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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Human Services Delivery

Social services are those services provided to help people help themselves. They have been developed and provided over time in a variety of forms. They can be public, private, community based, or personal. Social services emerged from a sense of responsibility for helping, caring, and protecting people. Social services have been provided throughout the country’s history by various agencies. Catholic missionaries and other religious orders provided social services to the sick, widowed, and orphaned settlers before the nation was founded (catholiccharitiesusa.org/who/history.html, 2001, parag. 1). It was during the 1800's that settlement houses were established and the Charity Organization Society was developed. Initially, these services were geared solely toward impoverished populations. Service providers, sometimes called "friendly visitors", made home visits to evaluate families to determine what kind of help they needed and whether they deserved it. Attention was given not only to the economic state of the family, but also their character was assessed as well (socialwork.catastrophe.net/History.html, 2000, parag. 2). During the Progressive Era (1890-
1920), social services experienced changes; the providers begin to shift from being primarily volunteers to professionals; and new forms of human services appeared with the founding of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the term "social workers" was coined (NASW, 1998, p.1).

Human services are not reserved only for the poor in this country. Human service providers could also be found working with delinquent youth in expanding reformatories (Abrams & Curran, 2000). Social services departments began to appear in hospitals after the turn of the century. Human services were provided in the hospitals to help patients deal with the social problems of their physical illnesses. As the end of the Progressive Era approached, psychiatric social workers appeared on the scene as the National Social Workers Exchange, which was later renamed the American Association of Social Workers was established as the first organization for social workers (NASW, 1998, p. 2).

In 1974, the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act was signed into law. Twenty years later, 49 of the 50 states required reporting of the neglect of children, and 41 states included language specifically requiring the reporting of emotional and psychological abuse as well (Oklahoma Child Welfare Staff, 1984). Child abuse referrals have increased
dramatically during the last two decades. In the United States, child abuse reports increased 86% from 606,000 in 1978 to 1,131,300 in 1984 (Ards, 1989, p. 484). Usually, public authorities are expected to respond quickly to surges in important areas of concern to children's welfare. In these times, however, other social ills have multiplied and local governments have been overburdened by inadequate resources to combat these growing problems (p. 484). Increases in the volume of work have not been matched by corresponding increases in staff. Human service provision is hampered when there are not enough staff to address all referrals in a timely fashion.

**Cultural Competence**

The delivery of human services has taken on many forms over the years and has involved many diverse populations. In a country such as the United States, which is composed of so many groups and which is constantly evolving, those providing the services need to be prepared to deal with a variety of cultures. Culture is a set of learned beliefs and behaviors shaping how members view and experience the world. People bring to social encounters worldviews and behaviors that have been shaped by their culture of origin and that were learned as children. Individuals also bring their cultures of affiliation. Cultures of affiliation may include
in part religious groups, ethnic groups, social classes, and voluntary and professional organizations which they have come to embrace (Robbins, Fantone, Hermann, Alexander, & Zweifler, 1998, p. 811).

Culture is the common behavior shared among members of a group (Carlson, 1997, p. 65). This behavior contains the customs, values, norms, language, and, expected ways of doing things (p. 65). Culture is also defined as (a) the totality of socially transmitted behavior patterns, arts, beliefs, institutions, and all other products of human work and thought characteristic of a community or population; (b) a style of social and artistic expression peculiar to a society or class; (c) intellectual and artistic activity, and the works produced by it; and (d) the act of developing the social, moral and intellectual faculties through education (Berube et al., 1985, p. 348).

In order to deal with this diversity caused by people having various cultural backgrounds, those delivering social services need to develop cultural competence. Cultural competence is a set of academic and interpersonal skills that allow people to increase their understanding and appreciation of cultural differences and similarities within, among, and between groups (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1994, chapt.1). It is a needed skill by
human services providers because willingness and ability to draw on community-based values, traditions, and customs and to work with knowledgeable individuals of and from the community in developing targeted interventions, communications, and other supports is essential to providing quality human services.

The Division of Counseling Psychology, Division 17 of the American Psychological Association wrote a position paper on multicultural competencies (Sue et al., 1982). This position paper described 11 cross-cultural counseling competencies organized within categories of awareness, knowledge, and skills (Ponterotto et al., 1996, pp. 247-248). The situation with Native Americans provides an example of how the issue of cultural competence relates to the delivery of human services. Social agencies charged with serving Native American populations are staffed predominately with non-Native American social workers whose professional education may not have provided the tools they need to deliver culturally competent services. A study of Native American cultural factors in the interaction between Native American clients and non-Native American professionals revealed that 65% of the professionals reported that during client interviews there was no discussion related to Native American culture (Williams &
Ellison, 1996). In addition, 15% indicated they did not need to ask for additional cultural information to effectively provide services. Those professionals who reported the need to ask for more cultural information said that they did not know how much weight to place on cultural characteristics and were uncomfortable with collecting the information. These results indicate a need for increased cultural competence among social services providers working with groups like Native Americans.

Problems such as alcoholism, child neglect, diabetes, spiritual loss, suicide and unemployment face people of color at disproportionate rates. Human service providers must be prepared to address these issues while developing culturally-relevant interventions for people who may distrust the very agency they have come to for help.

Since many human service providers come from cultural backgrounds different from their clients, the way to develop cultural competence is through professional development activities. Professional development is the on-going process of adult learning in the work place (Brotherton, 2001, p. 14). Investing in work place learning pays dividends in helping current employees grow and in attracting highly skilled professionals.
Advances in technology, the rise of the global economy, and relentless pressure to perform more efficiently while being more responsive to customers has profoundly transformed workplace learning (Brown, 2000, p. 90). The growing complexity of work alters the nature of learning because ready-made solutions to problems are limited. This places a premium on employees' ability to be self-directed learners (p. 90). Due to these changes, people and organizations are discovering that the line between work and learning is becoming blurred (p. 90). The facility to learn continuously is fast becoming a source of competitive advantage for many organizations. This means the most promising path to greater productivity lies in learning better and faster, thus enhancing employees' abilities to solve problems, innovate, and change (p. 92). Agencies and companies have found it essential to develop skills and competencies in-house at a time when quality employees are hard to come by (Brotherton, 2001, p. 14). This type of training is needed to foster cultural competency in service provision.

