score.

Marlowe-Crowne Short Form C (M-C Form C). We used the M-C Form C as a test of divergent validity and to determine whether individuals responded in a socially desirable manner. The 13-item measure, derived from the 33-item Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960), measures a person's tendency to respond in a socially desirable manner using true/false responses. Lower scores indicate higher levels of social desirability. The M-C Form C was correlated at .93 with the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale and yielded a Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficient of .76. In studies examining cultural topics (e.g., racism, feminism, sexism), researchers reported internal consistency reliability coefficients of .70 (Aosved & Long, 2006; Aosved, Long, & Voller, 2009) and .80 (Szymanski, 2003). Internal consistency in this study was .75.

Demographic questionnaire and overall course evaluation. Respondents indicated their age, gender, ethnicity, progress in completing their counseling program, and program focus (e.g., school counseling). Using a scale ranging from 1 (*extremely effective*) to 6 (*extremely ineffective*), they rated their perceptions regarding the effectiveness of course assignments and activities (e.g., didactic, interactive, experiential), coverage of course topics (e.g., racial/cultural identity, privilege, gender identity, social justice), and their multicultural course instructor's characteristics (e.g., was flexible, created safe training environment) and overall effectiveness, as well as their overall satisfaction with the course. These ratings were used as a measure of convergent validity, given that student resistance previously has been related to negative reactions to the course and instructor (e.g., Arredondo, 2003; Reynolds, 2011; Watt et al., 2009).

Procedure

We identified chairs of CACREP-accredited counseling programs using program websites. Following institutional review board approval, we sent them an explanatory email with the invitation to participate and the link to the study and asked them to forward the email to their counseling students. Five days later, we sent a follow-up reminder email.

Results

We first examined internal consistency of the 22-item CL-MTRS; Cronbach's alpha was .86. To determine the underlying structure of the CL-MTRS, we examined it with a maximum likelihood estimation method using an unrotated factor solution. Bartlett's test of sphericity produced a statistically significant value ($p < .001$), indicating the variables were sufficiently correlated, and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test for sampling adequacy was high (.87), suggesting that enough items were predicted by each factor (Leech, Barrett, & Morgan, 2005). The initial exploratory factor analysis extracted six factors (with eigenvalues greater than 1.0), which accounted for 43.54% of

the total variance, with the first factor explaining 19.25% of the variance, the second factor explaining 10.78%, the third factor explaining 5.07%, and the last three each explaining less than 4% of the variance. A goodness-of-fit test, $\chi^2(114, N = 194) = 0.88$, indicated the reproduced factor matrix was not significantly different from the observed matrix. Inspection of the scree plot suggested one to two break points (Costello & Osborne, 2005, p. 3). Because the first two factors explained most of the total variance (30.03%) and the scree plot suggested the appearance of one to two breakpoints, a one-factor and two-factor maximum likelihood extraction with direct oblimin rotation were performed. These particular rotations were used because correlation between factors was anticipated.

A minimum loading of .32 was used to determine whether an item loaded on a factor (see Table 1; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Items were examined to ascertain the cause for loadings less than .32. The rotated two-factor solution yielded a simple structure, with each item loading heavily on only one factor. Factors 1 and 2 correlated at .62, but the first factor accounted for 25.25% of the variance and the second factor accounted for 5.06%. Due to the moderately high correlation between the two factors and the low variance accounted for by the second factor, the one-factor solution was deemed most suitable for interpretation. For the one-factor solution, three items (Items 1, 7, and 9) had loadings less than .32. These items also had low communalities, suggesting they represented minimal variance.

Table 1. Two-Factor Rotated Solution and One-Factor Solution Factor Loading for the Crowell Lowery Multicultural Training Reactance Scale

