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In this study, the researcher examined the levels of cultural awareness and knowledge among graduate students enrolled in a counseling program at Mississippi State University. A secondary purpose was to assess differences in the level of cultural awareness between Caucasian and African American graduate students enrolled in this counseling program. The study continued the work of Cottrell (2004) who examined undergraduate student’s levels of cultural awareness and knowledge using the Culture Shock Inventory (CSI). Archival data from his study included a sample of 665 undergraduate students. The sample was extended to include 200 graduate students in a counseling program at Mississippi State University. The data were analyzed using descriptive and bivariate analyses, t tests, for the group of undergraduate and graduate students on their levels of cultural awareness. A multivariate analysis, MANOVA procedure, followed by eight univariate tests, was conducted to study the difference
between the two groups, undergraduate and graduate students, and to determine if differences existed between African American and Caucasian American graduate students in counseling.

Results from the $t$-tests for the undergraduate group indicated that these students had low levels of cultural awareness. The $t$ tests for the graduate students also indicated low levels of cultural awareness. The graduate students appeared to lack knowledge of different cultures and seemed to endorse high levels of Western ethnocentrism. The MANOVA procedure indicated statistically significant differences between the undergraduate and graduate students in cultural awareness, with the graduate students in counseling having higher levels of cultural awareness than the undergraduate students. No statistically significant differences in cultural awareness were found between the African and Caucasian American graduate students in counseling.

The results of the study appeared to indicate that training in counseling increased graduate counseling student’s observational skills and sensitivity to behavioral cues in dealing with persons from other countries and cultures. However, the counseling students in the study appeared to retain an underlying Western ethnocentrism and a substantial cultural close-mindedness that would impede the counseling relationship when working with persons from foreign countries and other cultural heritages. Implications for the counseling training field were discussed.
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The purpose of this study was to examine the level of cultural awareness and knowledge among undergraduates and graduate students enrolled in a counseling program at Mississippi State University. A secondary purpose was to assess differences in the level of cultural awareness between Caucasian and African American graduate students enrolled in a counseling program.

The study operationally defined cultural awareness and knowledge as an understanding and acceptance of individuals from one particular cultural group toward those who belong to other cultural groups – their traditions, beliefs, behaviors, learning styles, values, and priorities (Reddin & Rowell, 1995). Although cultural awareness can be defined as religious affiliation, socioeconomic status, gender preference, multiple-heritages (due to global immigration), sexual orientation, national origin, race, culture, ethnicity, age, disability, and native language (Pedersen, 1988; Speight, Myers, Cox, & Highlen, 1991), this study focused only on national origin and those cultural properties defined by national heritage.

In recent years, changes in the cultural composition of the United States has emphasized the importance of cultural understanding across the society. This transformation of the society has necessitated the development of multicultural education.
for professional educators and mental health service providers. According to Arredondo, Tovar-Blank and Parham (2008) the core of multicultural education in the United States is developing the multicultural competence of professional educators, researchers, and trainers. To clarify, multicultural education was defined by Bennet (1999) as:

a representative foundation of central democratic and indigenous American ideologies that accepts and recognizes individual difference; values the comprehensive, equitable, and dignified treatment of individuals; and fulfills accountability to the global community and environment. (p.820)

Asher (2002) stated that multicultural education addresses the ongoing tension in areas like race, ethnicity, culture, gender, sexuality, and socio-economic status, by initiating open and self-reflective discussions that stretch the student’s thinking beyond accepted conventional limits. In this way, multicultural education breaks through awkward silences by encouraging students to engage in self-examination and personal reflection.

Asher (2002) further indicated that multicultural education ventures into new avenues of thought by addressing past oppression, such as that of self and other, gay and straight, dominant and minority. Multicultural education is designed to open up a culture of denial and avoidance, forcing participants to reject ideas, such as “see no race, differences of sexuality, or relations of power, and hear no talk about any of them” (p.71). Nieto (2004) stressed the importance of multicultural education boldly moving toward “affirming diversity” (p.91). Asher (2007) challenged the notion of clarifying the intricate and ambiguous tensions of multiculturalism by generating a culture of “do ask,
do tell” (p.71) thus dismantling the façade of the accepted norm and learning through conflict (Kumashiro, 2000).

According to Landreman, King, Rasmussen, and Jiang (2007), colleges and universities in the United States profess to be committed to preparing students to live in a largely diverse society. Although multicultural education has been stressed on university campuses, there are gaps in how students learn. Landreman et al. observed that attempting to develop multicultural awareness and understanding in students was complicated by plans that were ‘over-simplistic’ in defining and consequently developing multicultural competence. Landreman (2003) indicated that although well-intentioned, current attempts at teaching multicultural competence were awkward and ineffective in helping students achieve behaviors that were culturally sensitive.

Multicultural competence through multicultural education has been emphasized by the codes of ethics of many professions, e.g. American Counseling Association (ACA), American Psychological Association (APA), Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), American Board of Nursing Specialties (ABNS), Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). Accreditation standards have been amended to emphasize a commitment to multicultural competence in the standards for their professions.

Smith (2004) and Smith et al. (2006) stressed the increasing emphasis on multicultural education as a fundamental part of professional training in counseling and
psychology as the population in the United States continues to diversify. Responding to the changing demographics in the U.S., both the American Counseling Association (2005) and the American Psychological Association (2003) have endorsed specific guidelines for developing multicultural competency in working with historically ignored (culturally diverse) populations. Sue et al. (1998) stated that counselors and psychotherapists should:

- recognize diversity in our society and embrace a cross-cultural approach in support of the worth, dignity, potential, and uniqueness of each individual...
- Counselors do not condone or engage in discrimination based on age, color, culture, disability, ethnic group, gender, race, region, sexual orientation.

(p. 84)

For the past two decades, the American Counseling Association (ACA), and the Council for Accreditation for Counseling and Related Education Program (CACREP) have acknowledged the significant value of developing multicultural competence in professional counselors (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992). The ACA Code of Ethics (2005) mandated that all counselors appreciate that corroborating networks adopt different meanings in the lives of clients, and therefore counselors subtly embrace the support, understanding, participation of others (e.g., religious or spiritual leaders, community leaders, family members, friends) as a substantial resource whenever required, with client consent.
In 2001, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (2001) revised their standards mandating multicultural training both in curriculum as well as in clinical skills. The 2009 CACREP Standards expanded counselor’s skills to become not only aware of the impact of diversity issues, but to be advocates for social justice in the lives of their culturally diverse clients.

To work effectively with clients, counselors must constantly assess their multicultural awareness, knowledge, and comfort levels. Counseling students should explore differences emerging from varied religious and spiritual beliefs, socioeconomic statuses, gender issues, multiple-heritage populations (due to global immigration), sexual orientation, national origin, race, culture, ethnicity, age, disability statuses, and primary language (Pedersen, 1988; Speight et al., 1991). Additionally, the inherent worldview of the counseling student in relation to these ever-changing factors must be addressed through multicultural education that emphasizes multicultural awareness and knowledge.

Hill (2003) endorsed an ongoing need for counseling students to explore their personal self-awareness and knowledge of diversity issues. Exploration entails examining privilege as well as oppression, power as well as prejudice, benefits as well as biases, what is appropriate as well as what is inappropriate in the student’s cultural background and those of potential clients. Hill believed that adding such an emphasis on self-investigation encourages both student and educator to develop insight into the conscious and unconscious gaps in students’ insight. Multicultural awareness and knowledge is an essential introductory step in multicultural education and promoting multicultural
competence that will develop into an eagerness by students to understand the perspectives and stances of clients.

Multicultural Competence

Multicultural competency is defined as “translating knowledge and self-awareness of multicultural issues into practice” (Rogers, Hoffman, & Wade, 1998, p.224). Pope and Reynolds (1997) described multicultural competence as the development of multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills in order to create multicultural campuses. Pope, Reynolds, and Mueller (2004) emphasized the incorporation of multicultural knowledge, along with personal exploration of multicultural awareness and skills, as vital for the development of effective multicultural practitioners. Rew, Becker, Cookston, Khosropour, and Martinez (2003) stated that the four components of multicultural competence include: (a) multicultural awareness, (b) multicultural sensitivity, (c) multicultural knowledge, and (d) multicultural skills. Multicultural awareness is an intrapersonal dimension that is affective in nature, whereas multicultural sensitivity is an attitudinal and interpersonal dimension. Multicultural knowledge comprises the cognitive component of multicultural competence, and the behavioral dimension is multicultural skills and practice. For counseling students all dimensions are essential, but the piece that has been overlooked in multicultural education is an initial assessment of their basic multicultural awareness and knowledge.
Developing multicultural competence in counseling students requires them to have an understanding and awareness of their personal values, beliefs, attitudes, biases, and prejudices (Colvin-Burque, Zugazaga, & Davis-Maye, 2007). When students are aware of their own particular worldviews they can appreciate and respect the worldview of others (Hill, 2003).

Counselors who are not aware of their personal issues regarding multiculturalism may engage in “deceptive tolerance,” a phenomenon that occurs when an individual is not aware of the ways their own unique cultural experiences influence their underlying beliefs and actions toward persons of another race or culture (Middleton et al., 2005). These beliefs and attitudes (e.g. White privilege, Black oppression) may become underlying triggers that shape and modify the counselor’s behaviors in the relationship with the client. The counselor should learn from their clients regarding their cultural values and perceptions, rather than trying to be an “expert” in areas in which they are unclear or uninformed (Pope-Davis and Constantine, 1996, p.113).

Sandhu and Looby (2003) affirmed that counselor multicultural competency and awareness are acquired through multicultural education and training. Without proper training, counselors only have a pseudo-awareness or knowledge, which is not conducive to effective counseling or therapy. Arredondo and Arciniega (2001) also endorsed the importance of training programs engaging in “systematic self-reflection and evaluation of existing practices as a preliminary step to revising curricula” (p.265).
Theoretical Framework

Two theoretical frameworks form the basis of this study: (a) Banks’s transformative approach based on Bloom’s taxonomy, and (b) Rogers’s client-centered theory. In Banks’s (1999) transformative approach (e.g., affective and attitudinal change), multicultural education includes: (a) the assumptions of one’s knowledge and beliefs (cognitive dimension); (b) the emotional links to such assumptions (affective dimension); and (c) the resulting overt and covert behaviors from these assumptions and resulting emotions (e.g., psychomotor or behavioral dimension). This necessitates the ability to distinguish between these three relevant factors, in order to effectively identify any deficiency in the three areas (Sabnani & Ponterotto, 1992). Therefore in order to initiate any new developments in multicultural educational factors, specific attitudes will have to be targeted for necessary alignment of these changes with the required end affects (Bevacqua, Johnson, Kim, & Wood, 1996).

Banks’s (1999) transformative approach is geared toward attitudinal and behavioral change, which is an important component of multicultural education. It incorporates the domains of affect and psychomotor or behavioral learning, which are essential to personalizing learning and changing biased and prejudicial attitudes (Munroe & Pearson, 2006). Traditional cognitive methods of evaluation may be ineffective in detecting and resolving experiences in the emotional and attitudinal realm (Kendall, 1996), because the areas targeted are prompted by unique social, moral and cultural environments (Arnold, 2000). Banks’s transformative approach is able to examine
changes in behaviors, which is currently the aim of institutions of higher education (Avramidis, Bayliss, & Burden, 2000; Banks & Banks, 1995).

The second theory is Rogers’s client-centered model. A primary focus of Rogers’s client-centered theory relates to the therapeutic relationship between counselor and client, which is seen as necessary and sufficient for therapeutic change. Rogers (1951) claimed that his theory was inclusive of culture because of: (a) its emphasis on non-evaluation by the therapist, and (b) its focus on observation of behavior in the therapeutic relationship. Such a counseling approach aligns with the foundations of multicultural counseling and multicultural counselor education as it transcends the influence of culture by placing the control in therapy on the client and his or her issues, values, and needs.

MacDougall (2002) stated that Rogers’s contribution had been his continued position that culturally competent counselors actively participate in an ongoing process of awareness of “their own assumptions about human nature, values, biases, and so forth” (Sue & Sue, 1990, p.49), attempting to understand and clarify their personal world views. Although Rogers recognized the significance of each counselor’s values and assumptions, he reminded counselors that it was of paramount importance that the client’s worth, dignity, and values be respected in the therapeutic relationship. As such the counselor is challenged to accommodate to the values, beliefs, assumptions of the client.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the level of cultural awareness and knowledge among undergraduates and graduate students enrolled in a counseling program at Mississippi State University. A secondary purpose was to assess differences in the level of cultural awareness between Caucasian and African American graduate students enrolled in a counseling program.

Research Questions

1. What is the level of cultural awareness and knowledge of undergraduate students at Mississippi State University?
2. What is the level of cultural awareness and knowledge of graduate students in a counseling program at Mississippi State University?
3. Is there a difference in the level of cultural awareness between undergraduate and graduate students who are in a counseling program at Mississippi State University?
4. Is there a racial difference in the level of cultural awareness and knowledge of Caucasian and African American graduate students in a counseling program at Mississippi State University?
Statement of the Problem

This study has relevance because of the social changes that have emerged in U.S. society in the early part of the 21st century. Many universities are not preparing undergraduates and graduates to deal with the multicultural issues that have become a focus of this decade. Atkinson and Lowe (1995) pointed out that the mental health professions were inundated with a plethora of cultural diversity courses in the late 1980s. Long overdue changes in professional guidelines were made hurriedly without considering (a) what counseling students already knew about culturally diverse populations; (b) how to assess existing knowledge and behaviors; and (c) what types of teaching approaches and basic skills should be taught. This precipitous approach has resulted in ambiguity in personal and professional change in student trainees and counselors in many cases (Atkinson & Lowe; Ponterotto & Casas, 1991). These authors believe that little groundwork has been made for the introduction of multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills in counseling programs. Counseling students are expected to immediately understand, incorporate, and integrate knowledge and skills that they are often ill prepared to assimilate. To complicate matters further, there is little attempt to assess their knowledge and skills in these areas before providing the required instruction. Without this initial assessment neither student nor educator can determine necessary areas for change and growth.

Hays, Dean, and Chang (2007) asserted that although ethical practice demands an awareness and knowledge of various cultural constructs, research indicated that such an
investigation of self-awareness and self-knowledge may be minimal in counselor training programs. Many professors tacitly assume that their counseling students have multicultural awareness and knowledge and do not actively assess or explore these vital issues with their students. Self-exploration of cultural attitudes and inherent beliefs promotes introspection that enhances personal and professional growth (Kiselica, 1998).

According to Neville, Worthington, and Spanierman (2001), with such self-examination, counseling students will consciously examine their stereotypical attitudes and behavior, while acquiring a broader perspective of the beliefs and values of others. In short, counselors become open to acquiring culturally specific knowledge from their clients as opposed to imposing their own ethnocentric values as part of therapy.

Pewewardy and Frey (2002) stated that such attitudes unless examined will remain unchanged and fixed. The counseling student may not perceive any need to develop a keener awareness that the perspectives of potential clients are quite different than their own. The therapeutic relationship is thus impaired, ultimately causing therapy to be ineffective because of insensitivity to the cultural background of the client.

Justification for Study

challenged the mental health field to make necessary improvements in addressing the
issue of cultural awareness and knowledge with professional mental health workers.
There are several reasons for the importance of this study: (a) it adds to the literature; (b)
it encourages purposeful curricular development; (c) it emphasizes the emerging cultural
climate of the new global village as opposed to the New World only; (d) it challenges
counselor educators to re-examine their own and their students’ worldview.

Limitations
This study was limited by the unequal size of the two groups: graduate and
undergraduate students. Therefore generalizability to similar groups is limited. Because
sample sizes were unequal, they may affect the significance of the results. Data were
collected via self-report and as such the accuracy and thoroughness in completing the
questionnaire is subject to response bias with regard to multicultural attitudes.