**Adult Learning**

"Historically, adult and continuing education has arisen as a response to particular needs . . . Adult education both responds to societal change and tends to feed
further change" (Raachal, 1989, p. 3). The mental learning state of an adult is not a blank chalkboard on which the teacher can write as they wish (Patterson, 1997, p. 122). Neither is the adult learner's head an empty pail for the teacher to fill with their knowledge and ideas. The adult learner's chalkboard already has many messages on it, and the mental pail is almost full already. The adult educators job is not to fill the pail but to help the learners reorganize their own thoughts, skills, and experiences (p. 122). The adult educator can do this by understanding the concepts of andragogy, self-directed learning, real-life learning, and transformational learning.

Andragogy

Though the term andragogy has been used since the 1800's, Malcolm Knowles first made it popular as a concept. Andragogy was Knowles attempt to challenge a nearly complete dependence upon pedagogy as a teaching and learning approach for adults (Patterson, 1997, p. 125).

Knowles (1980) defined andragogy as "the art and science of helping adults learn" (p. 43). He saw andragogy as part of a continuum which allows various approaches to be used. Any one approach could be appropriate for diverse learners at different points in the learning process given a particular field of study. Teaching methods that are
flexible enough to permit varying degrees of control are most beneficial when considering the knowledge and comfort level of the learner. Adult learners range from being fairly dependent on the instructor to learning almost independently. It is the responsibility of the adult educator to cultivate and promote independence in the learner.

Andragogy is based on a set of four assumptions. These are that as individuals mature: (a) their self-concept moves from one of being a dependent personality toward being a self-directed individual; (b) they accumulate a growing reservoir of experience that becomes an increasingly rich resource for learning; (c) their readiness to learn becomes oriented increasingly to the developmental tasks of their social roles; and (4) their time perspective changes from one of postponed application of knowledge to immediacy of application, and accordingly, their orientation toward learning shifts from one of subject-centeredness to one of performance-centeredness (Knowles, 1970, p. 44). In 1984, Knowles added an assumption stating that the motivation for adults to learn was internal in origin rather than external (p. 12). In 1990 a sixth assumption establishing an adults need to know why they are required to learn certain content was added (p. 57).
Self-Directed Learning

Self-directed learning is a process often linked with the discipline of Adult Education. The process occurs when individuals take the initiative, with or without the help of others, in diagnosing their learning needs, formulating learning goals, identifying human and material resources for learning, choosing and implementing appropriate learning strategies, and evaluating learning outcomes. (Knowles, 1975, p. 18)

Self-directed learning is an essential construct of andragogy and as such, it is significant to both the learner and the teacher (p. 7). Knowles (1998) identified two components of self-directed learning regarding how adults learn. The first component is observed when participants assume hegemony over the tools and techniques required to teach themselves. Thus, self-directed learning is self-teaching (p. 135). The second component of self-directed learning is personal autonomy and occurs when participants start "taking control of the goals and purposes of learning" (p. 135). Personal autonomy is the most significant of the two components for learning professionals (p. 136).

The idea that adults take control of their learning became a focal topic of adult education in the 1970's and 1980's. The emphasis on self-directed learning can be traced largely to Tough's work with adult learning projects
Tough found that nearly all adults engage in major learning endeavors each year; it is not unusual for adults to spend 700 hours each year involved in learning projects. These projects may be inspired due to practical reasons, curiosity, interest, or pleasure.

About 70% of all learning projects are planned by the learner himself, who seeks help and subject matter from a variety of acquaintances, experts, and printed resources. Other learning projects rely on a group or instructor, on private lessons or on some nonhuman resource. (Tough, 1979, p. 1)

Real-Life Learning

Learning from daily life situations, prospects, predicaments, and experiences is a process that adult learners confront countless times during their lives. As a field of study, Adult Education explores the benefits of learning that are readily applicable to adult learners' lives as opposed to learning that is from a teacher-centered curricula in formal education. Real-life learning is learning that is "relevant to the living tasks of the individual in contrast to those tasks considered more appropriate to formal education" (Fellenz & Conti, 1989, p. 3).

Learning processes historically used in formal educational venues differ significantly from the processes of real-life learning. During real-life learning, more
attention is afforded the living tasks of individual participants rather than tasks recommended by formal education (Fellenz & Conti, 1989). People are by and large ill prepared through formal education to learn from everyday life experience (Sternburg, 1990, p. 35).

**Transformational Learning**

Mezirow (1990) defines perspective transformation in adult learning as the process of becoming critically aware of the origin of adult presuppositions and how and why they control the way people perceive, understand and feel about the world. During perspective transformation, adults reformulate their assumptions to allow a more inclusive, discriminating, permeable and integrative perspective. This is manifested when people make decisions or otherwise act up on their new understandings (p. 14).

It is the business of all adult educators to engage in emancipatory education. Although adult educators must respond to initial learner interests and self-defined needs, they should respond with the intention of moving the learner to an awareness of the rationale for these needs and how the learners' meaning perspectives may have restricted the manner in which they normally perceive, think, feel, and behave in defining and endeavoring to satisfy their needs (Mezirow, 1990, p. 124).
Meaning constructs are transformed through reflection (Mezirow, 1994). Learners must reflect on unexplored assumptions when beliefs are not serving their purpose. Reflection requires close evaluation of assumptions to determine whether a belief learned during childhood is still valid in adulthood. This is accomplished by critically examining the origins, characteristics, and consequences of the assumptions (p. 223). When transformative learning occurs, learners must also make informed decisions about how and when to act upon their new perspectives (Mezirow, 1995, p. 124). Transformational learning is different than everyday learning in that it results in profound changes in individuals and actually "molds" them, their attitudes, and their future behaviors (Mezirow, 1990, p.2).