Item	Two-Factor Rotated Solution		One-Factor Solution
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 1
1. The topics covered in this course are irrelevant to my education.			
2. Racism only exists in the perception of the individual.		.50	.36
3. Learning about other cultural groups simply does not interest me.		.80	.51
4. Assignments that require me to participate in the cultural experiences of others are infringing on my rights as a person.		.63	.55
5. Talking openly in this course about oppression and discrimination will not create more awareness and understanding among people.		.36	.38
6. Listening to the instructor talk about injustices makes me wonder about his/her hidden agenda, especially if it is a person of color.		.42	.57
7. I fully expect the instructor to reprimand anyone who creates hostility, tension, or uneasiness in the course.			
8. At times I feel that the goal of this course is to change my values and beliefs.	.49		.44
9. At times I feel that I'm reacting to my instructor the same way I reacted to someone I knew before.			
10. I doubt that I will continue to study the history of racism and discrimination in the United States.		.71	.53
11. I question the long-term benefits of this course.	.47		.60
12. I'm concerned that the instructor may penalize me in some way if I fully express my true beliefs in this course.	.92		.76
13. I resent the fact that I'm supposed to feel guilty for the actions of others.	.59		.61
14. I feel nervous just thinking about going places where I'm the outsider.			.33
15. It seems like I'm always on guard in this course.	.77		.61
16. It feels like others distort their true feelings about diversity and multiculturalism in this course.	.47		.50

Item	Two-Factor Rotated Solution		One-Factor Solution
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 1
17. It's frustrating when the instructor cannot or will not give specific solutions for working with different cultural groups.			.39
18. I will definitely adjust how I participate the day a controversial topic like sexual orientation, religion, or affirmative action is discussed.	.50		.44
19. I tend to think twice before speaking out on topics in course discussions.	.53		.63
20. I will not participate in course activities that make me uncomfortable.		.47	.45
21. Even in smaller groups, I hesitate to share my personal cultural experiences.			.49
22. I tend to appear as if I'm in agreement with the instructor despite my true feelings.	.61		.69

Note. Factor loadings less than .32 are omitted. Response format for Items 1–10: 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). Response format for Items 11–22: 1 (*most unlike me*) to 6 (*most like me*).

Next, two tests for convergent validity were conducted (see Table 2); neither supported convergent validity as expected. Total scores on the CL-MTRS were not significantly correlated with TRS total scores or the TRS Behavioral Reactance subscale, and the significant correlation with the TRS Verbal Reactance subscale was low. Similarly, there were no significant correlations between CL-MTRS total scores and the MEIM-R total score or the MEIM-R Commitment subscale, and the significant correlation with the MEIM-R Exploration subscale was low.

Table 2. Means, Standard Deviations, Reliability Coefficients, and Correlations for All Variables

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. TRS Verbal	25.86	3.04	(.59)							
2. TRS Behavioral	48.34	4.37	.41**	(.69)						
3. TRS	74.21	6.27	.77**	.90**	(.74)					
4. MEIM-R Explore	7.70	3.02	.13	-.09	.00	(.88)				
5. MEIM-R Commit	7.44	2.69	.12	-.07	.01	.70**	(.86)			
6. MEIM-R	15.14	5.26	.14	-.09	.01	.93**	.91**	(.90)		
7. CL-MTRS	43.65	12.46	.18*	-.12	.00	.16*	.07	.13	(.86)	
8. M-C Form C	19.08	3.03	.11	.29**	.26**	-.15*	-.18*	-.17*	-.13	(.75)

Note. *N* = 194. Reliability coefficients are presented in parentheses along the diagonal. TRS Verbal = Therapeutic Reactance Scale Verbal Reactance subscale; TRS Behavioral = TRS Behavioral Reactance subscale; MEIM-R Explore = Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure-Revised Exploration subscale; MEIM-R Commit = MEIM-R Commitment subscale; CL-MTRS = Crowell Lowery Multicultural Training Reactance Scale; M-C Form C = Marlowe-Crowne Short Form C.

* *p* < .05.

** *p* < .01.

The test for divergent validity and social desirability yielded no significant correlations between CL-MTRS total scores and M-C Form C scores. In addition, the M-C Form C scores had low correlations with the TRS and MEIM-R scores. Thus, social desirability did not seem to have a substantial impact on participants' responses to measures used in this study.

Next, independent-samples *t* tests were conducted to examine CL-MTRS differences by demographic items. Age, ethnicity, and gender were examined because these variables have been found significant in general reactance research, with men (e.g., Seeman, Buboltz, Jenkins, Soper,

& Woller, 2004; Woller, Buboltz, & Loveland, 2007), younger people (e.g., Hong, Giannakopoulos, Laing, & Williams, 1994), and people of color (Seeman et al., 2004; Woller et al., 2007) having higher reactance scores. There were no significant differences in CL-MTRS scores by gender, age group (34 or younger vs. 35 or older), or ethnicity (Whites compared with all other participants).