These findings will also be limited by the reliability of the instrument used.
Further it must be mentioned that these data were subjective, because they are dependent
on the feelings and personal experience of each respondent. Therefore, results of this
study must be generalized with caution when used with other student populations.

Another limitation emerges from the fact that the group used for norming the
instrument (Culture Shock Inventory) consisted of 648 first level White American
managers. This characteristics of managers may be a limitation, because of the
differences created by gender, age, maturity and experience between the sample used for norming and the students who were part of this study.

A final limitation emerges from homogeneity of the scales on the Culture Shock Inventory. There is some overlap in defining the level of cultural awareness in the eight scales of the instrument.

**Definition of Terms**

There were a number of terms used in this study that should be operationally defined for the purposes of this research. The following list includes those terms and an operational definition of the terms in this study.

- **Cultural diversity:** Cultural diversity is defined as an “awareness and acceptance of differences in communication, life view, and definitions of health and family” (Cross, Bazron, Dennis, & Isaacs, 1989, p.19).

- **Multicultural competency:** Multicultural competency is defined as being skilled to translate knowledge and self-awareness of multicultural issues into practice (Rogers, Hoffman, & Wade, 1998). The multicultural process is sometimes referred to as multicultural competence, that is how effectively the multicultural content is applied in relationships (Smith et al.)

- **Multicultural awareness** is the affective dimension of multicultural (cultural) competency (Rew et al., 2003.)
• Multicultural knowledge is the cognitive dimension of multicultural (cultural) competency (Rew et al., 2003.)

• Multicultural skills is the behavioral dimension of multicultural (cultural) competency ((Rew et al., 2003.)

• Multicultural sensitivity is the attitudinal dimension of multicultural (cultural) competency (Rew et al., 2003.)

• Multicultural education is defined as a fundamental foundation of democratic and local (diverse) American ideologies that embrace individual differences, respect the impartial treatment of individuals, and at the same time satisfy accountability to the global community and the environment (Bennet, 1999)

• Worldview: Worldview is defined as the perception of individuals’ relationship with their environment / world around them, contributed by their peculiar cultural backgrounds, socio-political influence, as well their distinct life experiences (Brown & Landrum-Brown, 1995).
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to examine the level of cultural awareness and knowledge among undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in a counseling program at Mississippi State University. A secondary purpose was to assess differences in the level of cultural awareness between Caucasian and African American graduate students enrolled in a counseling program.

For the purposes of this study, cultural awareness or multicultural awareness was operationally defined as knowledge, awareness, and acceptance that individuals from one particular cultural group maintain about those who belong to other cultural groups – their traditions, beliefs, behaviors, learning styles, values, and priorities (Reddin & Rowell, 1995.) This definition is narrow and based on the idea of “relating to, consisting of, or participating in the cultures of different countries, ethnic groups, or religions” and promoting the integration of persons from these groups into the society as a whole (Encarta World English Dictionary, 2009). Although cultural or multicultural awareness has been broadened by some authors to include socioeconomic status, gender preference, multiple-heritages, sexual orientation, culture, ethnicity, age, disability, and native language (Pedersen, 1988; Speight et al., 1991), this study focused only on national origins and those cultural properties defined by national heritage of persons. For this
study, national origin is considered to be persons who are from countries other than the United States and cultural properties that are different from those common in the United States. For example, persons who are from Indonesia and the cultural and ethnic properties of Indonesia. The literature review includes the following topics: (a) definition of multiculturalism, (b) multiculturalism in education, (c) theories of multicultural education in counseling, (d) general multicultural competence.

**Definition of Multiculturalism**

Multiculturalism, a buzzword in education today, has been broadened to include such diverse areas as gender, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, national origin and a myriad of other individual qualities of difference in individuals or groups (Pedersen, 1988; Speight et al., 1991), such as race, culture, ethnicity, age, disability, and language. According to Banks (2000), multiculturalism is a continuing process of questioning, revising, and struggling to create and reinforce impartiality in every aspect of student life.

In the classroom, multiculturalism means scrutinizing materials used for teaching to eliminate biases or stereotypes based on cultural, racial, or ethnic origin (Banks, 2000). The stance of the instructor is clarified by asking him or herself difficult questions like: ‘Are all students served fairly? Are lessons discriminated chosen? Are the expectations of students different based on their race, ethnicity, nationality, class, gender, sexual orientation, religion, or any other division?’ In other words, multiculturalism combats
racism along with other forms of oppression by eliminating internal sources of bias and prejudice that negatively impact on educational processes. Multiculturalism encourages and promotes economic and societal fairness for all groups with the broader mission to promote social justice and interpersonal equity in a diverse national arena.

Helms (1994) and Locke (1990) defined multiculturalism solely based on racial and ethnic issues, with a goal to eliminate racism from education, whereas others (Pedersen, 1988; Speight et al., 1991) broadened this definition to include gender, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, as well as national origin. Lopez-Mulnix and Mulnix (2006) defined multiculturalism as the “effective awareness, sensitivity, and practices that embrace human diversity through recognizing strength in different cultural values, styles of communication, interactions, and time constructions” (p.7). Lopez-Mulnix and Mulnix related multiculturalism to an individual’s or an organization’s commitment to increased awareness and knowledge of diversity in human interactions. Multiculturalism becomes an ongoing process of questioning the world from a critical and radical perspective, and a struggle to create an atmosphere of equity and equality for all parties, in this case students, to attain their maximum educational potential (Banks, 2000; Bennet, 2001). Simply, multiculturalism emphasizes acknowledging and respecting differences in individuals of different national origins who are from different countries with different cultural traditions and customs.
Multicultural Competence

In practice, multiculturalism is becoming aware of the dissimilarity of one’s perspective from those of others, particularly in the presence of diverse cultures (Smith, Richards, Granley, & Obiakor, 2004). The process is invisible and internal, indicating that multiculturalism is more about the process of managing differences and establishing unity, than merely identifying the content of differences and areas of unity. This multicultural process is sometimes referred to as the development of multicultural competence, or how effectively multicultural content becomes used and applied in relationships between peoples (Smith, 2004).

Lopez, Kopelowicz and Canive (2002) supported a process model of multicultural competence because of its advantage over a content model. In contrast to a content model with its emphasis on merely recognizing the cultural aspects of different groups, a process model identifies and actively discourages cultural stereotypes. Thus, multiculturally competent professionals become aware of their cultural views and biases and learn to modify their behaviors to accommodate to the world views and cultural issues of others.

In conclusion, the content model of multicultural competence documents current cultural stereotypes, whereas the process model poses difficult questions with designs for change, beginning with awareness of human diversity. Teaching, using, and facilitating the content and process models together promotes a balanced approach to multicultural competence in education.
Multiculturalism in Education

Multiculturalism in education has emerged from a need to develop an understanding and awareness of the perspectives of diverse groups in the students and teachers of the 21st century. Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, & Gurin (2002) stated that the urgency and priority in education is to generate ‘interculturally’ (multiculturally) competent individuals due to increasing global interdependence. Gilroy (2003) stated that in the United States the structure of the workforce has changed and employers hope that college graduates will reflect that diversity. According to Bruffee (1993), since the world is undoubtedly changing, traditional college and university education that is founded on cognitively-based assumptions are out-dated because these ideas do not prepare the student for the 21st century, nor do they promote a global perspective.

At the University of Michigan, policies were developed to foster awareness and understanding of persons from diverse backgrounds and cultures. Supporting these policies, a team of Fortune 500 companies (Fortune 500 corporations, 2000) stated that students with an understanding of diversity are ready to:

- understand, learn from, and collaborate with others from a variety of racial, ethnic and cultural backgrounds; demonstrate creative problem solving by integrating differing perspectives; exhibit the skills required for good teamwork; and
- demonstrate more effective responsiveness to the needs of all types of consumers.

(p. 6)
King and Baxter-Magolda (2005) further stated that with the ongoing reporting of racially motivated hate crimes on university campuses, there is a need to determine effective ways of helping students acquire multicultural understanding. Anger and hate crimes emerge in an atmosphere of confusion and fear, which can be alleviated by a focus on awareness and knowledge of the diversity issues and cultural differences of other students and faculty.

The accreditation standards of the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB, 2004) pledged its “commitment to the concept that diversity in people and ideas enhanced the educational experience in every management education program” (p. 9). In the past two decades, the American Counseling Association (ACA), American Psychological Association (APA), and the Council for Accreditation for Counseling and Related Education Program (CACREP), have acknowledged the value of multicultural education in the life and training of counselors (Speight, Thomas, Kennel, & Anderson, 1995; Sue, Arredondo et al., 1992). In academia, particularly in programs for professional training, there is a need for multicultural education that embraces the perspectives of others from different and diverse cultures and promotes a healthy interdependence and appreciation of the heritage of those persons.

According to Banks (2000) multicultural education affords students from different backgrounds the necessary skills to work, contribute, and be a part of a culturally diverse society. Griffin (1999) emphasized that since 1960, the goal of multicultural education remained unchanged: the transformation of America in which individuals of every race,
culture, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, as well as New Age and other nonviolent ideological groups, are accepted and celebrated, and at the same time provided with equal rights and equal opportunities. The very essence of multicultural education is based on cooperative human relations and fostering an environment of acceptance, understanding, cooperation, and equity among people (Colangelo, Foxley, & Dustin, 1979).

Bennet (1999) defined multicultural education as a fundamental foundation of democratic and local American ideologies, embracing individual differences, respecting the impartial treatment of individuals, and satisfying accountability to the global community and the environment. Bennet (2001) further stated that multicultural education emerged from four principles. According to Bennet, the first principle is the theory of cultural pluralism (Kallen 1924; Ruiz, 1991) that idealizes a society in which each ethnic or diverse group preserves its own heritage in the larger picture of democracy and belonging. Although realistically ethnic or diverse groups may be expected to compromise in certain areas for the sake of maintaining harmony in the larger society and ‘national identity’, this principle assumes that every culture and diversity is acknowledged and respected by the larger society.

Another idea emphasizes that every individual in every diverse group is able to reach his or her highest potential. The principles of ending of racism and sexism, along with every other forms of discrimination or prejudice and the basic ideals of social justice contribute to embracing multiple diversities (e.g. race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, etc.). Another of these principles encourages consciously
eliminating any organizational inequity by developing cultural affirmations in teaching as well as in the learning process. Inclusion becomes the key and is translated into the curriculum development, classroom teaching, interactional management, and evaluation of learning. Each student’s cultural perspectives are given consideration, respect, and value (Pai, 1990). The final principle encourages a vision of equity and excellence in education that promotes maximized learning for all students. In this environment all students enjoy the same opportunity to realize their full personal and vocational potentials (Gay, 2000).

**Limitations in Multicultural Education**

For multicultural education to be effective, the curriculum and course work should include interaction with persons from diverse and varied backgrounds. Flowers (2003) found that master’s level students in student affairs programs in counseling were not trained to work with or to plan programs that encouraged and increased understanding of diversity or to interact appropriately with diverse populations. Flowers further asserted that these students were not equipped to support and assimilate culturally different students into higher education settings. This researcher recommended that a plan for diversity integration be included in the curriculum to prepare these counseling students to meet the needs of American universities in the 21st century. Other researchers, Whitt, Edison, and Pascarella (2001) and Gifford, Rhoades, and Shelton (2001) emphasized that teaching about diversity was inadequate without real-life
experiences with persons from diverse backgrounds. Concepts of multiculturalism have no basis in reality if the student has not experienced the perspectives of individuals with backgrounds different than their own.

Courses in multicultural education do not guarantee that changes in student’s attitudes or behaviors will be forthcoming (Allport, 1979). All aspects of life are influenced by culture, thus it is important to examine the unconscious motivators of action that are so embedded that the individual often is not aware of their influence on personal beliefs, values and subsequent decision making (Banks, 2001). To successfully create a multicultural experience requires not only examining the specifics of the cultures of others, but uncovering the layers of attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors that emerge from one’s own culture and disclosing the cultural framework that constitutes cultural relativism (Hardy, 1993).

According to Lopez-Mulnix and Mulnix (2006), although some universities have successfully integrated a study of different cultures into their curriculum, others have much to do to fully incorporate multiculturalism into their university life. The authors recommended reorganization that focuses on a systems perspective. Lopez-Mulniz and Mulnix encouraged universities to approach this issue with a worldview, namely institutions of higher education where leadership is decentralized, collaborative, and innovative, thus embracing multiculturalism. Munroe and Pearson (2006) agreed that even though colleges and universities want to diversify their learning environment, research reinforces the need for ingenuity in academic instruction and a practical
knowledge of diversity. Hooks (2000) asserted that current courses in multiculturalism or
diversity do not provide the breadth and depth of experience that students need, because
many university leaders have rarely experienced prejudice, oppression, and bias from a
personal perspective and are unaware of the profound personal impact that it creates.

**Theories of Multicultural Education in Counselor Education**

In developing courses in multicultural education, Ladson-Billings (1999)
indicated that “critical race theory” was an essential component. Critical race theory
basically challenges using the “White experience” as the criterion or the norm of
behavior when considering the experience of persons of color or those from other cultural
or ethnic experiences. Critical race theory emphasizes the legitimacy of the experiences
of persons from diverse cultures as having as much validity as those from the White
culture.

Another component of multicultural education is *critical pedagogy* (Giroux &
McLaren, 1994). Critical pedagogy refers to a theory of education, teaching and learning
practice that raises students’ critical consciousness regarding social justice and the
prevailing conditions for persons of other cultural groups. A meaningful dialogue that
addresses the experiences of instructor and student is designed for clarification of the
issues involved for persons who are not part of the majority culture. Brown (1997) stated
that critical pedagogy activates students to be proactive and involved in the pragmatism
of the global community.
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To clarify how multicultural education has been integrated into the curriculum for counseling students, two theories are discussed that emphasize universality, personal awareness and self-knowledge. The concepts for this study were based on (a) Banks’s transformative approach in education, (b) and Rogers’s client-centered theory in counseling.

The goal of Banks’s (2000, 2001) transformative approach in multicultural education focused on (a) allowing students to become aware of their ethnic, racial, and cultural identity, (b) encouraging students to venture beyond their ethnic and cultural boundaries, (c) empowering students to develop a commitment to social justice, and (d) cultivating advocacy skills that allow students to actively pursue equality and equity for citizens of the nation and the world. This transformative approach emphasizes content that focuses on an understanding and appreciation of other ethnic and cultural groups, rather than an attitude that marginalizes and devalues others.

In this way, multicultural awareness and knowledge are encouraged in the classroom. Students appreciate how knowledge is constructed, by reflecting on experiences, values, and perspectives of their own cultures, whereas the differing perspectives and experiences of minority cultures are meaningfully interjected together with discussions of the majority culture, heritage, and traditions. An awareness of the blending of many cultures is thus achieved. Students learn to value the differences and
similarities between their culture and that of other persons, while maintaining an open-minded and respectful appreciation of the perspectives of others (Banks, 2000; 2001).

Multicultural awareness is encouraged through hands-on activities, such as art activities, role-playing, and vignettes that promote the cognitive and moral development of students. For example, a discussion of the multiple meanings of the holiday, Thanksgiving, could include a dialogue between persons from the Native American perspective and those who held the White settler’s perspective. This exchange of differing ideas might prompt an exploration of cultural conflicts, serving as a source of enlightenment to persons from the majority culture who have no ambivalence when thinking about the meaning of this peculiarly North American holiday (Banks, 1999). Approaching multicultural education in this way increases knowledge and awareness by developing the student’s ability to view cultural issues through the process of critical reflection.