"Experience is the learner's living textbook" (Lindeman, 1995, p. 32). Crucial to education is helping learners interpret experience in a way that assists them in more clearly understanding their problems and options "so that they may assume responsibility for decision making" (Mezirow, 1995, p. 32). To accomplish this, workers should develop an awareness regarding their meaning schemes.

When workers become aware of the meaning schemes that control how they deliver social services, they can be empowered to critically analyze the meanings and
expectations they have attached to certain populations, and their level of cultural competency. When learners in a social work environment realize the relationship between their experiences, the meaning they attach to them, and the resulting behaviors or actions that follow, they are ready to re-evaluate their experiences and make the indicated changes in the meanings attached to them. This critical reflection allows adults to evaluate themselves and determine if change is indicated. If it is determined that some sort of change is desired, then they are poised for perspective transformation. Social workers can be empowered to seek out means to enhance their cultural competence. It is possible that a number of social workers may be changed so that they will cease to appear oppressive to the very people they work to serve. As social workers engage in the process of sharing their diversity experiences with each other, deficiencies in cultural competence can be addressed through a collaborative method.

**Problem Statement**

When minority group experiences are discussed, they are generally seen and analyzed from a white, middle-class perspective (Sue et al., 1982, p. 48). As a result, many human services professionals lack understanding and
knowledge about ethnic worldviews and values and their consequent interaction with an oppressive society.

Helping professionals should be culturally sensitive with children and families who are Black, Puerto Rican, Native American and Asian. While the intent to protect and advocate is an honorable one, many human services providers are loathe to admit much less be up front about the inequality with which people are treated based upon race, gender, and social class (Cunningham, 1993, p. 2). To be African American or Chicano or Native American or Asian American is to be often seen as different, though not in any positive sense, for we often conceptualize different as deficient despite the objective reality (p. 2).

The browning of our country is evident everywhere (Rodriguez, 1998, p. 1). Yet, in the course of human service provision, more children of color are removed from their homes than Caucasian children (Courtney, Barth, Berrick, Brooks & Devon, 1996, p. 100). A recent assessment was conducted of five states with large numbers of children placed in some form of foster care that included Texas, Michigan, New York, Illinois, and California. This assessment revealed that children of color are represented three to ten times as much as Caucasian children in state custody. The same study found that the National Center on
Child Abuse and Neglect has reported since 1988 that children of color are more likely to be over represented in child maltreatment reports when considering the number of children of color in the child population (Courtney et al, 1996, p. 101). After a referral is made, allegations of abuse regarding children of color are more likely to be confirmed by social services providers working as Child Welfare Specialists than referrals alleging the abuse or neglect of Caucasian children. The racism that has permeated child welfare services is demonstrated in three ways: (a) by the types of services made available, (b) by unfair treatment based on ethnicity within the system, and (c) by failing to follow through on plans to make changes within the system (Courtney et al, 1996, p. 105). While larger numbers of Black children have been served by public agencies, Caucasians parents have been given more support than other parents (Courtney et al, 1996, p. 106).

Once in the state custody system, over half of the families who had children in custody received no service recommendations (Courtney et al, 1996, p. 106). That is there were no efforts made to facilitate services that would result in over half of the families being reunited. Native American children were the least likely to have services recommended.
Situations such as these indicate a need for increasing the cultural competency of the social service providers in the system. Culturally competent social services professionals possess the skills that allow them to compare and contrast values, norms, customs, and institutions of groups of people who are from a variety of backgrounds. These professionals understand the effects of stereotyping, discrimination and oppression on the provision of social services to those families in need. To assist in resolving this problem, cultural competence in specific areas is necessary (Poole, 1998, p. 12).

Three areas critical in culturally competent service provision are awareness, knowledge, and skills. The awareness category has to do with the social services providers awareness of their own meaning schemes and how they may manifest during interactions with families in the form of culturally insensitive behaviors (Ponterotto et al., 1996, p. 248).

Knowledge refers to the social services providers knowledge of their her worldview as well as the worldview of the person or family being served and of other culture-specific information including the impact of racism on clients, models of acculturation, and racial identity development (p. 248). Practitioners have to be familiar
enough with the respective culture of the people they are serving to know differences within and among groups. For example, they need to realize that not all Hispanics are alike in everything and that Black people in Tulsa are not automatically the same as Black people in Castro Valley, California. Likewise, they must be aware that one band of Blackfeet cannot be expected to automatically have the same values and beliefs as a clan of another Native American Tribal group, or as other groups of Blackfeet.

Another area of competence is skill. This is being able to "make adjustments to work effectively in cross-cultural situations" (Poole, 1998). Skill has to do with the social workers ability to translate awareness and knowledge into culturally competent social services practice (Ponterotto et al, 1996, p. 248).

Defining cultural competence as just accepting and valuing the cultures of others is much too broad (Poole, 1998, p. 2). To exercise cultural competence, social service providers are encouraged to recognize there are good and bad components within every culture. Exercising cultural competence involves practicing tolerance but rejecting any cultural aspects that harm or oppress other people.

Marginalized populations are those groups of people who have historically had little if any voice in the society in
which they live. Children of marginalized populations in the system had fewer visits with their families, fewer services in general, and less contact with their social worker than those in the non marginalized population (Courtney, 1996).

For example,

A comprehensive 1994 federal study of child welfare cases in all 50 states compared children's natural families based on a number of different characteristics and found in every case that black children were more likely than white children to be removed from the home regardless of specific family problems. For example, even when there was no substance abuse problem in the home, black children were still removed 32 percent of the time while white children were removed only 21 percent of the time. Similarly, if a parent was employed, black children were removed in 36 percent of cases. Latino children in 34 percent of cases and white children in only 22 percent. This national study was commissioned by the federal Department of Health and Human Services and conducted by Westat, a private research firm. (<http://www.nycfuture.org /3/index.htm>, parag. 39)

Although Black children comprised only 15% of the child population in the United States in 1995, they represented 49% of children in foster care that same year. Caucasian children represented 36% of the child population in out of home care for that year (Morton, 1999, p. 23). Poverty plays a critical role in a child’s removal from a home. A national survey of abuse and neglect cases in the mid-1980's found that children in families with incomes below $15,000 were 5 times more likely to be victimized by their parents than
those with incomes above that level. Low-income parents are often under greater stress and are more poorly educated than those in higher income brackets, and Black and Latino families are far more likely to be poor than white families (http://www.nycfuture.org/3/index.ht>, , parag. 51).