Finally, in an additional test of convergent validity, we tested whether those who rated aspects of the course and instructor as ineffective reported higher reactance scores. Due to low response rates to the items regarding perceptions of the multicultural course, all responses were collapsed into groups labeled *effective* (including ratings of *extremely effective*, *effective*, or *slightly effective*) and *ineffective* (including ratings of *extremely ineffective*, *ineffective*, or *slightly ineffective*). Bonferroni's correction was used to determine significance across the 20 tests ($p < .0025$). Six significant differences were found, with higher CL-MTRS scores for participants who rated the following as ineffective: interactive process (e.g., class discussion, role plays); content on privilege, gender identity, and racism/discrimination; instructor's ability to create a safe environment; and overall course satisfaction. All significant findings yielded a moderate effect size (.47–.70) with adequate power (.39–.80). (The complete table is available from the first author upon request.)

Discussion

In general, initial results provided tentative support for the CL-MTRS as a promising measure of multicultural training reactance. The one-factor solution accounted for 25% of the variance, which is comparable with other measures of general psychological reactance (e.g., Dowd et al., 1991; Tucker & Byers, 1987). Across the pilot and main studies, the measure had adequate internal consistency and test-retest reliability, and participant responses did not seem to be influenced by social desirability. Support for convergent validity was reflected in the significantly higher reactance scores for those who rated several aspects of their multicultural course as well as the course overall as ineffective.

A PRT perspective may explain why students with higher CL-MTRS scores rated some aspects of the course as ineffective. First, interactive course processes (e.g., class discussions, role plays) may represent activities that force students out of their comfort zones or feel more intrusive and, thus, are perceived as higher threats to freedom, leading to reactance. Faculty who teach multicultural courses have noted that a process focus can be unexpected and uncomfortable and can result in negative reactions (e.g., Arredondo, 2003; Burton & Furr, 2014; Reynolds, 2011). They also have cited several student reactions that reflect multicultural training reactance, including missing class, distorting information, and criticizing the focus on discussions and personal explorations. Second, content on privilege, gender identity, and racism/discrimination may be especially threatening for some students, as they may directly challenge beliefs about themselves. Thus, they may have experienced a perceived risk to discussing these topics/issues. Similarly, Watt et al. (2009) reported White female master's students' strong defensive reactions (e.g., denial, deflection, rationalization) in response to difficult dialogues around racism, heterosexism, and ableism. Third, the facilitator's ability to create a safe environment certainly speaks to threat, suggesting some students did not feel safe to explore their beliefs and emotions openly in the classroom. It appears that, as a result, they also rated the instructor as rigid and

unwilling to listen, responses that are characteristic of reactance. Others have highlighted the key role of the multicultural course instructor in establishing a learning environment (e.g., Priester et al., 2008) and suggested approaches to facilitating difficult dialogues in the classroom (e.g., de Anda, 2007; Sue et al., 2011; Sue, Torino, Capodilupo, Rivera, & Lin, 2009). Their suggestions seem to reflect approaches that decrease potential threat, such as faculty self-disclosing their own cultural challenges (e.g., Reynolds, 2011; Sue et al., 2009, 2011) and being flexible in their teaching role (de Anda, 2007). To date, there is no evidence that these approaches are effective in reducing reactance (Reynolds, 2011); however, the CL-MTRS provides one avenue for investigating these and other approaches.

Other results suggested a lack of convergent validity. We expected positive associations between scores on the CL-MTRS and scores on both the TRS and the MEIM-R. However, students' multicultural training reactance was not related to their general psychological reactance nor their ethnic identity exploration and commitment. In addition, CL-MTRS scores did not vary by gender, age, or race/ethnicity, as have general psychological reactance scores in other studies (e.g., Hong et al., 1994; Seeman et al., 2004; Woller et al., 2007).

Taken together, however, these expected and unexpected results suggest that multicultural training reactance may manifest differently than general psychological reactance and is perhaps a unique construct. It may be that the multicultural training context present threats to freedoms that are especially salient to students, that speak to highly valued core beliefs about oneself and others. Such an explanation seems in line with PRT, in that individuals' actions for restoring a freedom vary in intensity based on the importance associated with that freedom (J. W. Brehm, 1966; S. S. Brehm & Brehm, 1981; see also Rosenberg & Siegel, 2017). Students who are particularly committed to their beliefs about culture and diversity, then, would have strong, sometimes even hostile, reactions when those beliefs are questioned, including, as found in this study, rating "threats" to their beliefs as ineffective.