For effective and long-term attitudinal and behavioral change, Banks advocated using Bloom’s (1999) taxonomy (i.e., cognitive, affective, psychomotor, behavioral change) from which decisions in areas of behavioral and attitudinal change in multicultural education could be monitored. Banks (2000; 2001) suggested that the methodology of instruction in multicultural education be coupled with teaching by providing resourceful facilitation that is empathic and experiential. Athnases, Christiano, and Lay, (1995) agreed that this style of instruction would help students internalize their personal growth and learning. In short, multicultural education fosters an ongoing
exploration, growing awareness, and internalized knowledge of the various constructs of culture, leading the student to personal and professional introspection and growth (Kiselica, 1998).

**Rogerian Theory**

Roger’s client-centered theory expects an interchange between the client and the counselor based on the counselor’s acceptance of, respect for, and understanding of the client’s personal values, unique perspectives, and cultural milieu (James & Foster, 2006). This model focuses on the importance of the counselor’s ability to develop a therapeutic relationship rather than mastery of a set of therapeutic skills. The client’s progress emerges in an atmosphere that encourages the client to take the lead in the therapeutic relationship (Hays, Dean, & Chang, 2007). Glauzer and Bozart (2001) asserted that the critical core of multicultural counseling competency lies in the counselor’s self-acceptance, through self-awareness and self-knowledge, as well as an acceptance of the client and his/her cultural perspectives.

Although most counseling theories acknowledge the value of the counseling relationship, it is Rogers (1957) who defined the counseling relationship as necessary and sufficient for progress and growth in therapy. The client-centered therapeutic relationship is based on empathy, unconditional positive regard, and genuineness, which necessitates a relationship that is devoid of game-playing or hidden agendas. Empathy was defined by Rogers (1980) as a state in which the counselor enters into the inner
world of the client, in a sense becoming the client and accepting the burdens and anxieties of the client. This method necessitates acceptance and understanding of the perspective and the values of the client. In the therapeutic relationship, the Rogerian therapist suspends his or her personal ideas and beliefs and enters the perceptual field of the client without judgment, censure, or disparagement.

Patterson (2004) referred to Rogers’s client-centered theory as the “universal system of counseling or psychotherapy” as it is based on five crucial counselor qualities: (a) empathic understanding, (b) respect or unconditional positive regard for the client, (c) genuineness, (d) communication of empathy, and (e) structuring. The empathetic understanding of the client’s experiences is related to entering the client’s world by understanding the groups to which that client belongs (i.e., cultural, national heritage, racial). Unconditional positive regard or respect refers to trusting the client to be self-directed and capable of leading the counseling process by making responsible choices, formulating sensible decisions, and resolving personal problems.

The genuineness of the Rogerian model requires the counselor to relinquish the role of expert and deal with the client in an authentic, direct, and honest manner. The counselor can enter into the therapeutic relationship in an open and uncritical way, accepting the client where he or she is at that present moment. Finally, the counselor communicates with the client in an empathetic, respectful, and genuine manner. This skill of communication empowers the client to process internal conflicts in a way that results in meaningful and effective solutions to life problems or internal conflicts. Sue and Sue
(1990) referred to the counselor’s understanding of cultural differences as both verbal and nonverbal behavior and indicate the value of this understanding as a tool for therapeutic change. According to Sue and Sue, the counselor’s:

- respect for and acceptance of the individual, unconditional positive regard,
- understanding the problem from the individual’s perspective, allowing the client to explore his or her own values and arriving at the individual solution are core qualities that may transcend culture. (p.187)

Structuring is important particularly when the client is unaware of the elements of a therapeutic relationship (e.g., how the counselor will conduct him/herself, and what is expected of client) or when the client has misconceptions about the counseling process. Therefore structuring is vital to facilitating multicultural counseling.

For the counseling student to develop the qualities of a mature counselor, the trainee must initiate a process of introspection and self-evaluation that results in personal awareness. Rogers (1951) emphasized the importance of raising the counselor’s levels of vulnerability, self-understanding, self-knowledge, and self-awareness. For Rogers this type of introspection accentuated an expansion of the internal and external locus of control of the client in the therapeutic healing process.

Brodley (2004) stated that when compared to other therapies, client-centered therapy is intrinsically multicultural, because it focuses on the perspective of the client rather than forcing the client to relate to the therapy through the counselor’s perspective. Brodley added that client-centered therapy avoids generalizations about individuals,
attending to their individual needs, irrespective of their race or their culture. Barnes, Craig, and Chambers (2000) agreed, stating that an atmosphere that provokes active participation and learning from the client fosters healing in a multiculturally sensitive manner.

**Multiculturalism in Counselor Education**

As early as 1994, multicultural education was encouraged in CACREP accredited counseling programs. The CACREP Standards that followed have expanded the inclusion of multicultural education in counseling programs. Chae, Foley, and Chae (2006) complained that counseling programs were lethargic about implementing the minimal standards required by accrediting bodies (Ponterotto & Austin, 2005). Atkinson and Lowe (1995) and Ponterotto and Casas (1991) commented that a repeated criticism in the mental health profession regarding multicultural education was that this field was developed without a theoretical base or empirical research. According to these authors, training programs that were obliged to create multicultural courses in the late 1980s responded to long overdue changes in professional guidelines with hasty programs and perhaps ill conceived courses.

Vontress and Jackson (2004) questioned the content and quality of multicultural education, whereas Carter (2001, 2003) challenged the mental health field to make necessary improvements. Smith et al. (2006) stated that a significant flaw in this field
was the alarming lack of evidence that the direction taken by instructors was aimed at skillful practice in multicultural clinical settings.

However, according to Smith et al.’s, (2006) research, there appeared to be an increasing emphasis in making multicultural education a fundamental part of professional training in counseling and psychology. Smith (2004) asserted that as the population of North America continues to diversify, there is a compelling need for multicultural competencies in order to be culturally sensitive to the emerging counseling clientele. Thus the urgency for multicultural competence in counseling / counselor education, particularly as the profession has continued to use white middle-class models of human development and behavior that do not characterize the needs of historically marginalized communities (Arredondo et al., 1996; Sue et al., 1992).

Sue and Sue (2003) agreed that according to multicultural scholars many of the contemporary theories and training programs in counseling as well as psychotherapy are founded on a mono-cultural basis, with the assumption that these traditional psychological theories are pertinent to all populations. Multicultural experts firmly reiterate that conventional counseling and psychotherapy theories are both stifling and ineffective for diverse populations (Atkinson, 2004), because they were essentially conceived with a Eurocentric perspective (Chae, Foley, & Chae, 2006). Consequently, minority communities are marginalized, lack a sense of belonging, and feel a profound sense of disenfranchisement when persons from these groups encounter therapists who are unable to relate to them from the perspective of anything but the majority culture.
Spanierman and Poteat (2005) advised all counselors-in-training to examine their attitudes about persons from diverse ethnic and racial background. In their investigation at a predominantly white university, the authors found that there was a trend among students to minimize racial issues. These students had a tendency to deny and distort racial and ethnic attitudes because they feared being labeled a racist in their classroom or in the university community. Their fear of being criticized for their attitudes, opinions, or beliefs caused them to avoid honest and open discussions. In fact, Ancis and Szymanski (2001) stated that some counseling students became angry and defensive when they were confronted with the problems and the emerge from White privilege and advantage.


In order to increase self-awareness, Armour, Bain, and Rubio (2004) reported that an emphasis on active learning as well as self-examination, helped in incorporating cultural diversity topics in social work curricula. Active learning focuses on consciously addressing “avoidant behaviors” (p.28). The student is encouraged to engage in activities and confront situations that may trigger anxiety, self-doubt, or negative attitudes or
judgment toward another person. Active learning therefore increases self-awareness through examination of the student’s inner dialogue or experience. Cashwell, Looby and Housley (1997) encouraged students to give feedback to each other from an ethnically diverse client’s viewpoint. In short, the goal was to increase both personal risk and self-scrutiny, while maintaining a safe place for students to dialogue (Armour et al., 2004).

Hepworth, Rooney, & Larsen (2002) stated that students are generally not aware of their own biases about culturally diverse groups, and how these biases influence their everyday interactions, perceptions, and attitudes. These authors suggested a lack of awareness may be ongoing due to limited interaction between different culturally diverse groups. The authors supported education that promotes the recognition and awareness of one’s own biases, discriminatory attitudes, and racial stereotypes.

Abreu, Chung, and Atkinson (2000) stated that research indicated that any perceptual process that takes place outside of conscious awareness does increase the student’s understanding of their cultural biases and stereotypes. Interactions should be direct and focus on personal biases and an appreciation of the cultural perceptions of those from diverse cultures. The counselor who is unaware of his or her own intrinsic cultural values is unable to confront the prejudices that may emerge from his or her value system. In addition, the counselor should be aware of the intrinsic values of clients from diverse cultures and how the client’s cultural perspectives influence problems, decisions, and therapeutic interactions. Research also supported a robust relationship between racial identity development (Cross, 1971, 1995; Helms, 1995; Phinney, 1989; Quintana, 1994,
1998) and multicultural counseling competence (Constantine, Juby, & Liang, 2001; Neville et al., 1996; Ottavi, Pope-Davis, & Dings, 1994; Vinson & Neimeyer, 2000).

**Cultural Awareness**

Niemann, Romero, and Arbona (2000) defined cultural awareness as a reflection of an individual’s cultural knowledge. This cultural knowledge constitutes one’s language, history, traditions, and heroes of that culture, all of which are viewed as the general components of differences in cultures. Being aware of cultural biases and values necessitate an understanding of one’s own cultural heritage, and sensitivity to oppression, racism, discrimination, or stereotyping that affected one personally or professionally. In addition, cultural awareness requires understanding racism and racial privilege as it impacts the individual.

Arredondo (1999) stressed the focus of self-awareness in multicultural competency as the “criticality of knowing oneself, cognitively and emotionally, and the importance of sociopolitical influences that affect all of us” (p. 108). Cunningham (2003) also identified as two leading principles of multicultural awareness, an understanding of the aspects of cultural identity and that the generalizations of culture must neither be stereotyped or over-simplified. She further stated that cultural identity is fundamental to people and should be valued, whether it is from the majority or a minority group. Asher (2007) stated that currently in the field of education, multicultural awareness takes place through dialogue and practice, that is asking, listening, seeing what is different, and what
is contradictory. Arredondo stated that cultural awareness also encompasses the client’s worldview. Awareness of the client’s worldview includes one’s own negative as well as positive responses toward any racial or ethnic group and familiarity with the sociopolitical effect (e.g. poverty, racism, stereotyping) on the self-esteem and self-concept of minority clients.

Banks (2001) defined worldview as the peculiar way in which each individual perceives his/her relationship with the immediate world around, influenced by his or her distinct cultural background, sociopolitical history, and unique life experience. Banks indicates that each individual’s distinct sense of awareness emerges as cultural relativism. Cultural relativism subsumes that every individual is a cultural being and that every attitude, perception, and behavior of a person derive their meaning from culture.

In the United States, individuals with a Euro-American worldview continually have validation of their beliefs and values since they function within the same cultural context (Sue et al, 1998). Some of the Euro-American cultural worldview characteristics are individualism, competition, universality, and a Judeo Christian-based religious view. In contrast, the cultural aspects of numerous other racial and ethnic groups have worldviews from Eastern philosophy made up of collectivism and interdependence, oneness with the universe, and a deep involvement with the group as opposed to self-development and self-growth (Bankart, 1997). For the last two decades immigrants to the U.S. have been primarily Hispanic, Latino, Asian, and other racial and ethnic groups (Sue et al., 1992). Unlike immigrants from European countries these groups do not
assimilate easily into the main culture, but rather cling to their distinct cultural heritages. Therefore the challenge of counselors in the 21st century is to acquire multicultural counseling competencies to be effective and efficient in working with this new set of clients.

**General Multicultural Competence**

Colvin-Burque, Davis-Maye, and Zugazaga (2007) proposed that recognizing, knowing, and being aware of the role of power in majority-minority experiences is a crucial component in building both sensitivity and multicultural competence. The authors pointed out that as students become aware of their own peculiar worldviews, they simultaneously respect the different worldviews of others, which changes and increases their multicultural counseling competence.

Sue and Torino (2005) defined multicultural counseling competence as the skill to actively take part or create possibilities that develop client and client personhood to the highest potential. In multicultural counseling competence, this advanced skill is attained primarily by the counselor’s readiness to acquire the awareness, knowledge, and skills required to efficiently function in a “pluralistic democratic society” (p.8). Such efficiency in multicultural competence also demands a superior skill in communication, interaction, negotiation, and intervention for clients from backgrounds that are diverse.

From a number studies on racial prejudice (Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992; Jones, 2002) evaluated by Castillo et al. (2007), findings indicated the positive influence
of multicultural education and training on multicultural counseling competency. Sue et al. (1992) affirmed that scholars indicate that a counselor with multicultural competence has an awareness of racial prejudice and functions in a distinctly non-racist manner. Glauser and Bozarth (2001) stated that various patterns of assumptions woven together create the construct known as “culture”, and prejudice is made up of assumptions that are culturally biased.

**Developing Multicultural Competence in Counselor Education**

According to Sue et al. (1992), whose paper is a benchmark for multicultural counseling and counselor training today, multicultural counseling competencies are essentially made up of multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. Therefore these authors defined multicultural counseling competence as a ‘tripartite conceptualization’ of the attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, and skills of counselors. This longstanding definition has been challenged by those who began to include perceptions of the client as a pertinent factor in multicultural counseling competence.

Significant definitions included: (a) Sodowsky et al. (1994) introduced the four-factor model emphasizing relationship; (b) Constantine and Ladany (2001) focused on the importance of understanding client variables (e.g. values, traits, group identity, etc.) as well as the counselor-client relationship. Therefore the counselor alone was no longer the only point of reference in assessing multicultural counseling competence.
In the light of the above, Constantine et al. (2002) upheld the importance of training of multicultural competent counselors. Constantine et al. recommended that the various roles of the counselor should be addressed i.e., adviser, consultant, advocate, change agent, facilitator for alternative support systems, facilitator of alternative healing practice, counselor, psychotherapist (Atkinson, Thompson & Grant, 1993). Constantine et al. also recommended that a wide range of ‘cultural immersion’ experiences would increase the counselor’s understanding and appreciation of the problems of persons of diverse cultures. The goal is to produce a counselor who has both an awareness of and knowledge about their clients of diverse cultures. Above all, counselor flexibility is the core skill (Pope-Davis et al. 2002). Counselors must be able to subtly identify if cultural identity is inconsistent and how to address such issues. Therefore training of multiculturally competent counselors entails fostering a range of distinct client variables to advance multicultural awareness and knowledge.

Pope-Davis et al. (2002) focused on important client variables that influenced the counseling relationship. Important to the relationship was the client’s assessment of the counselors’ multicultural competence and the client’s perception of a counselor’s clinical competence even if not skilled in understanding their ethnicity or culture. Some clients reported that a lack of knowledge did not stand in the way of the counseling relationship, but they blamed themselves for a counselor’s lack of awareness. Also important were the client’s participation in a discussion and exploration of cultural issues in the counseling relationship. Even when clients of another ethnicity do not bring up cultural issues, the
counselor would do well to initiate such a dialogue in the early sessions of therapy. This dialogue regarding cultural issues opens paths of exploration in therapeutic work.