Services to children can be enhanced when social services workers become self-aware regarding white privilege and other factors prohibiting cultural competence. Giving these professionals who have chosen to perform a very difficult job an opportunity to raise their own consciousness can result in fewer children being removed from their homes.

There is wide agreement among scholars that the process of becoming culturally competent is developmental (Beamer, 1992, p. 288). That is, learning cultural competence is a process. Cultural competence involves both external and internal adjustments. It is not just external. Internal cultural competence must also be promoted, encouraged, and facilitate. Social workers cannot merely be cognizant of the fact that they are to provide services for families of different ethnicities. Child welfare and other social workers must also experience raised consciousness to discover their personal realities about dealing with families of color. "Critical consciousness facilitates
analysis of problems within their context for the purpose of enabling people together to transform their reality rather than merely understanding it or adapting to it with less discomfort" (Cunningham, 1993, p. 7).

The problem was that in order to deliver needed services, the service providers must be culturally competent. There was no way to identify this cultural competence. This lack of an identifying process thwarted the continuing education process that could lead to heightened awareness of cultural appreciation within organizations that serve the public.

The development of a user-friendly instrument to identify cultural appreciation was needed to promote cultural appreciation and enhance service provision. Such an instrument may set the stage for a transformative learning experience for social services professionals. "This may involve new ways of understanding and using knowledge or new ways of understanding oneself and acting in interpersonal relationships" (Merriam, 1995). The development of an instrument that identifies cultural competence may facilitate child welfare or other helping professionals becoming aware of how they perceive and interact with people of different ethnicities. At that point, they may apply this new knowledge to enhance the interpersonal relationships
they have with children and families of color. By doing so, service provision may be improved.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to develop and establish the validity and reliability of an instrument to identify cultural competence in human services workers. The instrument that was developed was patterned after Assessing The Learning Strategies of Adults (ATLAS) and therefore utilized a design similar to that for creating ATLAS (Conti & Kolody, 1999(a), 1999 (b)). This process involved analyses using various multivariate procedures with data collected from social services workers with the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MCKAS) and, the Quick Discrimination Index (Ponterotto, et al., 1995, 1027).

**Research Questions**

The following research questions were addressed in this study.

1. What is the pool of items that can be used to produce an instrument to identify cultural competence in social workers?
2. What is the construct validity for an instrument identifying cultural competency?
3. What is the content validity for an instrument identifying cultural competency?
4. What is the criterion-related validity for an instrument identifying cultural competency?
5. What is the reliability for an instrument identifying cultural competency?
In order to develop a user-friendly instrument with a flow-chart design for identifying cultural competency in social workers, workers at the Oklahoma Department of Human Services completed two existing instruments that assess cultural competence. Responses from the participants were compared to demographic variables to assure that the two instruments were appropriate for the group. Construct validity was established by conducting a confirmatory factor analysis on each instrument to demonstrate that human services responses were similar to the published results for the instrument. In addition, cluster analysis was used to identify the groups that possessed different levels of cultural competency based on the concepts in the literature that are measured by the two instruments. Content validity was established by using discriminant analysis to create precise items for an instrument using a flow-chart design. Criterion-related validity was established by comparing participant responses on the new instrument to their responses on the items used to create the new instrument. Finally, reliability was established by the test-retest method.
Definition of Terms

Adult Learning: The process of adults gaining knowledge and expertise (Knowles, Horton & Swanson, 1998, p.124).

Andragogy: The art and science of helping adults learn (Knowles, 1980, p. 43).

ATLAS: Assessing the Learning Strategies of Adults is an easy to administer and complete learning strategies assessment instrument developed using the international database compiled using SKILLS data (Conti & Kolody, 1998b, p. 109).

Cultural Competence: Having the knowledge and interpersonal skills to understand, appreciate, and work with individuals and families from cultures other than one's own and using the knowledge and skills effectively in the helping process (Zayas, Evans, Mejia, & Rodriguez, 1997, parag. 6)

Perspective Transformation: The process of becoming critically aware of how and why our presuppositions have come to constrain the way we perceive, understand, and feel about our world; of reformulating these assumptions to permit a more inclusive, discriminating, permeable, and integrative perspective; and of making decisions or otherwise acting upon these new understandings (Mezirow, 1990, p. 14).

Real-Life Learning: Learning that is relevant to the living tasks of the individuals in contrast to those tasks considered more appropriate to formal education. Such learning is also called "real-world" learning or learning that results in "practical" knowledge (Fellenz & Conti, 1989, p. 3).

Social Services: Those services designed to help people in need help themselves (catholiccharitiesusa.org/who/history.html, 2001, parag. 1).

Worldview: An individual's perception of his or her relationship with the world (i.e. nature, institutions, people, and things (Sue, 1978, p.459).
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Human Services Delivery

At the beginning of the century, friendly "visitors" practiced a rudimentary form of service provision that more closely resembled missionary work than social work (http://www.idbsu.edu/socwork/dhuff/history/chapts/1-2.htm). Their service sought to lessen the burdens of the poor through direct relief and prayer. In the 1860's a new movement associated with the history of social work emerged when efforts were made to bring order to the management of state institutions. These institutions included orphanages, reformatories, poor houses, mental institutions and prisons.

A more advanced form of social service provision was practiced by volunteers with the Sanitation Commission and the Freedman's Bureau. The Sanitation Commission was a Civil War volunteer organization that built services that are now associated with public health and the Red Cross. The Freedman's Bureau was organized to assist newly emancipated slaves cope with issues related to being Negro in America.