Limitations

Limited diversity in the sample may have influenced some results, especially the tests for differences by gender, age, and race/ethnicity. Only 12.9% were men, 16% were over age 34, and 27.3% were people of color, although these percentages seem somewhat representative of counseling students overall. It is not clear how many counselor education department chairs forwarded the email invitation to their students and, even more, whether students who chose to participate were different from those who chose not to participate. Thus, although the CL-MTRS appears promising, additional studies, especially with more diverse samples, are needed to more fully ascertain its reliability, validity, and factor structure. In particular, Items 1, 7, and 9 need further scrutiny, given their factor loadings and communalities; however, due to the homogeneity of our sample, we suggest keeping these items at this point. In line with most research on multicultural training, CL-MTRS items primarily suggest issues around race/ethnicity, although some items are general (e.g., "The topics in this course are irrelevant to my education") and other items name specific topics (e.g., "I will definitely adjust how I participate the day a controversial topic like sexual orientation, religion, or affirmative action is discussed"). Research on reactance specific to nonrace cultural variables (e.g., sexual orientation) and/or their interactions with race and ethnicity, may require creation of a different measure. Finally, it may be that students' low

ratings of their instructors may have reflected instructors' actual ineffectiveness in the classroom rather than students' reactance.

Implications for Research and Training

The CL-MTRS opens up new avenues for multicultural training research. The new measure is particularly relevant to investigating strategies designed to manage resistance (e.g., Kim & Lyons, 2003; Mio & Barker-Hackett, 2003; Sue et al., 2011; Tromski & Doston, 2003), conflict (Burton & Furr, 2014), and negative responses to the instructor (Reynolds, 2011), as well as specific teaching tools (e.g., simulation games, films; Jones et al., 2013). Such studies can be conducted in actual classrooms and, drawing on reactance research with undergraduates (e.g., Ball & Goodboy, 2014; Zhang & Sapp, 2013), also might be based on vignettes that isolate particular topics, instructor characteristics, teaching interventions, and communication strategies. Following suggestions from Chao et al. (2011), the CL-MTRS could be used to evaluate whether traditional approaches to multicultural instruction that focus on understanding the different "other" generate more reactance than those that "conceptualize racism as a sociocultural phenomenon that can be tackled" (p. 270). Such studies would be important steps toward generating evidence-based multicultural training practices that account for the mediating effect of reactance.

Arredondo (2003) suggested that students' responses to multicultural issues would vary based on the individual's stage of racial and cultural identity. Although our results did not support this supposition, future researchers might use identity scales that measure stages or levels of cultural identity to further assess Arredondo's idea. Multicultural training reactance also might be related to general stages of change as outlined by Prochaska and DiClemente (1982; cf. Sammons & Speight, 2008). The relationship of CL-MTRS scores to other relevant variables, such as microaggressions and cultural humility (Hook, Davis, Owen, Worthington, & Utsey, 2013), also would be informative in further understanding how multicultural training reactance is manifested. Ultimately, the intersection of students' multicultural training reactance with their levels of multicultural counseling competence, as well as their interactions with diverse clients, need to be studied. Thus, how multicultural reactance is evident in clinical supervision is another area for future exploration.

Multicultural course instructors now have additional evidence that a safe, open learning environment is critical to their effectiveness. They may want to consider both explaining and normalizing multicultural training reactance, noting that individuals will differ in what content and course activities trigger their reactance, and self-disclose their own challenges with reactance to multicultural issues. With additional validation studies, the CL-MTRS can offer instructors a method of evaluating the effectiveness of these and other multicultural training approaches.

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by a grant awarded to the first author by the Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision.