Another issue is the client’s evaluation of counseling at different stages of the counseling process enhances targeting specific goals. This kind of periodic feedback increases progress and is more advantageous than feedback at termination. At the same time, Constantine et al. (2002) warned of certain discrepancies in the above study strongly recommending that the needs of clients be ethically scrutinized. For example, if a woman from a patriarchal society requests skills to tolerate her spouse’s physical and verbal abusive behavior, the counselor may be obliged to reframe skills here in the light of safety and individual rights. Another difficulty may be the possible dynamics pending difference in the level of racial or cultural identity status. If a client bears a more advanced status, there will be a “regressive relationship” (Helms, 1995) between client and counselor as opposed to a more equivalent relationship if client and counselor function at a similar racial or cultural identity status. According to a nation-wide survey on multicultural competence and counselor training, Holcomb-McCoy and Myers (1999) reported that there was no statistically significant difference in multicultural competence between those graduating from CACREP accredited and graduates of non-accredited programs.

Arredondo and Arciniega (2001) observed a gap in the emphasis on multicultural competency in counseling programs despite the increase in the level of leadership training at national conferences as well as more doctoral research on this topic. The
authors recommended self-reflection and self-study to continually revise and review existing curriculum to meet the needs of multicultural competency. Arredondo and Arciniega recommended the infusion of ‘competency-based teaching’ for this purpose. Competency-based teaching means providing guidelines and specific developmental standards in modified cognitive, emotional and behavioral areas. Guidelines were based on strategies and techniques of multicultural counseling competencies recommended (Arredondo et. al, 1996), and later in 2003 developed by Association of Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD; Roysircar, Arredondo, Fuertes. Ponterotto, & Toporek, 2003).

The key is developing the ability to freely question accepted norms while reframing counseling programs. The philosophy of multicultural counseling competence (AMCD) is: (a) all counseling is multicultural; (b) counseling beliefs, values, and practices as well as the worldview of clients and counselors alike are influenced by both socio-political and historical forces; (c) counseling and practice must include all the different dimensions of diversity like race, ethnicity, religion, and language.

The most important topics to consider are: counselor awareness and understanding of the history of the counselor’s unique cultural values, assumptions, biases as well as counselor awareness of the worldview of the client; and intervention skills that are culturally appropriate. An activity that fosters the development of awareness included writing an autobiography exploring experiences of their cultural group, their beliefs, assumptions, biases, privileges (Carter, 2003; Mio & Barker-Hackett,
Another profitable experience is an open exchange of counseling students inherent expectations and others’ expectations of them. In this way students become aware of their cultural “hidden agenda” in relation with others. Open discussions and role playing vignettes promotes multicultural awareness and knowledge (Asher, 2007).

Other helpful strategies included video clips, probing counselor’s counseling style and theoretical orientation; understanding client’s perception of right and wrong from a collectivist worldview, difference in gender-based socialization skills, addressing emotions of counselor and client, and pertinent historical factors. Students can be encouraged to dialogue about their vulnerability regarding racism and race-related issues (Barnes, Craig, & Chambers, 2000). Through genuineness and reframing, students may become aware that traditional counseling theory and practice are rooted in Euro-American traditions and assumptions. With this competency-based approach, students build confidence in generalizing these “new” concepts and practices to other areas like sexism, ageism, and homophobia.

Pope-Davis et al. (2002) studied the experience of clients with a multiculturally competent counselor, with the goal of enhancing multicultural counselor training and education. The author recommended that counselors learn multicultural knowledge, sensitivity, and openness in addressing cultural issues. Counselors should be trained to appropriately assess client characteristics and needs as crucial in avoiding cultural impasses in the counseling process. Training should focus on how the balance of power in client-counselor relationship facilitates disclosure and safety in the counseling
relationship. Counseling students must constantly be instructed in initiating communication regarding the role of culture in therapy, as well as acknowledging the various identities of the client, and substantiating the cultural aspect of the client’s presenting problem. Finally, the counselor should be aware of networking for client cultural support in the community, particularly when counselor experiences a lack of cultural competency.

**Influence of Personal Characteristics**

The research indicates that multicultural awareness and knowledge is influenced by a number of personal characteristics and issues. According to D’Andrea and Daniels (2000) currently there are many subtle and covert forms of racism and exclusionism in contemporary society. Unless these negative feelings are explored and expressed they cannot be addressed or resolved (Spanierman & Poteat, 2005). Some of the issues include: (a) stereotypical thought processes (Abreu, 2000); (b) lack of communication skills to initiate discussion regarding sensitive issues of racism (Wade, 2005); (c) ambivalence in questioning racial situation or signs of discrimination (Carter, 2007); (d) discomfort and anxiety about discussing race or racism in a mixed-racial group (Wade). For fear of being labeled as a ‘racist’ or being negatively evaluated by their instructors, Caucasian students indicated that they were often reluctant or afraid to openly acknowledge their less than politically correct or even controversial attitudes (Tatum, 1992). In the following section, the issue of (a) differences between Caucasian and
African American students in attitudes toward other cultures and (b) the impact of international exposure on multicultural awareness and knowledge will be examined.

**Differences Between Caucasian and African American Students**

Phillips (2005) in his comparative study between African American and Caucasian students registered in an equal opportunities program on major White college campuses reported that although African American students felt marginalized, Caucasian students were not conscious of the difficulties faced by their African American peers. The author concluded that the three major stumbling blocks to understanding were: race, socioeconomic status, and academic difficulties.

Phillips (2005) affirmed that students needed to experience a sense of belonging in the environment and appeared to agree with Rosenberg & McCullough (1981) who identified four areas that promote a sense of significance: (a) attention, mutual interest and awareness, (b) importance, mutual caring and concern, (c) ego-extension, the feeling that others will be proud or sad by one’s achievements and failures, and (d) dependence, the positive influence of mutual dependence. Scholessberg (1989) included a fifth dimension: appreciation, which means that one’s efforts are respected and held in high esteem by others.

Concluding his research, Phillips (2005) recommended that issues of diversity be closely monitored and scrutinized by campus authorities, as social and academic adjustment and management is crucial to minority or diverse populations. To bolster
these recommendations, Castillo et al’s (2006) study indicated that multicultural training increased multicultural awareness and decreased inherent racial prejudice.

From his study on African American women on a predominantly White campus, Sims (2008) noticed that African American (female) students were of the firm belief that other groups do not understand their life experiences, and for this reason were comfortable that relationships do not develop. This being the fact of the matter, there was neither a sense of loss nor need for mutual understanding.

Lewis, Ginsberg, and Davies (2004) in their study on African American doctoral students, stated that many research studies (Allen, 1992; Fleming, 1981; Nettles, 1998) reported that African American undergraduate students had higher attrition rates, lower cumulative GPA (grade point average), and less perseverance toward completion and graduation than majority students. Some of the reasons for this difference have been identified as academic preparation that is weak, very few or lack of role models on campus, feelings of isolation and helplessness, as well as lack of communication and negotiation skills in relating to academic and social systems on campus, which result in an experience of “uninvited guests in a strange land” (Brown, 1986; Parker & Scott, 1985, p.67). Intense feelings of feeling isolated were described as almost being “invisible” on large predominantly White campuses (Lewis, Ginsberg, Davies). African American students reported minimal University support, and basically felt that they had to depend on themselves. Additionally, they experienced that the faculty and the university neither understood them or their needs. According to Brown (1986), these
above mentioned factors for African American undergraduates is also true for African American students at the doctoral level.

**International Exposure and Multicultural Awareness and Knowledge**

According to Mueller and Pope (2001) there was a statistical significant relationship between multicultural awareness and knowledge and international exposure. Steward (1998) affirmed that education designed for international exposure, (i.e., study abroad, language immersion programs, student and faculty exchanges) enhanced multicultural awareness and knowledge, a primary step in achieving multicultural competency. Cottrell (2004), in his study of cultural awareness of students and faculty concluded that continued international exposure played a crucial role in increasing multicultural awareness and knowledge.

Zhai and Scheer (2002) reported from their study of students studying abroad as part of their curriculum, that international exposure enhanced their global perspective as well as sharpened their cultural sensitivity particularly their awareness and openness to cultural diversity. As a result of their study, the authors stated that college students’ personal growth was remarkable following study abroad programs. The student’s global perspective and multicultural sensitivity was increased and refined. He further indicated that after study abroad, students had an openness to and acceptance of cultural diversity that was lacking in their peers.
Alexander, Kruczek, and Ponterotto (2005) emphasized that practical experience and exposure enhanced multicultural awareness. International exchange of students, in the process of didactic learning significantly enhanced their multicultural awareness, knowledge and skills. These authors recommended an international cultural immersion field experience in which counseling students would interact with people from another culture in their geographic region. Immersion experiences challenged students to examine assumptions and biases that directed their behavior, attitudes, and insights. Pedersen (2002) stated that through direct contact with other cultures counselor trainees and students will rehearse first-hand the required skills to survive in the emerging multifaceted and diverse global village.

In conclusion, some of the common themes discussed include the importance of: (a) creating a safe place for multicultural exploration; (b) leaders, administrators, teachers making a binding and genuine commitment to multiculturalism; (c) interacting and making personal connections across cultural differences; (d) actively evolving strategies that work; (e) accepting and participating in a collective perspective; (f) advocating the relationship / connection between multiculturalism and socio-political venues (Lewis, 2003.)

Emphasis on the importance of research and continued education to understand the ever-changing trends in the social and cultural environment is essential to insight and change. It is with such an emphasis that the search for innovative skills and techniques in multicultural education will continue to grow. Above all such scrutiny and proficiency is
crucial in the field of mental health, an area that must be sensitive to the evolving global community. With the election of the first African American President in the United States in 2008, there is no doubt that the cultural climate of the U.S. is rapidly changing. Counselors in the United States who address the mental health issues of 21st century clients should be trained to be comfortable assisting persons with diverse national and cultural backgrounds.

**Summary of Review of the Literature**

The literature review affirmed that in the ever-changing cultural milieu of the U.S., multicultural awareness and knowledge are important for college students to acquire. Multiculturalism has many interesting and complex facets that include gender, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, national origin (Pedersen, 1988; Speight et al., 1991) as well as race, culture, ethnicity, age, disability, language (Helms, 1994; Locke, 1990). Multicultural education helps students from different cultural backgrounds to find a niche in a culturally diverse society (Banks, 2000) and the opportunity to reach their highest personal and professional potential (Gay, 2000).

However, Lopez-Mulnix and Mulnix (2006) maintained that many universities still have a long way to go in integrating diverse cultural perspectives into their curriculum. Cates et al. (2007) stated that there was a gap in literature on how various educational institutions incorporate multicultural subject matter in their course work. Atkinson (2004) identified that currently counseling theories are ineffective for diverse
populations, because they use Eurocentric models rather than more diverse perspectives (Chae, Foley, & Chae, 2006).

For effective clinical multicultural skills, counselor-trainees must know, understand, and be aware of their own levels of cultural awareness (Abreu, Chung, & Atkinson, 2000). Niemann, Romero and Arbona (2000) defined cultural awareness as the reflection of one’s own cultural knowledge.

Sue et al., (1992) established that multicultural counseling competency is composed of multicultural awareness, knowledge, and skills. Sodowsky (1994) added the counseling relationship as a fourth dimension of multicultural counseling competence. The American Counseling Association (2005) endorsed the development of multicultural counseling competence with dignity through diversity.

In training multicultural competent counselors, Pope-Davis et al. (2002) recommended: (a) multicultural knowledge, sensitivity, and openness in addressing cultural issues, (b) appropriately addressing client characteristics and needs in order to avoid cultural impasse in the counseling process, (c) balance of power in the client-counselor relationship, (d) initiating communication regarding the role of culture in the presenting problem, and (e) networking for client cultural support in the community, especially when counselor experienced a lack of cultural competency.

Two theoretical models that support multicultural education in counseling are Banks’s transformative approach and Rogers’s client-centered theory respectively. The first, Banks’s multicultural education emphasized: (a) helping students explore their
ethnic, racial, as well as cultural identity; (b) helping students venture beyond their ethnic and cultural boundaries; and (c) helping students develop commitment as well as skills for full participation, personal, social, and in civic action, in order to make the nation and the world more democratic. The second theory, Rogers’s client-centered theory, focused on the therapeutic relationship between client and counselor without consideration of culture, caste or creed. This therapeutic relationship is based on empathy, unconditional positive regard (respect), and genuineness.

Some of the variables that influenced multicultural awareness and knowledge were: (a) difference between Caucasian and African American students; (b) international exposure. In his comparative study of African American and Caucasian students, Phillips (2005) reported that although African American students felt marginalized, Caucasian students were unaware of the difficulties faced by their African American counterparts.

According to Mueller and Pope (2004) there was a significant correlation between multicultural awareness and knowledge and international exposure. With the reality of globalization coming to the forefront in the 21st century, instilling multicultural awareness and knowledge in college education is no longer a choice, but a necessity.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to examine the level of cultural awareness and knowledge among undergraduates and graduate students enrolled in a counseling program at Mississippi State University. A secondary purpose was to assess differences in the level of cultural awareness between Caucasian and African American graduate students enrolled in a counseling program. For the purposes of this study, cultural awareness (or multicultural awareness) was operationally defined as knowledge, awareness, and acceptance that individuals from one particular cultural group maintain about those who belong to other cultural groups – their traditions, beliefs, behaviors, learning styles, values, and priorities (Reddin & Rowell, 1995). Although cultural awareness can be defined as religious affiliation, socioeconomic status, gender preference, multiple-heritages (due to global immigration), sexual orientation, national origin, race, culture, ethnicity, age, disability, and native language (Pedersen, 1988; Speight et al., 1991), this study focuses only on national origin and those cultural properties defined by national heritage.
Research Design

The present research study used a comparative research design to determine the levels of cultural awareness between two groups: (a) undergraduate students and graduate students in counseling program; and (b) African American and Caucasian graduate students in counseling. In this particular type of research design, independent variables are not directly manipulated, and yet the researcher is able to observe the possible influences of specific variables on present behaviors (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). The independent variables measured were: (a) gender, and (b) ethnicity. The dependent variables measured were the eight scores of the level of cultural awareness as defined by the Culture Shock Inventory (Reddin & Rowell, 1995).

Sampling and Participants

The data for the undergraduate students at Mississippi State University were collected by Stephen Cottrell in 2003 for his dissertation, Cultural awareness levels of professionals and students at Mississippi State University: International education’s challenge. The undergraduate student sample was comprised of those who enrolled in all sections of Introduction to World Geography (GR 1123) during 2003. Since this course was among the selection of required courses in the social sciences, it was assumed that this group constituted a random sample of the undergraduate student population across all majors and was assumed to be racially diverse. Cottrell’s total sample consisted of 665 undergraduate students, 118 faculty members, and 67 administrative persons. For the
purpose of this current study, only the undergraduate student sample of 665 was utilized for analysis.

Data from 200 graduate students enrolled in counseling classes at Mississippi State University (MSU) were collected by the researcher in the following semesters: Fall 2007, Spring 2009, and Summer 2009. Caution was taken to insure that graduate students were sampled only once: (a) in 2008, a gap in data collection was maintained; and (b) students were repeatedly reminded not to participate in the survey a second time. In Fall Semester 2007, the Coordinator of the Counseling Program at the Meridian campus of MSU collected data from the counseling graduate students and returned them to the researcher.