More interested in studying social problems and management difficulties than in developing new techniques and skills, the state board movement's direct influence was relatively brief. It was quickly eclipsed by similar advancements among private charities. However, the pioneers in the state board movement were the first charity leaders who tried to develop a more systematic and rational approach to
their work and to push it away from its traditional association with religion. The state boards took the first steps in developing charity work into a distinct activity (http://www.idbsu.edu/socwork/dhuff/history/chapts/1-2.htm).

State and local charity work increased as did social problems with the growth of immigration, industrialization and urbanization. The first American charity organization society was established in 1877(http://www.idbsu.edu/socwork/dhuff/history/chapts/1-2.htm). By the turn of the century nearly every major urban area in the country hosted some form of charity organization. These organization established exchanges to monitor relief provided to the indigent to make sure they did not receive help from more than one source. The charity leaders believed poverty could be eradicated by application of a scientific method to be carried out by the friendly “visitor.” These “visitors” were always women.

The thinking at that time was that the poverty stricken were more in need of upper-class role models than decent wages and safe housing. During the 1890's, studies began to assert that thinking about the poor needed to change. These studies were based on investigations conducted by the friendly visitors. They acknowledged that the poor were not the morally inferior to the wealthy. They also stated that wealth did not necessarily imply virtue. Professional
training then began to be offered by such organizations as the New York Summer School for Applied Philanthropy and the visitors began to be replaced by professional social workers.

The role of social work grew during the progressive era of 1900 - 1920. A hallmark of this period was the rise of a coalition between radically minded farmers and urban reformers who believed the government could be instrumental in social improvement. That political partnership eventually led to the formation of the Progressive Party during Teddy Roosevelt’s third campaign for president in 1916 (http://www.idbsu.edu/socwork/dhuff/history/chapts/1-2.htm).

The Sheppard-Towner bill was introduced in 1918 by Congresswoman Jeanette Rankin. Ms. Rankin was the first congresswoman in the U.S. Congress and a social worker. The proposed legislation provided funds to local health departments for maternal and infant health services and after considerable opposition from conservative legislators was finally signed by the president in 1921 (http://www.idbsu.edu/socwork/dhuff/history/chapts/1-2.htm).

After the stock market crash of 1929, relief agencies exhausted their funds and implored President Herbert Hoover to take federal action. Hoover had been of the opinion that relief services were private and should be handled locally. Until the end of World War II the United States government had been primarily involved in maintaining the national
defense. However, the role of the federal government changed from this position particularly with the implementation of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal. Human services from the federal government level were extended to the blind, the elderly, and the helpless (Kelly, 1978, p. 622). When the United States Social Security Act was signed into law in 1935, it included the establishment of a federal welfare program to help states pay for and administer social services in the form of Old Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind, Aid to Dependent Children (later to be called Aid to Families with Dependent Children), and General Assistance for people in need who did not qualify for other forms of help (naswdc.org/NASW/Centen/centmil3.htm).

Social services have emerged in both the private and public sectors to attempt to meet the needs of the less fortunate and those in crisis. In 1974 the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act was signed into law (Oklahoma Child Welfare Staff, 1984). Twenty years later, 49 of the 50 states required reporting of neglect and 41 states included language specifically requiring the reporting of emotional and psychological abuse as well. Aid for Families with Dependent Children was only 60 years old when President Clinton signed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act into law in 1996 (Gallagher,
Zedlewski, & Loprest, 2000, p. 1). The act established block grants providing states with a fixed amount of federal funding. States were given broad flexibility in setting eligibility standards (Ryan, 1998, p. 8). Clients were encouraged to seek employment while still getting time limited assistance through Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.

The ability of families on welfare to achieve economic independence is dependent on many things including work ethics, education, and motivation (Gooden, 2000, p. 4). Success for families participating in this program is also dependent in part on their relationship and interactions with their case manager or social worker. Social workers and case managers are entrusted with making critical decisions about people that affect families permanently. A basic assumption of welfare reform policy is that all families receive similar treatment by case managers (p. 4). Social work interventions with minority families have been a source of controversy and frustration for decades because of a lack of cultural understanding (Graham, 1999, p. 103).

**Cultural Competence**

Three decades have passed since Lewis (1969) wrote:

> We cannot hide the fact that racism is encountered in counseling in many forms. We cannot hide it, so we have got to face it...we must not allow the presence of racism to choke our efforts, to
prevent progress in human relationships, to make us less human, to undermine our confidence and ability to do a job. (p. 54)

As evidenced in Lewis' observation, the 1970s reflected an era of heightened awareness among human services professionals regarding the strong relationship between racism and the mental health system (Turner & Kramer, 1995; Willie, Kramer, & Brown, 1973; Willie, Rieker, Kramer, & Brown, 1995). Reports citing the paucity of racial/ethnic minority mental health workers, lack of systemic efforts to combat institutional racism, and widespread use of culturally insensitive treatment modalities were instrumental in raising the sensitivity level of Caucasian practitioners. Some counselors and therapists even came to believe "that racism was itself a mental illness striking at the nation's health" (Turner & Kramer, 1995, p. 4). Such increased awareness, however, did not seem to promote change within the mental health system. Throughout the 1980s, a plethora of scholars continued to reveal numerous inadequacies within the system. For example, it was suggested that counseling was basically a service provided by White Americans (Dillard, 1983; Kupers, 1981; Sue et al., 1982) who were trained by White educators and supervisors (Greene, 1986; Sue & Sue, 1990) in the use of interventions derived from White theories (Ivey, 1987; Pedersen &
Marsella, 1982; Sue & Zane, 1987) which were based exclusively upon White cultural values (Casas, 1984; Katz, 1985).

Health disparities among racial and ethnic groups in the United States have been noted for at least a century, yet they continue to exist in large measure undiminished (Anonymous, 2000, p. 1794). Despite attempts to reduce barriers to health care for non-White populations, people of color receive fewer health services and consistently experience higher rates of infant and adult morbidity and mortality than Caucasians (Anonymous, 2000, p. 1795). These disturbing statistics compel researchers, planners, and practitioners to renew efforts to determine the reasons for these gaps and how to close them.