References

- Ackerman, T. (2005). *Item41 [Computer software]*. Greensboro, NC: Author.
- Aosved, A. C., & Long, P. J. (2006). Co-occurrence of rape myth acceptance, sexism, racism, homophobia, ageism, classism, and religious intolerance. *Sex Roles*, **55**, 481– 492. doi:[10.1007/s11199-006-9101-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9101-4)
- Aosved, A. C., Long, P. J., & Voller, E. K. (2009). Measuring sexism, racism, sexual prejudice, ageism, classism, and religious intolerance: The Intolerant Schema Measure. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **39**, 2321– 2354. doi:[10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00528](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00528)
- Arredondo, P. (2003). Manifestations of resistance to diversity and multiculturalism in organizations. In J. S. Mio & G. Y. Iwamasa (Eds.), *Culturally diverse mental health: The challenges of research and resistance* (pp. 83– 104). New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge.
- Ball, H., & Goodboy, A. K. (2014). An experimental investigation of the antecedents and consequences of psychological reactance in the college classroom. *Communication Education*, **63**, 192– 209.
- Brehm, J. W. (1966). *A theory of psychological reactance*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Brehm, S. S., & Brehm, J. W. (1981). *Psychological reactance: A theory of freedom and control*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Burton, S., & Furr, S. (2014). Conflict in multicultural classes: Approaches to resolving difficult dialogues. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, **53**, 97– 110. doi:[10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00051.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00051.x)
- Chao, M. M., Okazaki, S., & Hong, Y. (2011). The quest for multicultural competence: Challenges and lessons learned from clinical and organizational research. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, **5**, 263– 274.
- Coleman, M., Collings, M., & McDonald, P. (1999). Teaching anti-oppressive practice on the diploma in social work: Integrating learning. *Social Work Education*, **18**, 297– 309.
- Constantine, M. G. (2002). Racism attitudes, White racial identity attitudes, and multicultural counseling competence in school counselor trainees. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, **41**, 162– 174. doi:[10.1002/j.1556-6978.2002.tb01281.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2002.tb01281.x)
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment Research & Evaluation*, **10**, 1– 9. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.umass.edu/pare/vol10/iss1/7/>
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. (2015). *2016 CACREP standards*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, **24**, 349– 354.

- de Anda, D. (2007). Reflections on introducing students to multicultural populations and diversity content. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work*, **16**, 143– 158. doi:[10.1300/J051v16n03_12](https://doi.org/10.1300/J051v16n03_12)
- Dillard, J. P., & Shen, L. (2005). On the nature of reactance and its role in persuasive health communication. *Communication Monographs*, **72**, 144– 168.
- Dowd, E. T., Milne, C. R., & Wise, S. L. (1991). The Therapeutic Reactance Scale: A measure of psychological reactance. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, **69**, 541– 545. doi:[10.1002/j.1556-6676.1991.tb02638.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1991.tb02638.x)
- Hong, S.-M., Giannakopoulos, E., Laing, D., & Williams, N. A. (1994). Psychological reactance: Effects of age and gender. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, **134**, 223– 228.
- Hook, J. N., Davis, D. E. Owen, J., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Utsey, S. O. (2013). Cultural humility: Measuring openness to culturally diverse clients. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, **60**, 353– 366.
- Jackson, L. C. (1999). Ethnocultural resistance to multicultural training: Students and faculty. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, **5**, 27– 36.
- Jones, J. M., Sander, J. B., & Booker, K. W. (2013). Multicultural competency building: Practical solutions for training and evaluating student progress. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, **7**, 12– 22.
- Kim, B. S. K., & Lyons, H. Z. (2003). Experiential activities and multicultural counseling competence training. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, **81**, 400– 408. doi:[10.1002/j.1556-6678.2003.tb00266.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2003.tb00266.x)
- Leech, N. L., Barrett, K., & Morgan, G. A. (2005). *SPSS for intermediate statistics: Use and interpretation* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Mio, J. S., & Awakuni, G. I. (2000). *Resistance to multiculturalism: Issues and interventions*. Philadelphia, PA: Brunner/Mazel.
- Mio, J. S., & Barker-Hackett, L. (2003). Reaction papers and journal writing as techniques for assessing resistance in multicultural courses. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, **31**, 12– 19. doi:[10.1002/j.2161-1912.2003.tb00526.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2003.tb00526.x)
- Netemeyer, R. G., Bearden, W. O., & Sharma, S. (2003). *Scaling procedures: Issues and applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Paone, T. R., Malott, K. M., & Barr, J. J. (2015). Assessing the impact of a race-based course on counseling students: A quantitative study. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, **43**, 206– 220. doi:[10.1002/jmcd.12015](https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12015)
- Phinney, J. S. (1992). The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, **7**, 156– 176.
- Phinney, J. S., & Ong, A. D. (2007). Conceptualization and measurement of ethnic identity: Current status and future directions. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, **54**, 271– 281.