Therefore, the sample consisted of 665 undergraduate students (existing data, Cottrell, 2004) and 200 graduate students in counseling from Fall 2007, Summer 2009 and Spring 2009. Of the sample of undergraduate students, 52% (345) were women and 48% (320) were men, whereas the sample of graduate students in counseling was composed of 165 women (82%) and 35 men (18%). Racial and ethnic make-up of the groups consisted of 14% (91) African Americans, 82% (542) Caucasian Americans, and 5% (32) others of different ethnicity in the undergraduate group, whereas in the graduate students in counseling group, 34% (67) were African Americans, 65% (130) were Caucasian American, and 2% (3) in the other category (Table 3.1). The ages of all students ranged from 18 to over 55 years of age.
Table 3.1

Descriptive Statistics by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th></th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one month</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one month</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language Fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor or Fair</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good or excellent</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instrumentation**

The instrument (Appendix A) consisted of two parts: (a) Culture Shock Inventory; (b) a demographic questionnaire that consisted of questions related to characteristics of the respondents: gender, religion, ethnicity, level of education, family heritage and international exposure defined as travel abroad and foreign languages spoken. The Culture Shock Inventory was developed by Reddin and Rowell (1975) as a
tool to assess the respondents’ cultural awareness and knowledge of cultures other than their own. The Culture Shock Inventory is based on “international norms of 648 primarily first-level North American managers” (Reddin, 1998, p.6). The Culture Shock Inventory consists of eighty agree-disagree questions that measure eight indices of cultural awareness. Each index of cultural awareness consists of ten questions. The eighty questions are divided among the eight scales. These scales include: (a) a lack of Western ethnocentrism, (b) experience, (c) cognitive flex, (d) behavioral flex, (e) cultural knowledge-specific, (f) cultural knowledge-general, (g) cultural behavior-general and (h) interpersonal sensitivity (see Table 3.2).
Table 3.2
Definitions of the Eight Scales of the Culture Shock Inventory (Reddin, 1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Items</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Lack of Western Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>the degree to which the Western value system is seen as inappropriate for other parts of the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Experience</td>
<td>the degree of direct experience with people from other countries through working, traveling, and conversing, and also learned skills such as reading and speaking foreign languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Cognitive Flex</td>
<td>the degree of openness to new ideas and beliefs and the degree to which these are accepted by the individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Behavioral Flex</td>
<td>the degree to which one’s own behavior is open to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Cultural Knowledge-Specific</td>
<td>the degree of awareness and understanding of various beliefs and patterns of behavior in specific other cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Cultural Knowledge-General</td>
<td>the degree of awareness and understanding of various beliefs and patterns of behavior in other cultures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-Cultural Behavior-General</td>
<td>the degree of awareness and understanding of patterns of behaviors observed in people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-Interpersonal Sensitivity</td>
<td>the degree of awareness and understanding of verbal and non-verbal human behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of the eight scales includes items, measured on a Likert scale (0 – 10) with zero being the lowest and ten being the highest score on each item. The reported average mean scores of the scales developed and reported by Reddin for each of the eight scales were: 6, 4, 6, 6, 6, 7, 6, 8. with scores that fell above and below these scores considered as lower and higher than a standard level of cultural awareness (Reddin, 1998). The average mean scores of the scales were derived by assessing the cultural awareness of 648 first-level North American managers. Reddin derived these mean scores based on these data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Scale Range &amp; question numbers</th>
<th>Reddin’s Mean score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Lack of Western Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>1, 9, 17, 25, 33, 41, 49, 57, 65, 73</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Experience</td>
<td>2, 10, 18, 26, 34, 42, 50, 58, 66, 74</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Cognitive Flex</td>
<td>3, 11, 19, 27, 35, 43, 51, 59, 67, 75</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Behavioral Flex</td>
<td>4, 12, 20, 28, 36, 44, 52, 60, 68, 76</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Cultural Knowledge-Specific</td>
<td>5, 13, 21, 29, 37, 45, 53, 61, 69, 77</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Cultural Knowledge-General</td>
<td>6, 14, 22, 30, 38, 46, 54, 62, 70, 78</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-Cultural Behavior-General</td>
<td>7, 15, 23, 31, 39, 47, 55, 63, 71, 79</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-Interpersonal Sensitivity</td>
<td>8, 16, 24, 32, 40, 48, 56, 64, 72, 80</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Culture Shock Inventory was considered a satisfactory instrument for this study because it purported to provide norms for cultural awareness; and it was designed for use of those who relate to individuals from minority cultures inside their own country.
This inventory appeared appropriate for students from dominant and minority cultures that intermingle on a university campus (Cottrell, 2004). According to Reddin (1975) this inventory is suitable for individuals who work with persons from other cultures and subcultures in their own country; and for individuals who work in the helping professions (i.e., psychology, counseling, social work, medicine). Reddin indicated that the four primary uses of this instrument were as an aid for: (a) training, (b) training evaluation, (c) counseling and assessment, and (d) research in cultural awareness. Reddin added that the Culture Shock Inventory is useful for training in leadership, human relations, and international and cross-cultural training and assessment, also for screening, assessment and evaluation, and behavior change. The author believed that the CSI is especially useful for personal development and for creating self-awareness and insight related to cultural differences.

Steward (1993) used the Culture Shock Inventory with a university student affairs staff population who had no academic training in cultural diversity. High scores were recorded in culture behavior-general and cultural knowledge-general. Steward interpreted this to mean that participants acknowledged the importance of learning cultural differences as the means of understanding differences in behavior and cognition. Ethnocentrism, behavioral flex (or cross-cultural experience) scores were in the medium range, according to Reddin’s mean score. The researcher concluded that the sample
evidenced low scores on the scales that measured cognitive flex, cultural knowledge-specific, and interpersonal sensitivity. Steward concluded that these university students had deficits in being: (a) open to new ideas, (b) able to classify or identify cultural behaviors and beliefs distinctly different from the those in the U.S., and (c) able to interact with persons who possess different interpersonal skills than the participants. In the current study, the CSI was used to assess the cognitive knowledge and intrapersonal self-awareness of graduate students in counseling.

Reddin and Rowell (1975) recommended that this instrument was suitable as both a training aid for cultural awareness and as a research tool with graduate students in Anthropology. Cottrell (2004) indicated that the instrument was an appropriate research tool for use with undergraduate students. In this study, the researcher used the instrument for research with graduate students in counseling.

**Validity and Reliability of the Culture Shock Inventory**

The validity and reliability of the Culture Shock Inventory was assessed by Reddin, (1975). Content validity of the Culture Shock Inventory was assessed across multiple items and resulted in construction of the eight scales, with each index or scale consisting of ten items. As reported in the CSI manual (Reddin) the intercorrelations between scales of the CSI were low ranging from .03 to .36. This indicated that the items were not highly correlated and according to Reddin indicated that this instrument was practically and “efficiently designed as a scale discriminator” (p. 32).
Reddin (1975) established the validity of the CSI by using the original population, managers, from whom the norms of the scales were derived. Validity measures were established by comparing different categories of managers, for example, one group of Personnel-Training managers with another group of production managers. The criterion-related validity of the instrument was assessed by comparing this instrument with other existing instruments that had been used for similar purposes. Instruments to which the CSI was compared were: the Behavioral Inventory Battery Cell Analysis; and the Behavioral Inventory Battery Group-Group Analysis.

To establish test-retest reliability, Reddin (1975) administered the CSI in a government organization to 107 first and second level managers with a retest conducted two months after the original test. The range of correlation coefficients was from 0.57 to 0.86. The actual correlation coefficients for each scale was as follows: A-Lack of Western ethnocentrism \( r = .67 \), B-Experience \( r = .86 \), C-Cognitive flex \( r = .69 \), D-Behavioral flex \( r = .77 \), E-Cultural Knowledge-specific \( r = .76 \), F-Cultural Knowledge-general \( r = .57 \), G-Cultural Behavior-general \( r = .74 \) and H-Interpersonal Sensitivity \( r = .81 \). According to the Reddin, these correlation coefficients constitute acceptable correlations for research with the CSI. No other research data were available on the use of this instrument with undergraduate or graduate students.
Procedures

Prior to collecting data, written permission was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Mississippi State University. The IRB of Mississippi State University gave permission (Appendix B) to use Cottrell’s data collected in 2003 of the undergraduate population along with permission to collect data from graduate students registered in the counseling program in the Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology in Fall 2007. On request, IRB renewed this permission for data collection in the semesters: Spring 2009 and Summer 2009.

With prior permission from professors of the graduate level courses in the counseling program, the researcher collected data from different classes. In Fall 2007, the classes from which volunteer participants were obtained were: Developmental Counseling and Mental Health, Counseling Skills Development (2 sections), Counseling Theory (2 sections), Family Counseling Theory, Vocational Rehabilitation Counseling, Counseling Supervision, Advanced Counseling Theory, Practicum and Internship, Psychosocial Rehabilitation, School Counseling Services, and Counseling Chemically Dependent Families, Community Counseling, and Community Counseling Clinical. In Fall 2007, the classes on the MSU Meridian campus were: Practicum and Internship (data collected by Coordinator, Counseling program, MSU Meridian campus). In Spring 2009 the classes were: Psychosocial Rehabilitation, and College Student Counseling. In Summer 2009, the classes were: Cultural Foundations in Counseling, Advanced Multicultural Counseling, Developmental Counseling and Mental Health, Utilizing Art
Therapy in Counseling, Psychosocial Rehabilitation, Gender Issues in Counseling, Counseling Children, Spirituality in Counseling, and Counseling Chemically Dependent Families.

Graduate students signed an Informed Consent form (Appendix C) prior to completion of the instruments. The researcher explained the purpose of the study, emphasizing that participation was voluntary, as well as explaining the confidentiality of the information provided in the questionnaire and CSI inventory. No names or identifying numbers were given to the completed inventory. No incentive was offered to students.

Data Analysis

This is an extension of a study by Cottrell’s (2004) in which he examined and compared the level of cultural awareness of undergraduates. The present study also examined the cultural awareness of undergraduates as well as graduate students in the counseling program in the Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology at Mississippi State University. Descriptive and bivariate analyses were conducted for both groups (undergraduate and graduate students). Multivariate analysis (MANOVA), followed by eight univariate tests, was conducted to study the difference between the two groups. The descriptive analysis gave a clearer understanding of the status of both groups. The bivariate analysis indicated whether the two groups fell above or below the average means for each of the eight scales of cultural awareness on the CSI. A
MANOVA procedure was conducted to study differences in the levels of cultural awareness between the two groups. The MANOVA procedure was followed by eight univariate tests of significance that explained the level of cultural awareness for each of the eight CSI scales operated as the dependent variables in this study. Assumptions were examined for normality, homogeneity, and homoscedasticity for all eight dependent variables. The level of significance was .006 for t-tests, and .05 for multivariate and univariate tests.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive and bivariate analyses were conducted for the undergraduate and graduate groups. A multivariate analysis (MANOVA) was conducted to examine the difference between these two groups.

The descriptive analysis clarified the status of the groups indicating the number of responses from students for each of the scales, as well as means and standard deviations. Second, the bivariate analysis indicated whether the two groups fell above or below-the-CSI average mean for each of the eight levels of cultural awareness.

A MANOVA procedure was conducted to determine the difference at each level of cultural awareness between graduate and undergraduate groups and between African Americans (67) and Caucasian American (130) counseling graduate students. The MANOVA procedure was followed by eight univariate tests of significance. The MANOVA procedure was chosen because there were five independent variables and eight dependent variables included in the analysis.

Research Questions

1. What is the level of cultural awareness and knowledge of undergraduate students at Mississippi State University?
2. What is the level of cultural awareness and knowledge of graduate students in a counseling program at Mississippi State University?

3. Is there a difference in the level of cultural awareness between undergraduate and graduate students who are in a counseling program at Mississippi State University?

4. Is there a racial difference in the level of cultural awareness and knowledge of Caucasian and African American graduate students in a counseling program at Mississippi State University?

Each of the research questions was addressed using the appropriate statistical analysis. Research question one, What is the level of cultural awareness and knowledge of undergraduates at Mississippi State University?, was addressed by using descriptive analysis and t-tests to compare the undergraduate scores on each of the eight scales of cultural awareness on the CSI with the average means on the CSI as indicated by Reddin (1998). Research question two, What is the level of cultural awareness and knowledge of graduate students in a counseling program at Mississippi State University?, was also addressed using descriptive and t-tests to compare the graduate scores on each of the eight scales of cultural awareness on the CSI with the average means on the CSI as indicated by Reddin (1998).

Sample t-tests were conducted to compare the average of each of the eight scales against the CSI average means, with a goal to individually compare each of the means of the undergraduate group and the graduate group with Reddin’s average mean. In order to
control Type I error, a simple Bonferroni adjustment was implemented and the family-wise alpha level was set at .006 (.05 / 8), because there were eight scale means. The results of the $t$-tests are given below (see Tables 4.1 and 4.2).

Table 4.1

Comparison of Means by the CSI Average Mean for Undergraduates using $t$-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>CSI Average Mean</th>
<th>Sample Mean</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>$t$-test by CSI mean</th>
<th>$P$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A- Lack of Western Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B- Experience</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C- Cognitive Flex</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D- Behavioral Flex</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E- Cultural Knowledge-Specific</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F- Cultural Knowledge-General</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G- Cultural Behavior-General</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H- Interpersonal Sensitivity</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p$ was significant at a family wise alpha < .006 level
Table 4.2

Comparison of Means by the CSI Average Mean for Graduates using \( t \)-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A- Lack of Western Ethnocentrism</th>
<th>CSI Average Mean</th>
<th>Sample Mean</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>( t )-test by CSI mean</th>
<th>( p ) value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B- Experience</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C- Cognitive Flex</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D- Behavioral Flex</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E- Cultural Knowledge-Specific</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F- Cultural Knowledge-General</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G- Cultural Behavior-General</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H- Interpersonal Sensitivity</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>+0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( *p \) was significant at a family wise alpha < .006 level

Levels of Cultural Awareness of Undergraduate Group

All eight scales (Table 4.1) fell below the Reddin’s average mean and except for D-Behavioral Flex were statistically significantly different than Reddin’s mean score for that scale, indicating a statistically significant “low” level of cultural awareness when compared to Reddin (1998) table of reference. According to Reddin, the five levels of cultural awareness are as follows: very high (2-4 points above CSI average mean), high (1 point above CSI average mean), low (1 point below CSI mean average mean), very low (2-6 points below CSI mean average mean).
Scale F-Cultural Knowledge- General was - 0.62 below Reddin’s average mean. Although less than a one point difference, it was statistically significant, placing it also in the “low” level of cultural awareness, below-Reddin’s average mean score. The H-Interpersonal Sensitivity scale was also statistically significantly below the CSI mean at .20. None of the scales had an above Reddin’s average mean score. From consideration of these data it appears that the undergraduate group had a “low” level of cultural awareness as measured by the CSI, indicated by the statistically significant mean differences between their scores and the average mean scores of the CSI reported by Reddin (1998).

The scores of the undergraduates on the A or Lack of Western Ethnocentrism scale appears to indicate these participants were more ethnocentric than the participants used to norm the CSI. Western Ethnocentrism is the general belief that the cultural beliefs, values, and customs of western society should be adopted by other cultures and are the “best way” for people to live. Reddin (1998) defined this scale as ‘the degree to which the western value system is seen as inappropriate for other parts of the world’. The statistically significant low scores on this scale may indicate that these undergraduate participants appear to be ethnocentric, tenaciously preferring their culture to other cultures. The undergraduate participants also appear to be less open to information about other cultures shown by the statistically significant below average means on the scales: F-Cultural Knowledge-General, G-Cultural Behavior-General, and H-Interpersonal Sensitivity.
A statistically significant below Reddin’s average mean for scale B-Experience also indicated that this undergraduate group may lack international exposure (i.e., travel abroad and fluency in a foreign language). In short, there is a lack of cross-cultural experiences by the undergraduate participants. This was bolstered by self-report (Table 3.1) that revealed only 20% of these undergraduate participants had traveled abroad and only 4% of that group had traveled to a foreign country for more than a month. Of these undergraduate participants only 17% had fluency in a language other than English and only another 27% had a minimal knowledge of a foreign language.