Black youth are over-represented in juvenile correction facilities at an alarming rate (Drakeford & Garfinkel, 2000, p. 51). Over the last 4 decades, racial inequalities among African American and other young men in juvenile detention centers have been well documented. The factors associated with over-representation of youth in corrections are complex. Evidence suggests that school failure, poorly developed social skills, and inadequate school and community supports are also associated with this phenomenon.

The United States is the most ethnically diverse
country in the world, representing 100 racial, ethnic, and
cultural groups (Taylor, 1998, p. 30). The 1990 census
revealed the following increases over the 1980 census: a 53%
increase in the Latino population, a 107% increase in
Asians, a 13.2% increase in Blacks, and a 37.9% increase in
Native Americans. The demographic differences also reflect
differences in basic values, beliefs, and behaviors. These
contrasting ways can pose great challenges in facilitating
human services provision.

Increasingly, helping professionals are recognizing the
importance of culture in their interactions with clients and
colleagues (Bonder, Martin & Miracle, 2001, p. 35). As the
United States population becomes more diverse, practitioners
face situations in which their clients' cultural backgrounds
are clearly different from their own. American medicine is
only recently coming to the realization that the broad
diversity within this country's population requires training
physicians to practice with a heightened level of cultural
awareness (Sharf, 2000, p. 111). Medical schools across the
country are adding instructional components intended to help
practitioners become more culturally competent. Skills that
enhance human service providers' abilities to recognize
different cultural values, beliefs, and practices and to
address these factors in intervention are likely to lead to
more successful treatment outcomes.

As far back as the 1960's, challenges were raised as to the appropriateness of services offered to minority families (Sue et al., 1982, p. 45). Many allegations were made against traditional counseling practices as being demanding, irrelevant and oppressive toward the culturally different. Five patterns of differential treatment of children of color exist: (a) higher rates of out-of-home placement among minority children than among Caucasian children, (b) different, more restrictive patterns of referral and diagnosis for Black youth than for Caucasian youth, (c) disproportionate numbers of Black children in less desirable placements, (d) greater proportions of Black children serviced in the public sector than in the private sector, and (e) less social service support received my parents of color than by Caucasian parents (Stehno, 1982, p. 42).

The differential treatment of children of color and their families is supported by a number of other assertions. Social agencies mandated to provide services to American Indian populations are staffed predominantly by non-Indian social workers whose professional education may not have provided the tools to deliver culturally appropriate services (Williams & Ellison, 1996, p. 147). Seriously emotionally disturbed Black adolescents are more likely to
end up in the juvenile justice system rather than in the
treatment setting to which their Caucasian counterpart would
be referred (Comer & Hill, 1985; Hawkins & Salisbury, 1983).
Native American children with serious emotional problems are
more likely than Caucasian children to go without treatment
or be removed from their family or tribe (Berlin, 1983;
Shore, 1978). Hispanic children with emotional disorders
will probably be assessed in a language not their own
(Padilla, Ruiz, & Alvarez, 1975). Cultural traits,
behaviors, and beliefs are often interpreted as dysfunctions
to be overcome. Human services systems have a history of
providing differential treatment to children of color in
various settings (Cummins, 1986; Dana, 1984; Katz-Leavy,
Lourie, & Kaufman, 1987; Ortiz & Maldonado-Colon, 1986;
Stehno, 1982).

One of the biggest barriers to cultural competence is
prejudice. Prejudice is an aversive or hostile attitude
toward a person who belongs to a group simply because of
membership in that group and who is therefore presumed to
have the objectionable qualities ascribed to the group
(Taylor, 1998, p. 31). People behave according to prejudice
when they react negatively to others on an emotional basis
with an absence of direct contact or factual material about
the others. A close parallel to prejudice is stereotyping,
which is an exaggerated belief associated with a particular group of people.

Experts believe that prejudice serves four main functions (Taylor, 1998, p. 32). First, there are personal rewards, such as people believing they might be more liked by members of their own group if they reject members of certain groups. Second, they hold prejudices because they do not want to admit their own inadequacies. Third, they hold certain prejudices because the prejudice expresses the aspects of life that are prized. Fourth, they believe everyone has the need to be aware of their surroundings.

Assumptions and perceptions about people are made based on their ethnicity and cultural background. Perceptions may be maintained even though many are not supported by reality. When this occurs in human services work, people may receive adverse attention for being poor, poorly educated, or different.

As a result, recommendations have been made to develop and implement new strategies, concepts, and services that are more appropriate to the life experiences and needs of minority families. These steps are recommended for communicating effectively in a multicultural setting.

1. Gain cultural knowledge. Read, observe and, ask questions. Learning about other cultures will help you to overcome ethnocentrism and prejudices.
2. Gain insight into your own cultural heritage. When tension occurs in a cross-cultural interaction, it is a sign that one's basic values and beliefs are being challenged.


4. Get out of the comfort zone. One of the most effective ways to learn and grow is to be exposed to different cultures.

5. Resist judgmental reactions. Remember, "different" does not mean "inferior." Seek out more information. Don't allow stereotypes to mask perceptions. Learn to respect cultural differences.

6. Improve communication skills. A requisite skill to being culturally competent is interpersonal effectiveness. Important skills are listening, giving feedback, and resolving conflict. To avoid misunderstanding, true listening is essential. The learning comes from really hearing what the other person is saying. (Taylor, 1998, p. 32)

The average values of different populations provide no information about any one individual (Sue et al., 1982, p. 46). People should realize that they live in a multicultural, multilingual, and pluralistic society. It is infrequent that individuals have no contact with people whose cultural backgrounds or lifestyles differ from their own. In one way or another, in the diverse American society, human beings are bound to interact with individuals who can be classified as "culturally different," and it is the responsibility of helping professionals to become more culturally aware and sensitive to their work with different
populations (p.47).