- Priester, P. E., Jones, J. E., Jackson-Bailey, C. M., Jana-Masri, A., Jordan, E. X., & Metz, A. J. (2008). An analysis of content and instructional strategies in multicultural counseling courses. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 36*, 29–39. doi:[10.1002/j.2161-1912.2008.tb00067.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2008.tb00067.x)
- Prochaska, J. O., & DiClemente, C. C. (1982). Transtheoretical therapy: Toward a more integrated model of change. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice, 19*, 276–288.
- Reynolds, A. L. (2011). Understanding the perceptions and experiences of faculty who teach multicultural counseling courses: An exploratory study. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 5*, 167–174.
- Rosenberg, B. D., & Siegel, J. T. (2017). A 50-year review of psychological reactance theory: Do not read this article. *Motivation Science, 4*, 281–300. doi:[10.1037/mot0000091](https://doi.org/10.1037/mot0000091)
- Sammons, C. C., & Speight, S. L. (2008). A qualitative investigation of graduate-student changes associated with multicultural counseling courses. *The Counseling Psychologist, 36*, 814–838. doi:[10.1177/0011000008316036](https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000008316036)
- Seeman, E. A., Buboltz, W. C., Jenkins, S. M., Soper, B., & Woller, K. (2004). Ethnic and gender differences in psychological reactance: The importance of reactance in multicultural counseling. *Counseling Psychology Quarterly, 17*, 167–176. doi:[10.1080/09515070410001728316](https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070410001728316)
- Seward, D. X. (2014). Multicultural course pedagogy: Experiences of master's-level students of color. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 53*, 62–79. doi:[10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00049.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2014.00049.x)
- Smith, T. B., Constantine, M. G., Dunn, T. W., Dinehart, J. M., & Montoya, J. A. (2006). Multicultural education in the mental health professions: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*, 132–145.
- Sue, D. W., Rivera, D. P., Watkins, N. L., Kim, R. H., Kim, S., & Williams, C. D. (2011). Racial dialogues: Challenges faculty of color face in the classroom. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17*, 331–340.
- Sue, D. W., Torino, G. C., Capodilupo, C. M., Rivera, D. P., & Lin, A. I. (2009). How White faculty perceive and react to difficult dialogues on race: Implications for education and training. *The Counseling Psychologist, 37*, 1090–1115. doi:[10.1177/0011000009340443](https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000009340443)
- Szymanski, D. M. (2003). The Feminist Supervision Scale: A rational/theoretical approach. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 27*, 221–232. doi:[10.1111/1471-6402.00102](https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.00102)
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tidwell, R. (2004). The “no-show” phenomenon and the issue of resistance among African American female patients at an urban health care center. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 26*, 1–12.

- Tromski, D., & Doston, G. (2003). Interactive drama: A method for experiential multicultural training. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, **31**, 52– 62.
doi:[10.1002/j.2161-1912.2003.tb00531.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2003.tb00531.x)
- Tucker, R. K., & Byers, P. Y. (1987). Factor validity of Merz's Psychological Reactance Scale. *Psychological Reports*, **61**, 811– 815.
- Walsh, W. B., & Betz, N. E. (1994). *Tests and assessments* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Watt, S. K., Curtis, G. C., Drummond, J., Kellogg, A. H., Lozano, A., Nicoli, G. T., & Rosas, M. (2009). Privileged identity exploration: Examining counselor trainees' reactions to difficult dialogues. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, **49**, 86– 105.
doi:[10.1002/j.1556-6978.2009.tb00090.x](https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2009.tb00090.x)
- Woller, K. M. P., Buboltz, W. C., & Loveland, J. M. (2007). Psychological reactance: Examination across age, ethnicity, and gender. *American Journal of Psychology*, **120**, 15– 24.
- Zhang, Q., & Sapp, D. A. (2013). Psychological reactance and resistance intention in the classroom: Effects of perceived request politeness and legitimacy, relationship distance, and teacher credibility. *Communication Education*, **62**, 1– 25.