The data appeared to indicate low levels of cultural awareness as measured by the CSI in this group of undergraduate participants. It may be concluded that these undergraduate participants need to focus on openness to others’ beliefs through interpersonal observation, personal contact, developing a fluency in another language, direct interaction through travel and work experience, and social interaction with persons from other countries.

**Levels of Cultural Awareness of Graduate Students Group**

Five scales (Table 4.2), A-Lack of Western Ethnocentrism; B-Experience, C-Cognitive Flex, E-Cultural Knowledge-Specific, F-Cultural Knowledge-General, fell below Reddin’s average mean and were statistically significantly different than Reddin’s mean score for that scale, indicating a statistically significant “low” level of cultural awareness when compared to Reddin’s (1998) table of reference. Three scales: D-
Behavioral Flex, G-Cultural Behavior-General and H-Interpersonal Sensitivity were above Reddin’s mean score, but only G-Cultural Behavior-General was statistically significant. According to Reddin, the five levels of cultural awareness are as follows: very high (2-4 points above CSI average mean), high (1 point above CSI average mean), average mean, low (1 point below CSI mean average mean), very low (2-6 points below CSI mean average mean).

Of the eight scales on the CSI only one, G-Cultural Behavior-General, was statistically significantly above the Reddin’s mean scores. These data appeared to indicate that participants who were graduate students in counseling may be behaviorally initiating opportunities to interact with persons of other cultures, but are cognitively close-minded to internalizing and welcoming the beliefs and values of other cultures. In this case the dichotomy may be that these graduate students indicate an outward interest in other cultures, but have retained an inward intolerance and internal close-mindedness.

Scale B-Experience was statistically significantly below Reddin’s average mean, indicating that these graduate students in counseling may lack cross-cultural experience, defined as foreign travel, as well as knowledge, fluency, and familiarity in foreign language or culture. Self-report by these graduate students (Table 3.1) revealed that only 54% had traveled abroad and of those only 28% had traveled for more than one month. Further, only 22% of the graduate student participants endorsed having fluency in a foreign language while only 29% have minimal knowledge of another language than English.
Scale, E-Cultural Knowledge-Specific, fell below the CSI mean suggesting that this group of graduate students in counseling were lacking in the ability to pick-up on specific and particular cues in different cultural groups. Scores on this scale showed a lack of knowledge of foreign cultures and values, a vulnerability that could seriously compromise these students interactions with persons from other countries and cultural hearths.

These results indicated that the graduate students in counseling may be lacking in the skills necessary to be at ease, internally and externally, with persons from other countries and cultures. Of the five below average mean scales the four, A-Lack of Western Ethnocentrism, B-Experience, C-Cognitive Flex, E-Culture Knowledge-Specific, that were statistically significant below the CSI means, showed low levels of cultural awareness in the graduate students in counseling included in this study. The fifth scale F-Cultural Knowledge-General was below-the-CSI average mean, but was not statistically significant.

In conclusion, examination of the data appeared to indicate that the graduate students in counseling demonstrated low levels of cultural awareness, as well as western ethnocentrism, cognitive inflexibility, and a lack of knowledge of differences and idiosyncratic beliefs and values of other cultures. Some of the reasons for this lack of knowledge may be minimal cross-cultural experience that is fostered and enhanced by international travel and living in other countries, as well as developing a fluency in another language. Deficits in personal experience may create an insular attitude and
unconscious cultural mindset of “us versus them” that reinforces western ethnocentrism in attitudes and behaviors.

At the same time, the openness to behavioral change is indicated in the above average mean scores on scale G-Cultural Behavior-General, which was statistically significant. Two other scales were not statistically significant, but were scored above the CSI average, D-Behavioral Flex, and H-Interpersonal Sensitivity.

These results may be interpreted to indicate that this group may have a readiness and interest in new learning and training for multicultural interaction and competency. These graduate students in counseling have made a small but important effort to become acquainted with other cultures on a behavioral level. An underlying cognitive close-mindedness seemed to be indicated by the statistically significant below average mean on the scales, A-Lack of Western Ethnocentrism, C-Cognitive Flex, and E-Cultural Knowledge Specific (see Table 4.2). Further, the low mean on the scale, B-Experience, suggests that this group of participants is constricted by a lack of experience with foreign travel and foreign language. By its definition, scale B-Experience delineates international exposure through travel and knowledge of or interest in foreign languages. Descriptive statistics reveal that 54% of the graduate students in counseling have traveled abroad and 49% have no knowledge of a foreign language. This lack of international exposure may be due to the fact that students may be traveling within the wide expanses of the 50 states of this vast country.
Difference in Levels of Cultural Awareness

Research question three, “Is there a difference in the level of cultural awareness between undergraduate and graduate students in a counseling program?” was addressed using the MANOVA procedure. A General Linear Model multivariate design (MANOVA) was conducted to examine any difference in the level of cultural awareness between the undergraduate and graduate students on the eight scales of cultural awareness. Multivariariate and univariate tests were conducted to determine any statistically significant difference between the two groups. Means and standard deviations were examined to identify the group with the higher level of cultural awareness.

First assumptions were examined for homogeneity, homoscedasticity, and normality. The Levene’s test for homogeneity indicated that the assumption was not met for seven scales; the assumption was satisfied only for B-Experience ($p > .05$). The assumption for homoscedasticity was also not met (Box’s M-test: $p < .05$). Iversen and Norpoth (1976) stated that the Box’s M-test “is generally not useful, because the test itself is extremely sensitive to departures from normality” (p.34). The Shapiro Wilks test for normality, indicated that this assumption was violated for all eight scales for both the undergraduate and graduate groups at $p < .05$. On examining the histogram for each of the dependent variables, scale B-Experience was negatively skewed and H-Interpersonal Sensitivity was positively skewed for both groups. With square-root and even power transformation respectively for scale B- Experience and scale H-Interpersonal Sensitivity, there was no improvement in the histogram. According to Norusis (2002) “if your
sample is large and the distribution of values is not extremely far from normal, you don’t really have to worry” (p.259).

There was a statistically significant difference between groups, $F(8, 856) = 5.49$, $p < .01$. The effect size was .05 which means that 5% of the proportion of variance in the level of cultural awareness is explained by difference in groups. According to Cohen (1977) this is a small effect size. The univariate tests indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the undergraduate and graduate group on five levels of cultural awareness. Statistically significant results for the univariate tests are given below in Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>$df1, df2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\eta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B- Experience</td>
<td>1, 863</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D- Behavioral Flex</td>
<td>1, 863</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E- Cultural Knowledge-Specific</td>
<td>1, 863</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G- Cultural Behavior-General</td>
<td>1, 863</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H- Interpersonal Sensitivity</td>
<td>1, 863</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The partial eta-squared for each of the above scales indicated small effect sizes (Cohen, 1977). Examining the proportion of variance in the level of cultural awareness
explained by the above mentioned scales, it appears that 3% of the variance was explained by G-Cultural Behavior-General. Scale B-Experience explained 2% of the variance, but only .5% of the variance was explained by each of the other three scales: D-Behavioral Flex, E-Cultural Knowledge-Specific, and H-Interpersonal Sensitivity.

On examining the means of both groups showed in Table 4.4, it was found that for each of these five scales the means of the graduate students in counseling were higher than those of the undergraduate group. These were compared on scale B-Experience, undergraduate students (M = 2.3, SD = 2.0) and graduate counseling students (M = 3.0, SD = 2.1). For scale, D-Behavioral Flex, the undergraduate students were (M = 5.8, SD = 2.5), whereas for the graduate students in counseling were (M = 6.2, SD = 2.0). For scale, E-Cultural Knowledge-Specific, the undergraduate students were at (M = 4.7, SD = 2.5), whereas the graduate counseling students were at (M = 5.1, SD = 1.8). On scale, G-Cultural Behavior-General, the undergraduate students were at (M = 5.6, SD = 2.2) and graduate counseling student were at (M = 6.5, SD = 1.7). On scale, H-Interpersonal Sensitivity, the undergraduate students were at (M = 7.7, SD = 2.5), whereas the graduate counseling students were at (M = 8.1, SD = 1.2). Only scale G-Cultural Behavior-General was consistently above the CSI average mean and statistically significant for both t-tests and univariate tests.
Table 4.4

Means and Standard Deviations of Five Scales for Undergraduate and Graduate Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-Experience</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Behavioral Flex</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Cultural Knowledge-Specific</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-Cultural Behavior-General</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-Interpersonal Sensitivity</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of scores on the CSI scales indicated that the graduate counseling students appeared to be more open to diversity and differences of persons from other countries and cultures than the undergraduate students. This may be due to these graduate students’ levels of maturity, work experience, and their natural interest in the issues of other people. Choosing to participate in a graduate training program in counseling may be a pertinent factor in explaining these differences and the personality traits of graduate students in developing their observation skills because of their keen interest in and responsiveness to the issues of other people. However, the data from other scales does not indicate that this outward interest is in complement with an inward or cognitive flexibility and acceptance of the peculiarities and traditions of other cultures.
Overall, while the graduate group does have a statistically significant higher level of cultural awareness than the undergraduate group, the weakness in the level of cultural awareness in the graduate group appears to be in the cognitive area (knowledge), and their strength in the behavioral area of cultural understanding, curiosity, inquisitiveness, with a growing sensitivity toward experiencing other cultures. It may be added that data from scales, B- Experience and H- Interpersonal Sensitivity, were negatively and positive skewed respectively, and transformation did not make a difference. Therefore interpretations regarding these two scales may be skewed as well.

**Differences in Caucasian and African American Graduate Students**

Research Question four, Is there a difference in cultural awareness between African American and Caucasian graduate students in the counseling? In the graduate counseling student sample, were 67 African Americans, 130 Caucasians, and 3 who indicated other as their ethnic origin. Because there were only three persons in this group, ‘Other’, they were dropped from this analysis.

A General Linear Model multivariate analysis (MANOVA) was conducted to examine any differences in the levels of cultural awareness between African American and Caucasian graduate students in counseling in the eight scales of cultural awareness measured by the CSI. The results indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between these two groups. The assumption for homoscedasticity was not met (Box’s M-test: p < .05).
The multivariate test indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in the levels of cultural awareness between African Americans and Caucasians, $F(8, 191) = 1.22, p > .05$. It may be concluded that in this study ethnicity does not appear to be a factor in levels of cultural knowledge and awareness.

**Discussion**

When compared to Reddin’s average mean scores on the various scales of the CSI, the undergraduates in this study were in the “low” level of cultural awareness for all eight scales. These lower levels of cultural awareness may have several explanations. One may be that the students in this study may lack exposure to persons from foreign countries and their cultural heritage and tradition. Few of these undergraduates had studied foreign languages, since there are few requirements for them in the undergraduate curriculum. These undergraduates may also have little interest in the cultural heritage of persons from other countries due to western focus or ethnocentric attitudes and beliefs. Whatever the explanation, it appears that little progress has occurred that encourage these undergraduates to embrace the heritages and cultural traditions of persons from foreign lands. The results of this study appeared to support the conclusions of Lopez-Mulnix & Mulnix (2006) and Cates et al. (2007) who indicated that many universities may not have adequately integrated multicultural subject matter into their curriculum. In addition the students in this study may lack exposure to persons from foreign countries and their cultural behavior.
Smith et al. (2006) stated that there was an ongoing effort to develop curriculum that incorporated multicultural education into the professional training of mental health professionals in counseling and psychology. However, Chae, Foley, and Chae (2006) questioned whether counseling programs implemented even the minimal standards required by accrediting bodies. In this current study, t-tests indicated that only one of the three scales that were above Reddin’s average mean score, G-Cultural Behavior-General was statistically significant. This appears to indicate that graduate students in counseling had high levels of awareness in areas of behavioral interest that measured behavioral patterns and observational interests. For example, graduate counseling students are observant of body language, interactions of groups of people from other cultures, curious about food habits, clothing, and other peculiarities of differing cultural groups.

The remaining five scales, A-Lack of Western Ethnocentrism, B-Experience, C-Cognitive Flex, E-Cultural Knowledge General, F-Cultural Behavior-General, that fell in the “low” level of cultural awareness may indicate that graduate counseling students may lack an understanding and appreciation of other cultures. According to Reddin’s average mean scores, graduate counseling students may also have beliefs that might be characterized by some authorities as ethnocentric and lacking in a broad worldview. These results may indicate that cognitively these graduate students in counseling, like the undergraduate students in this study, may not have a flexible cultural mindset. If this is true, an inflexible cultural mindset is one that resists appreciation, understanding, and
valuing cultural norms from other cultures and ethnic traditions that differ from their own cultural and ethnic traditions.

Yan and Lam (2000) stated that the underpinnings of most counseling theories are entrenched in Western psychology, which tends to propagate European-American ideals. Western psychology may reinforce western ethnocentrism, rather than encouraging a perspective that incorporates a wider worldview. Perhaps the undergraduate students as well as the graduate students in counseling may not even recognize their tendency toward ethnocentric ideas and may consider their ideas the worldwide norm. Western thought, perspectives and ideals tend to perpetuate the assumption that European-American ideals are standards for normality. Katz (1985), Mays (1985) and Sue (1981) indicated that if persons have western ethnocentric perception, they may perpetuate a notion that all ethnic minorities are deprived, disadvantaged, or deficient culturally unless integrated into western values, culture, and aspirations. Leong and Chou (1996) recommended that cross-cultural counselors “unveil their own cultural selves” (p.490) by expanding their idiosyncratic or atypical cultural sensitivities, as a very fundamental prerequisite for understanding clients’ problems. Unfortunately, it may be that some U.S. counselors, regardless of their ethnic or racial background, are unaware of their own lack of insight and understanding about cultural values and standards when they do not conform to western thought or incentive.

Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis (1992) affirmed that the tripartite feature of multicultural counseling competence is awareness, knowledge, and skills, whereas
Sodowsky (1996) stated that a fourth dimension was the counseling relationship. Additionally, the American Counseling Association (2005) authorized the development of multicultural counseling competence with dignity through diversity. The importance and gravity of instilling multicultural knowledge effectively in graduates in the counseling program is undisputed, but often misunderstood. Although this study indicated that the graduate counseling students had a higher level of cultural awareness than the undergraduate group according to the Culture Shock Inventory and Reddin’s average mean scores, the counseling profession has much work to do to achieve multicultural competency for counselors.

Research indicated that some of the variables that influenced multicultural awareness and knowledge were: (a) differences between Caucasian and African American students and (b) international exposure. Phillips (2005) stated that African American students experienced marginalization due to (a) race, (b) socioeconomic status, and (c) academic difficulties. Lewis, Ginzberg, Davis and Smith (2004) found higher attrition rates, lower cumulative grade point averages, and lower graduation rates among African American than Caucasian students. Other researchers added that some of the reasons for this disparity were: (a) poor academic preparation, (b) none or few role models on campus or among faculty, (c) lack of belongingness, isolation and helplessness on campus, and (d) poor communication and negotiation skills in relating to academic and social systems on campus (Parker & Scott, 1985; Brown, 1997). The assumption would be that African American students, due to their own history of being discriminated
against and marginalized in U.S. society would be more sensitive and interested in the
issues and concerns of other cultures. This study did not indicate any difference in the
scores of African and Caucasian American graduate students in counseling on the CSI.