Dialogue regarding the need to address multicultural counseling, which is now used interchangeably with cultural competence, has been documented as far back as the 1950's (Abreu & Atkinson, 2000, p. 641). The American Psychological Associations recognition of the need for cultural competence dates back to 1973; at its conference the conclusion was reached that cultural competence was a matter of ethical practice (Abreu & Atkinson, 2000, p. 641). In recent years, social work's concern about the ethnic or cultural competence of practitioners has begun to increase as well (Oles, 1998, p. 656). Ethnic or cultural competence is the ability to work with ethnic minorities of color. It requires an understanding of culture, the role culture plays in the development and resolution of problems, as well as knowledge of diverse cultures. It requires of social workers a commitment to helping members of ethnic minorities of color remain positively connected to their cultural group while functioning satisfactorily in the mainstream. Culturally competent practice requires social workers to understand clients within the context of their culture and to resist confusing cultural attributes with deficiencies (p. 657).

Cultural competence in clinical practice is defined not by a discrete endpoint but as a commitment and active
engagement in a lifelong process that individuals enter into on an ongoing basis with clients, communities, colleagues, and themselves (Tervalon & Murray-Garcia, 1998, p. 117). It is a process that calls for humility as individuals continually engage in self-reflection and self-critique as lifelong learners and reflective practitioners. Becoming culturally competent is a process that requires humility in how human service workers bring into check the power imbalances that exist in the dynamics of worker-client communication by using client-centered interviewing and service provision (Tervalon & Murray-Garcia, 1998, p. 118).

The assumption that people's beliefs and values are similar can lead to staff conflict as well as poor outcomes for clients (Taylor, 1998, p. 30). For example, an American human services worker with a direct communication style may be viewed as abrupt and uncaring by an Asian counterpart who values harmony in relationships over freedom of personal expression. To become culturally competent is to realize that one's values and beliefs simply reflect a single set of options among many. Cultural competence is key to becoming an effective helping professional in a multicultural environment. This awareness leads to a concomitant respect for others' cultural ways.

Two main approaches have predominated in recent efforts
to promote cultural knowledge and competency for healthcare providers (Bonder, Martin, & Miracle, 2001, p. 39). First is the fact-centered approach, which provides information about the health beliefs and behaviors of particular ethnic groups. The advantage of such an approach is that it provides clinicians with a starting place for interacting with a particular individual. Some factual knowledge is vital to effective cross-cultural interaction. However, it is impossible to know all there is to know about every culture. African American, Hispanic, and Asian are not single cultures, but many. Each ethnic group contains various cultures within it. For example, the category "African American" may include second-generation Haitian immigrants and descendants of Philadelphia's pre-Civil War free black community (p. 40). "Hispanic" may encompass both recent immigrants from Honduras and individuals whose families have been living in what is now California for generations.

Further, because every culture changes over time, it is important to know the characteristics of a culture at the moment as well as the historical influences that have affected its development. Wars, displacement, and new technologies all affect the ways in which particular cultures develop. Even if a clinician could learn all there
is to know about Chinese culture, the individual being treated is not only Chinese but has other experiences that influence health and healthcare. This includes such things as place of residence, language, and degree of acculturation. "A person is not a bundle of cultural facts but rather a complex bundle of cultural influences and other factors" (Bonder, Martin, & Miracle, in press).

Finally, a fact-centered approach risks replacing one stereotype with another. The new stereotype may be more positive but still fail to capture the complex nature of an individual's culture. While information about specific cultures may contribute to understanding, superficial knowledge sometimes results in stereotyping that belies the complexity of cultural issues and the nature of the individual (Bonder, Martin, & Miracle, in press, p. 41). One drawback to this approach is that it does not involve evaluating clinicians to determine levels of cultural competence prior to providing cultural facts about those with whom they will be interacting.

A second approach to culture is attitude-centered. It emphasizes the importance of valuing all cultures. The advantage of such an approach is its acknowledgment of the centrality of culture and encouragement of positive attitudes. This approach could be enhanced with an
assessment component to determine where participants are in their cultural competence.

Helping professionals can benefit from a third method, which is an ethnographic approach to cultural competence (Bonder, Martin, & Miracle, in press; Johnson, Hardt, & Kleinman, 1995). This approach offers a practical strategy of "learning how to ask" (Briggs, 1986), which is based on anthropological methods for gathering cultural information. The focus of this approach is on inquiry, reflection and analysis, and evaluation and assessment practices used throughout treatment. The approach rests on the notion that culture is but one of the factors that define any individual's moment-by-moment perspective on a situation or event.

Little research has effectively broached the idea of cultural competence in terms of how adults learn to become culturally competent (Taylor, 1994, p. 154). In the last 25 years, the numerous studies conducted on the subject of cultural competence have had as their primary focus the identification of predictors that lend themselves to a list of qualities possessed by those who would be deemed culturally competent. These include qualities such as respect, empathy, and active listening skills (Taylor, 1994, p. 154). Only in recent years have any instruments been
developed to measure cultural competence (Ponterotto, Reiger, Barrett, & Sparks, 1994, p. 316).

Measuring Cultural Competency

There were four early instruments found on cultural competence in the counseling arena. These instruments were designed for use in clinical settings rather than for training purposes. They are valuable in having laid the groundwork for this study and warrant further development. These instruments were also important in identifying the need for user-friendly tools to assess cultural competency as part of a training curriculum for social services providers.

The Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory-Revised (CCCI-R) was designed by LaFromboise, Coleman, and Hernandez to assess counseling effectiveness with culturally diverse clients (Ponterotto, 1994, p. 316). Further research has been suggested to examine the scale's test-retest reliability, inter-rater reliability and factor structure.

The Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge-and-Skills Survey (MAKSS) was developed by D'Andrea, Daniels, and Heck in 1991 to assess the effect of instructional strategies on students multicultural counseling development (Ponterotto et al., 1994, p. 319). Additional factor analytic studies are recommended to test the three-dimensional construct of the
Cultural competence has also been conceptualized as consisting of the two areas of knowledge and awareness of cultural diversity. The Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MCKAS) was developed by Ponterotto, Sanchez, and Magids to measure multicultural knowledge skills and awareness in 1991 (Ponterotto, Rieger, Barrett, & Sparks, 1994, p. 317). The MCKAS has many limitations that prohibit its use in training programs. First, it should be further tested with large samples dispersed geographically, and concurrent validity studies are strenuously recommended (Ponterotto et al., 1994, p.318). More attention needs to be devoted to testing the bidimensional structure of the instrument. Finally, although the MCKAS has three items measuring social desirability, the authors have not yet delineated the utility and validity of this aspect of the instrument.