Mueller and Pope (2004) stated that there is a significant correlation between
multicultural awareness and knowledge and international exposure. While this study
indicated that the graduate students in counseling had a higher level of cultural awareness
than the undergraduate students, descriptive statistics confirmed that the graduate
counseling students had more travel experience and fluency in a foreign language than
the undergraduate group, which may have had some influence on their scores.
Additionally, training in counseling focuses on the needs and values of the individual,
which should sensitize the graduate counseling student to more diverse values and
beliefs. However, it appears that counseling programs may need to more adequately
address the issues of Western ethnocentrism in their curriculum. To be effective,
counselors must be aware of their own perspectives and vulnerabilities and this continued
lack of understanding of the impact of western ethnocentrism could impede the personal
and professional growth of counselors. In turn, the development of the counseling
relationship can be inhibited by unconscious and undiscovered stereotypes and prejudices
on the part of the counselor.
The present study was an attempt to examine the levels of cultural awareness and knowledge among undergraduate and graduate students who were enrolled in a counseling program at Mississippi State University using the Culture Shock Inventory (Reddin & Rowell, 1995) as the measure of cultural awareness. In addition to the primary purpose, a secondary purpose was to assess differences in the levels of cultural awareness between Caucasian and African American graduate students enrolled in a counseling program. For this study, cultural awareness (or multicultural awareness) was operationally defined as knowledge, awareness, and acceptance that individuals from a particular cultural group maintain about those who belong to other cultural groups, their traditions, beliefs, behaviors, learning styles, values, and priorities (Reddin & Rowell).

Although cultural awareness can be defined as religious affiliation, socioeconomic status, gender preference, multiple-heritages (due to global immigration), sexual orientation, national origin, race, culture, ethnicity, age, disability, and native language (Pedersen, 1988; Speight et al., 1991), this study focuses only on national origins and those cultural properties defined by national heritage. National origins and national heritage are defined as those cultural properties of persons from countries other than the United States of America.
In the U.S., the cultural environment has always been one of change due to immigration from other countries. Acceptance of the diverse view of persons from other countries and other cultures has been an issue for persons in the U.S. for many years. After a thorough review of the literature the researcher determined that authorities and accrediting bodies recommended that college students and mental health professionals develop multicultural awareness and knowledge. Characteristics that define multiculturalism include: gender, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, national origin (Pedersen, 1988; Speight et al., 1991). Other aspects of the person that have been included are race, culture, ethnicity, age, disability, language (Helms, 1994; Locke, 1990). To ensure that people from other cultural milieus are accepted, appreciated, and are successful in a culturally diverse society, like the U.S., multicultural education has been included in university and college curricula (Banks, 2000; Gay, 2000).

Integrating multicultural education into the curricula of many universities has not been a smooth process according to authors Cates et al. (2007), and Lopez-Mulnix and Mulnix (2006). In addition, Chae, Foley, and Chae (2006) believed that counseling and counselor education programs had not adequately addressed multicultural issues, nor developed effective programs of multicultural education for their counseling students. Part of this problem according to Atkinson (2004) and Chae, Foley, and Chae relates to the heavy focus on Eurocentric and Western Ethnocentrism values and principles in most of the more prominent counseling theories.
Abreu, Chung, and Atkinson (2000) indicated that for counseling students to develop effective and comprehensive multicultural competencies, they must first have insight into their own cultural values and standards. Cultural awareness emerges from examination of the counselor’s own cultural milieu and incorporates an understanding and knowledge of the stereotypes, prejudices, and labels that are part of the counseling students’ cognitive and emotional understanding of others (Arredondo, 1999; Niemann, Romero, & Arbona, 2000). In counseling, development of multicultural competence encompasses awareness, knowledge, skills, as well as effective counseling relationships (American Counseling Association, 2005; Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992).

Pope-Davis et al. (2002) suggested that competent counselors needed to be sensitive and open in dealing with the client’s cultural issues and that this sensitivity should assist in creating a positive and productive counseling relationship. The authors advocated addressing power balances in the counseling relationship and communicating about cultural impasses when they negatively influence the client and counselor interaction.

The researcher chose two theoretical models that appeared to bolster multicultural education in counseling: Banks’s transformative approach and Rogers’s client-centered counseling model. Bank’s approach encouraged (a) self-exploration by students of their cultural identity; (b) creating an atmosphere of discovery and adventure when studying other cultures; and (c) developing students’ ideals as advocates for those from other cultural heritages. Choosing Roger’s client-centered theory emerged from the acceptance,
tolerance, and belief in the value of others that characterizes this counseling theory. According to Rogers, the effective counselor respects his or her client as a change agent who has the capacity for self-direction and growth. The counselor who is competent in working with persons from other cultures embodies Rogers’s qualities of genuineness, positive regard, and empathetic understanding.

An essential component of developing multicultural awareness, according to Mueller and Pope (2004), is an introduction to international culture through travel and study of foreign languages (Steward, 1998; Zhai & Scheer, 2002). Travel to other countries promotes a clearer understanding of what comprises cultural beliefs and standards. The study of foreign languages has become less and less popular as an adjunct to comprehensive education in the U.S. The study of a foreign language promotes cultural pluralism and increases understanding and appreciation of persons from other cultures. In summary, multicultural education has emerged as an important part of the competent college student and the competent counselor or mental health professional. Changes in the U.S. cultural landscape necessitate having a more comprehensive approach to providing culturally enriching curricula for undergraduate and graduate students, alike.

In this study, the Culture Shock Inventory (CSI) was administered to 200 graduate students in counseling. Existing or archival data from 665 undergraduate students were provided by Cottrell for analysis (Cottrell, 2004). The data from the graduate and undergraduate groups were examined using t-tests for each group. The levels of cultural
awareness of the graduate counseling students were derived by comparing the eight levels of cultural awareness between the graduate and undergraduate groups using a multivariate analysis (MANOVA), followed by univariate tests.

The undergraduate group (Table 3.1) included: 320 men (48%) and 345 women (52%). The ethnicity in the undergraduate group was primarily African and Caucasian American (96%), with 91 African American, 542 Caucasian American, and 32 undergraduates designated as Other. Of the undergraduate group 17% were fluent in a foreign language, 27% had minimal skills in a foreign language and 56% knew no foreign language. Of the 200 graduate students in counseling, 35 were men (18%), and 165 were women (82%), with 67 African Americans (34%), 130 Caucasian Americans (65%), and only 3 (2%) designated as Other. The graduate counseling students endorsed fluency in a foreign language at 22%, with 29% having minimal foreign language skills and 49% having no foreign language knowledge. Of the undergraduates, 80% had not traveled in a foreign country, with 16% making a brief trip of less than a month, and only 4% having traveled in a foreign country for over a month. The graduate students in counseling indicated that 28% had traveled in a foreign country for more than a month, 26% for less than a month, and 47% has not traveled abroad.

Examination of the multivariate analysis, MANOVA procedure, revealed that the graduate counseling students had a statistically significant higher level of cultural awareness than the undergraduate group. Inspection of the univariate tests (Table 4.3) revealed that the graduate students in counseling had higher levels of cultural awareness
than the undergraduate group in five levels of cultural awareness as measured by the CSI scales: (a) B-Experience; (b) D-Behavioral Flex; (c) E-Cultural Knowledge-Specific; (d) G- Cultural Behavior-General; (e) H-Interpersonal Sensitivity.

Of these five CSI levels of cultural awareness, t-tests revealed that for both groups: (a) two CSI scales B- Experience and E-Cultural Knowledge-Specific, were statistically significantly below the average mean on the CSI, and, (b) overall, both groups fell in the “low” level of cultural awareness on the CSI. Of the other three CSI scales, D-Behavioral Flex and H-Interpersonal Sensitivity, were not statistically significantly higher than the CSI average mean for the graduate students in counseling; and G-Cultural Behavior-General and H-Interpersonal Sensitivity were statistically significantly lower than the CSI average mean for the undergraduate group. Only one CSI Scale, G- Cultural Behavior-General, had a statistically significant higher level of cultural awareness and this was only for the graduate students in counseling.

Therefore it may be concluded from this study that the graduate students in counseling may have a higher level of external awareness, understanding and curiosity indicated by observing patterns of behavior of individuals from different cultures as defined by CSI scale G-Cultural Behavior-General. Additionally, it appears that although this group of graduate students had a higher level of cultural awareness in scale G-Cultural Behavior-General (curiosity and understanding of peculiarities in behavior in different cultures through observation), they continue to lack acceptance and understanding of the various beliefs of other cultures as indicated by low levels of
cultural awareness evidenced on the five CSI scales (Table 4.2): A-Lack of Western Ethnocentrism, B-Experience, C-Cognitive Flex, E-Cultural Knowledge-Specific, F-Cultural Knowledge-General. These five scales together measure cognitive levels of cultural knowledge and awareness, suggesting cognitive inflexibility in this group of participants. This study appears to indicate that although these graduate students in counseling had an appreciable level of external cultural awareness and interest, they retain a “low” level of cultural knowledge and acceptance.

It was therefore surmised that the strength of the graduate students in counseling was in understanding patterns of behavior of other cultures through observation, but they may continue to maintain high levels of western ethnocentrism. This internalized belief, ethnocentrism, assumes that the culture of one’s group or country is right and essentially the only rational response (Ethnocentrism, 2009). All other cultures are therefore judged by this yardstick, leaving no room for flexibility or acceptance of other cultures or their traditions, customs, ideologies, and differences. Pedersen (2003) stated that the U.S. approach to international relations is a zealousness in “teaching” and “leading” other countries according to U.S. cultural beliefs and norms. Whereas, when it is the turn of the U.S. to “learn” or “follow,” the country as a whole shies away from such a position. This attitude creates little understanding and appreciation of the perspectives of others, particularly when they are different than those of U.S. culture.

The challenge for counselor educators may be in opening this closed off internal mind-set of graduate students in counseling programs. The findings of this study appear
consistent with the research of Chung, Bemak, Ortiz and Sandoval-Perez (2008), who emphasized the importance of scrutinizing one’s automatic thoughts that naturally flow as a result of negativity, misunderstanding, and discomfort with an emerging multicultural environment, along with stereotypical media influences. Earlier research studies also referred to “deceptive tolerance,” which is a phenomenon that occurs when individuals are not aware of the different ways in which their unique cultural experiences influence their underlying beliefs about other races or cultures, and how those beliefs influence their actions (Middleton et al., 2005). Barnes, Craig and Chambers (2000) emphasized the importance of seeking a clear sense of cultural awareness and knowledge of one’s own cultural beliefs and cultural heritage in order to develop cultural competency. Although the graduate students in counseling had overall higher level of cultural awareness than the undergraduate group (MANOVA), this graduate group still lacks in the requisite skills for professional multicultural counseling competency.

**Implications**

This study appears to support the need for more focused and specific training for undergraduates and for graduate counseling students in multicultural education. In addition, this research appears to indicate that counseling programs should specifically address the areas of multicultural competence that was shown to be “low” by the Reddin’s average mean scale scores for the graduate students in this study.
Researchers have indicated that there was a lack of empirical evidence of the preparation of graduate students in counseling and questioned whether present methods of training result in multicultural competence. This study recommends research in areas of curriculum and its effectiveness, the didactic teaching methods, and a current lack of periodic assessment and thorough self-assessment. Awareness, knowledge, and skills play a crucial role in multicultural training and research. Colvin-Burque, Zugazaga, and David-Maye (2007) indicated that developing multicultural competence requires a clear awareness and knowledge of one’s values, beliefs, attitudes, biases, and prejudices. This study identified gaps in areas of awareness, knowledge, and curriculum planning in specific areas of multicultural counseling competence. Awareness of students own cultural make-up like inherent factors of privilege or oppression, levels of openness or ethnocentrism, degree of international exposure by way of travel outside the U.S. and fluency in at least one foreign language might increase students’ knowledge and awareness. In addition, addressing these students’ lack of knowledge of their own assumptions, values, beliefs, attitudes, prejudices may increase their competency, awareness, and knowledge. An earlier researcher, Kiselica (1998) stated that self-exploration and introspection about cultural attitudes and inherent beliefs promote substantial personal and professional growth in counselors. Neville, Worthington, and Spanierman (2001) agreed that such self-examination assisted counselors-in-training to consciously critique their stereotypical attitudes and behavior, and move ahead to a
broader systemic perspective. Such self-scrutiny can become one of the ways to target and perhaps ameliorate ethnocentric values and beliefs in counselors.

Hays, Dean and Chang (2007) reported that although ethical practices demanded an awareness and knowledge of various cultural constructs, research indicated that such investigation may be minimal in counselor training programs. King and Baxter-Magdola (2005) asserted that overly simplistic and sometimes incomplete plans and ideas for developing the basic levels of cultural understanding or multicultural competence, have hindered proper growth in counselors.

At the same time, this study indicated that the strength of graduate counseling students lies in behavioral areas of scrutinizing patterns of behavior and their fairly sharp observation skills of individuals from other cultures. It appeared that the graduate counseling students in this study had developed their observations skills and were sensitive to behavioral cues in persons from other countries and cultures. Counseling training focuses on observational skills and developing an understanding of the client by careful listening and observation of verbal cues and body language. However, the results appears to indicate there may be cognitive inflexibility in these counseling students. If these students retain an underlying Western ethnocentrism and a cultural close-mindedness, this would impede the counseling relationship when working with persons from foreign countries and other cultural heritages. If these results are valid, these students have an *external* interest and curiosity in other cultures, however they may be
internally unaware of their Western Ethnocentrism, which could hinder the examination of their own values, standards, and ideals.

In short, this study may help point researchers toward investigating ways of (a) achieving cognitive flexibility, thus helping counseling graduate students open their minds to their own distinctive and sometimes idiosyncratic beliefs (e.g. of privilege or of oppression), which is key to accepting and respecting the peculiar beliefs, customs, and traditions of other cultures; (b) introducing cross-cultural experiences that are interesting and useful to the counseling student; and (c) identifying and addressing cultural “micro-aggressions” (Sue et al., 2008) that are almost invisible due to their ambiguity and subtlety. Such research would certainly contribute in training multicultural competent counselors for the 21st century.

**Recommendations**

Parham (2004) commended the progress of the multicultural counseling movement thus far, at the same time emphasizing the need for continuing and constant innovation. Arredondo, Tovar-Blank and Parham (2008) discussed their vision for a counseling profession which is ‘anchored’ in multicultural competency, with strong values and practices. These authors underscored the importance of expanding the ‘cultural competency lens’ as they foresee the growth of multiracial families in the next 10 to 20 years. A new and different worldview of this ‘new’ population may demand more cultural sensitivity and understanding from counselors. These authors also added
that religion and culture may take on new dimensions. As a case in point, Chung et al. (2008) questioned the automatic thoughts generated about individuals who are Muslim, because of stereotypical and negative messages propagated by the media and other socio-political influences about this cultural group.

Recommendations that emerge from this research relate to ways and means to increase awareness and knowledge to attain multicultural competency especially in counseling; along with supporting amendment in the (counseling) curriculum. With regard to awareness (of self and other) and (cultural) cognitive development, students may be encouraged to journal their observation of individuals from other cultures, focusing on one or two cultures specifically. Particularly as observations skills was a strength among counseling students as per this study, this may be an interesting entry point for counseling students. Along with journaling observations of cultural differences and similarities of one or two individuals from a specific culture/s, counseling students may be required to research these specific cultures, concluding with their thoughts about differences or similarities between their reading and their personal experience with individuals from those cultures. Such an experiential-cum-research study is likely to open young counseling minds to limitations in personal opinion and the vast unknown about another cultures. Further, sharing such experiences in the classroom, may help break through barriers of ethnocentrism, stereotypical limitations, and other underlying and perhaps unconscious individual and human prejudices. Such clarity and self
awareness may be a big step toward self-and-other acceptance, a necessary component in counseling.

Other recommendations include combining experiential and didactic styles of learning in the classroom: (a) using films, literature, music, and/or art from different countries illustrating different values and cultural norms; (b) encouraging students to participate in informal international activities on campus; (c) inviting minority and international students to interact with counseling students in classroom discussions that address differences and similarities in cultural and perhaps religious values and issues; (d) making available study abroad programs or attending international conferences with ACA support to acquaint counselors with other cultures; (e) partnering counseling programs with those in other countries to foster exchange programs; (f) encouraging masters-level students to minor in a foreign language or enlist in immersion programs (i.e., immersion program in Rio de Janeiro using Spanish and Portuguese); (h) considering curricula changes in counseling to help students become intimately aware of their own cultural nuances and its consequential influence and impact on the sensitive counseling process (Yan & Lam, 2000).

Recommendations for educators in academia would call for: (a) recognizing travel to a foreign country for extra credit in undergraduate classes; (b) making an introductory course in a foreign language mandatory for undergraduate students; (c) encouraging students to do research by interviewing students of different cultures emphasizing differences and similarities in other traditions and customs; (d) inviting students from
other cultures to be interviewed in the classroom to understand and appreciate differences and similarities; (e) making study abroad more feasible and financially viable for the average student; (f) encouraging more students to avail themselves of student exchange programs; (g) organizing symposiums for interactive presentations focusing on different countries, their cultural nuances and interests; (h) offering extra credit for students who critique a movie or book from another culture.

In conclusion, a pertinent observation may be that the undergraduate sample came from a general population of undergraduates, whereas the graduate sample came from a specific counseling graduate program. However it may be recommended that graduate and undergraduate students alike be required course work and practical exposure to other cultures for growth in multicultural knowledge and awareness. Literature is generally supportive of this recommendation. Students need a brand of higher education that will equip them to be citizens of the world, as opposed to being just citizens of the United States. The challenge of the 21st century is integration into the Global Village with academia’s challenge creating an environment that fosters understanding of cultural diversity in an environment of acceptance, awareness, and knowledge.
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APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENT : CSI QUESTIONNAIRE AND DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY
CULTURE SHOCK INVENTORY

1. A great many countries would not benefit from increased industrialization.
   Agree            Disagree

2. People from other countries are often invited in our house.
   Agree            Disagree

3. I am never called opinionated.
   Agree            Disagree

4. I have done some very unusual things that have changed my life.
   Agree            Disagree

5. America is thought to be less class conscious than Britain.
   Agree            Disagree

6. No languages are inferior to other languages.
   Agree            Disagree

7. People in lesser developed countries do not behave in unnatural ways.
   Agree            Disagree

8. The way a person stands can tell you something about that person as a person.
   Agree            Disagree

9. Many countries do not want or need industrial progress.
   Agree            Disagree

10. As an adult, I have had at least one very close friend from another country.
    Agree            Disagree
11. I frequently change my opinion.
  Agree               Disagree

12. Most people would say I am easy going.
  Agree               Disagree

13. Germans are believed to form and join clubs more than people from most other countries.
  Agree               Disagree

14. No races are born intellectually superior to other races.
  Agree               Disagree

15. Work and play are not clearly different.
  Agree               Disagree

16. A smile does not always indicate pleasure.
  Agree               Disagree

17. If lesser developed countries remained just as they are now they would not be too badly off.
  Agree               Disagree

18. I have worked for more than three years in a country other than my own.
  Agree               Disagree

19. It is always best to be completely open-minded and willing to change one’s opinion,
  Agree               Disagree

20. I would like to change.
  Agree               Disagree
21. Superstition is said to play a larger part in life in Ireland than in many other countries.
   Agree          Disagree

22. Countries have no system of courts can still provide adequate justice for their people.
   Agree          Disagree

23. All ceremonies have practical value.
   Agree          Disagree

24. Different people can communicate similar feelings in quite different ways.
   Agree          Disagree

25. In a great many ways, people in lesser developed countries have a better life than those in industrialized countries.
   Agree          Disagree

26. I have traveled for a total of at least six months in one or more countries other than the one I was born in.
   Agree          Disagree

27. There is never only one right answer to questions involving people.
   Agree          Disagree

28. I am involved in several quite different kinds of social groups.
   Agree          Disagree

29. In France, art and literature are thought to be valued more than in most other countries.
   Agree          Disagree

30. Religious beliefs may hinder a country from advancing economically.
    Agree          Disagree
31. Gracious manners in one country may be poor manners in another.  
   Agree  Disagree

32. Stating a point loudly and frequently is a poor way of gaining acceptance for it.  
   Agree  Disagree

33. The average level of morality, if different at all, is probably higher in less developed countries.  
   Agree  Disagree

34. I have taken a course in anthropology or read at least three professional books about other cultures.  
   Agree  Disagree

35. Listening to every idea presented is always a good policy.  
   Agree  Disagree

36. I often experiment with new methods of doing things.  
   Agree  Disagree

37. North Americans and Latin Americans think differently about time.  
   Agree  Disagree

38. People in less economically developed countries usually have well developed social customs.  
   Agree  Disagree

39. Weeping has quite different means in different cultures.  
   Agree  Disagree

40. A person’s facial expression can change the meaning of the words spoken.  
   Agree  Disagree

41. Economic progress is by no means the most important measure of a country’s advancement.  
   Agree  Disagree
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42. I can converse easily in at least one language other than my own.

   Agree                      Disagree

43. I sometimes change my opinion even if I am not certain I am right in doing so.

   Agree                      Disagree

44. I am very different now from two years ago.

   Agree                      Disagree

45. Male friends in North America touch each other less than male friends in Latin America.

   Agree                      Disagree

46. A country’s geographical position influences the way of life of its people.

   Agree                      Disagree

47. No custom is strange to the people who practice it.

   Agree                      Disagree

48. People often communicate without realizing it.

   Agree                      Disagree

49. Lesser developed countries do not owe it to the world to strive to become more industrialized.

   Agree                      Disagree

50. I can make sense out of a daily newspaper in at least two languages other than my own.

   Agree                      Disagree

51. There are usually more good reasons for change than against it.

   Agree                      Disagree

52. I seldom conform unless I have to.

   Agree                      Disagree
53. In normal conversations North Americans stand further apart than Latin Americans.
   Agree                                   Disagree

54. In some countries only a little sympathy is felt for a sick family member.
   Agree                                   Disagree

55. No country is more boorish or vulgar than another.
   Agree                                   Disagree

56. Even slight gestures can mean and convey just as much as many words.
   Agree                                   Disagree

57. Industrialization has as many bad points as good ones.
   Agree                                   Disagree

58. I go out of my way to talk with people from other countries.
   Agree                                   Disagree

59. In most case right and wrong are hard to distinguish.
   Agree                                   Disagree

60. I often do things on the spur of the moment.
   Agree                                   Disagree

61. Australians see themselves as individuals.
   Agree                                   Disagree

62. There is no such things as a bad smell which all nationalities would agree on.
   Agree                                   Disagree

63. Patterns of everyday courtesies are complex in all countries.
   Agree                                   Disagree
64. Clothes reflect personality.

Agree                  Disagree

65. Many lesser developed countries reject democracy as it is clearly unsuitable to their needs at the moment.

Agree                  Disagree

66. I have visited at least one other country at least six times.

Agree                  Disagree

67. I do have many firm beliefs.

Agree                  Disagree

68. I don’t usually plan too well before acting.

Agree                  Disagree

69. Religion is more important in Myanmar than in most countries.

Agree                  Disagree

70. It is difficult to learn the way of life of the people in another country.

Agree                  Disagree

71. Witch doctors usually help the sick.

Agree                  Disagree

72. Gazing around while listening probably indicates disinterest in what is being said.

Agree                  Disagree

73. Income has little relationship of the quality of one’s life.

Agree                  Disagree

74. I have worked with people from at least two countries other than the one I was born in.

Agree                  Disagree
75. Other people very often have better ideas than I do.
Agree  Disagree

76. I often do things differently after hearing the suggestions of others.
Agree  Disagree

77. People in America are on a first name basis more quickly than people of most other countries.
Agree  Disagree

78. Climate affects customs and economic development.
Agree  Disagree

79. Making or scarring the body nearly always serves a practical purpose in countries where it is practiced.
Agree  Disagree

80. The method of shaking hands reflects personality.
Agree  Disagree
CULTURE SHOCK INVENTORY
ANSWER SHEET

1. Sex:  ○ Male
          ○ Female

2. Age  ○ 18 – 20 years
          ○ 21 – 24 years
          ○ 25 – 29 years
          ○ 30 – 39 years
          ○ 40 – 49 years
          ○ Above 50 years

3. Ethnicity
   ○ African American – not Hispanic
   ○ Asian American
   ○ Hispanic
   ○ Native American
   ○ White (Caucasian) – not Hispanic
   ○ International – Please specify nation of citizenship

4. Which degree program are you enrolled in?
   Please check one:
   ○ Counselor education
   ○ School Psychology
   ○ Special Ed
   Please check one:
   ○ Masters
   ○ Ph.D.
   ○ Ed. S.

5. What is your specialty?
   ○ College Counseling
   ○ Community Counseling
   ○ School Counseling
   ○ Student development
   ○ Rehab counseling

6. How many semesters have you been in the program?
   ........................................

7. Do you have your:
   ○ certification: Yes / No
   ○ license: Yes / No

8. Family Heritage:
   (a) Religious Affiliation
   ○ Buddhist
   ○ Catholic
   ○ Jewish
   ○ Protestant (Please Specify)
   ........................................
   ○ Other (Please Specify)
   ........................................
   ○ None

   (b) Political Affiliation:
   ○ Ultra Conservative
   ○ Conservative
   ○ Moderate
   ○ Liberal
   ○ Ultra Liberal
   ○ I don’t know
   ○ None
9. What are the four countries you have traveled to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Length of Stay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. What foreign languages can you speak and/or read?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Fluency Level (Excellent, Good, Poor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

APPROVAL LETTER AND RENEWAL (SPRING 2009)
September 6, 2007

Phyllis Benjamin
PO Box 1726
Ms State, MS 39762

RE: IRB Study #07-178: Cultural Awareness in a University Setting

Dear Ms. Benjamin:

The above referenced project was reviewed and approved via administrative review on 9/6/2007 in accordance with 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2). Continuing review is not necessary for this project. However, any modification to the project must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to implementation. Any failure to adhere to the approved protocol could result in suspension or termination of your project. The IRB reserves the right, at anytime during the project period, to observe you and the additional researchers on this project.

Please refer to your IRB number (#07-178) when contacting our office regarding this application.

Thank you for your cooperation and good luck to you in conducting this research project. If you have questions or concerns, please contact Christine Williams at c.williams@research.msstate.edu or 325-5220.

Sincerely,

Katherine Crowley
Assistant IRB Compliance Administrator

cc: Kathy Dooley

Office for Regulatory Compliance
P.O. Box 6223 • 84 Morgan Street • Mialstep 9965 • Mississippi State, MS 39762 • (662) 325-3294 • FAX (662) 325-8776
Procedural Modification/Addendum Request Form

Please note: This form may NOT be used for personnel changes or time extensions. Please complete a Personnel Modification form for personnel changes or a Continuing Review Report form for time extension requests.

IRB Study#07 - 178

Principal Researcher/Investigator: Phyllis Benjamin

Study Title: Multicultural Awareness in a University Setting

1. Summarize / Itemize requested changes and justification for each. Request permission to collect more data this semester - Spring 2008 CEPSE

2. Do changes require revisions to the assessment of risk of harm to the subjects?
   ☐ YES - If yes, explain.
   ☑ NO

3. Do changes require revisions to the methods of ensuring anonymity or confidentiality?
   ☐ YES - If yes, explain.
   ☑ NO

4. Are there new findings that may relate to a participant's willingness to continue taking part in the research study?
   ☐ YES - If yes, explain whether these findings need to be provided to participants, and if so, how this will be accomplished.
   ☑ NO

5. Do changes require a revised consent statement or procedure?
   ☑ YES - If yes, attach a revised consent form with the changes tracked, AND a clean copy for the IRB approval stamp.
   ☐ NO

 principalsignature
 Principal Investigator
 Date 3.26.09

 researchadvisorsignature
 Research Advisor (if applicable)
 Date 03/06/09

*Note: You must receive written notification of approval from the IRB before implementing any changes (except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the subject).
APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH STUDY

(FALL 2007 & SPRING / SUMMER 2009)
INFORMED CONSENT

Studies have shown the importance of cultural awareness and competency, as it facilitates understanding and acceptance of people from minority / diverse cultures. This is a survey (Culture Shock Inventory) that measures cultural awareness.

Your participation is requested, as I wish to measure the level of cultural awareness among students registered for a graduate level course in CEPSE, and I invite you to assist me by completing the attached inventory. I anticipate no harm to you. Your name will not be used after your survey has been given a code number. All results will be kept confidential. It will take 10 minutes to complete the inventory and the demographic survey.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. Your refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss to which you are otherwise entitled. You may withdraw from the study at any time or refuse to answer any specific question you do not want to answer.

Do you understand? ______
Do you agree to participate? ______

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to contact Phyllis Benjamin at 662-325-5030 or email pjb5@msstate.edu or MSU Counseling Center – 662-325-2091; or Dr. K. Dooley at 662-325-8177 or email kathyd@ra.msstate.edu

For more information about human participation in research, please contact the MSU Regulatory Compliance Office at 662-325-5220.

___________________  __________________
Student’s Name          Date:

___________________  __________________
Investigator’s Name & Signature Date:

Please remember:
Your participation is entirely voluntary.
You may withdraw from the study at any point.
You may choose NOT to answer any question on this survey.
You may contact me (325-5030) or the Institutional Review Board (325-3994) for answers to any questions about the research and subject’s rights.
The results of your participation will be kept confidential.
You are requested to kindly keep a copy of this document for your records.
THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.
INFORMED CONSENT

Studies have shown the importance of cultural awareness and competency, as it facilitates understanding and acceptance of people from minority/diverse cultures. This is a survey (Culture Shock Inventory) that measures cultural awareness.

Your participation is requested, as I wish to measure the level of cultural awareness among students registered for a graduate level course in CEP, and I invite you to assist me by completing the attached inventory. I anticipate no harm to you. Your name will not be used after your survey has been given a code number. All results will be kept confidential. It will take 15 minutes to complete the inventory and the demographic survey.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. Your refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss to which you are otherwise entitled. You may withdraw from the study at any time or refuse to answer any specific question you do not want to answer.

Do you understand? __________
Do you agree to participate? __________

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to contact Phyllis Benjamin at 662 325 9364 or email pjb5@mstate.edu or MSU Student Counseling Services – 662 325 2091 or Dr. K. Dooley at 662 325 8177, email kathvd@ra.mstate.edu

For more information about human participation in research, please contact the MSU Regulatory Compliance Office at 662 325 5220.

__________________________________________  ______________________________
Student’s Name                                           Date

__________________________________________  ______________________________
Investigator’s Name & Signature                           Date

Please remember:
Your participation is entirely voluntary.
You may withdraw from the study at any point.
You may choose NOT to answer any question on this survey.
You may contact me (325 9364) or the Institutional Review Board (325-5220) for answers to any questions about research subjects’ rights.
The results of your participation will be kept confidential.
You are requested to kindly keep a copy of this document for your records.
THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.

MSU IRB
Approved: 4/7/09
Expires: ______/____/____
APPENDIX D

LETTER OF PERMISSION FROM DR. STEPHEN COTTRELL TO USE DATA COLLECTED IN 2003
From: Dr. Stephen Cottrell
Assistant Director
International Services
MSU
MS - 39762

To: Phyllis Benjamin
Doctoral Student
Department of counselor education
MSU
MS-39762

June 22, 2007

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

I am giving permission to Phyllis Benjamin, doctoral student from the Department of Counselor Education to access an archival database which I collected in 2003. She has my permission to analyze this data and use the results to prepare a research manuscript. These are archival data that have been delinked from any personal identification from the subjects from whom data was gathered.

She also has permission to use the instrument, Culture Shock Inventory for gathering other data for her research.

Dr. Stephen Cottrell