The Quick Discrimination Index (QDI) was developed in an effort to tap into the cognitive and affective components of prejudicial attitudes (Ponterotto, et al., 1995, p. 1027). The QDI is composed of three factors. Factor 1 focuses on cognitive attitudes toward racial diversity. Factor 2 assesses more affective and personal ways of
thinking as they relate to personal exposure. Factor 3 considers general attitudes regarding women's equity issues. This instrument requires continued efforts to assess the reliability and validity of QDI scores (Utsey & Ponterotto, 1999, p. 325).

These instruments have been designed as psychometric tools to determine whether an existing multicultural training curriculum is adequately preparing practitioners and researchers in clinical psychology graduate programs (Ponterotto et al., 1996). They provide initial tools for identifying the concept among those in clinical settings. However, they have limited use for professional development and real life application.

Professional Development

Whether in policy making, program development, or direct practice, those providing services to the most vulnerable families and children do so in an environment of constant change, limited resources, competing and sometimes conflicting expectations from a multitude of stakeholders, and new technologies of which many are largely untested (Tracy & Pine, 2000, p. 93). Preparing professionals through professional development and training to work in this environment presents its own challenges. Schools of social work as institutions have their own obstacles to overcome as
they try to both create and manage change in an academic environment that is not always conducive to rapid response. Yet, the design of an educational activity perpetually reformulates (Houle, 1972, p. 56).

Professional practice in child welfare is primarily agency based and is conducted in public agencies with a legislative mandate to serve dependent and neglected children and in private, nonprofit agencies which provide contracted services to these children and their families (p. 94). Social workers in these agencies are professionally trained and provide diverse services in programs that include child protection, out-of-home care, adoption, and adolescent support. Social workers may work at any level in the agency including director, supervisor, or direct service provider. Other staff in these agencies may have no professional training in social work; this may include even those whose title is also "social worker."

Agencies and companies have found it essential to develop skills and competencies in-house at a time when quality employees are hard to find (Brotherton, 2001, p. 14). As the laws, policies, and protocols relevant to human services provision continue to change and grow at a rapid pace, agency and company professionals need on-going education in order to make the best decisions on behalf of
families. In diverse communities, human service professionals must be prepared to make such decisions based in part on the culture of those with whom they are working. In planning workplace learning to cultivate cultural competence among social service providers, the first step must always be to assess the needs of the learner (Wilson & Cervero, 1996, p. 20). Once the needs are known, then learning objectives can be determined, and content can be selected. In the absence of this protocol for planned workplace learning, the result is a superficial curriculum imposed on learners (McPhatter, 1997, p. 256).

For the past 20 years, the social work profession has stressed the importance of cultural diversity in student enrollment, faculty, and curricula (McPhatter, 1997, p. 256). Schools of social work are mandated to demonstrate throughout their curricula that students are being prepared to serve a culturally diverse population. However, there is reason to believe that this mandate has been significantly ineffective. Most of the social work literature on practice with people of color is "naive and superficial" (McMahon & Allen-Meares, 1992, p. 533). A study of social work schools (Diggs, 1992) found that when schools of social work do not make the inclusion of ethnic and cultural content a priority in the curriculum and do not provide appropriate resources,
then contents rarely surfaced; and moreover, two-thirds of the teachers studied maintained that their most problematic teaching concern was a lack of knowledge and competence to teach diversity content. These teachers described textbook content as inadequate and depthless. Another disturbing finding was that these instructors, who were charged with facilitating the learning of such a critical nature, readily acknowledged having not been educated and trained in their own social work preparation to convey multicultural content and did not feel confident or competent to do so in their classes.

Employees are an appreciating asset that agencies and companies would do well to fine tune for quality performance (Kaye & Jordan-Evan, 2000, p. 30). Consequently, many agencies have begun to improve their employee development programs (Brown, 2000). Employees are being encouraged to take responsibility for their professional development and careers (p. 91). However, most federal agencies are slow in responding to the evolution of workplace learning (p. 91).

One of the largest obstacles to creating an environment that supports continuous learning in government may be the fear of failure. The prevailing thought should be that if most of what adults learn is learned by doing, then it is reasonable to expect failure to be a fairly common part of
the learning process; this is called trial-and-error (Brown, 2000, p. 91).

Many studies have shown what most adults learn from personal experience. The lessons they learn best are those taught by failure. The Organizational Learning Center at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, founded by Peter Senge, encourages the creation of "practice fields" to foster individual and organizational learning. These are places where it is okay to make mistakes and to learn from them. The best management development programs accomplish this goal by giving managers rotational and "stretch" assignments, fully expecting that most will experience mistakes and failures as part of their learning journey. The Army has been a pioneer in the use of after-action reviews to capture lessons learned from things that have gone wrong. (Brown, 2000, p.91).

The field of adult education has already begun to recognize that building increased awareness of social cultural context is essential among learners (Fellenz & Conti, 1989, p. 24). Training policies that recommend and that in some cases require participation in training that builds cultural knowledge and skills can enhance cultural competence (Cross, Bazron, Dennis, & Isaacs, 1989, p. 26). For such training to be successful, planners must commit the
resources to implement such policies and consult cultural advisors on the necessary content (Cameron & Talavera, 1976; Zane, Sue, Castro, & George, 1982). Planners must also keep in mind that these policies should be flexible enough to permit on-going reformulation as adult learners participate in professional development for different reasons.

In a landmark study Houle (1961) found that adults learners fall into three groups in terms of their motivation for participating in learning endeavors. First, goal oriented learners are involved in order to achieve a particular goal. Second, activity-oriented learners participate in adult learning for the sake of the activity. Third, learning-oriented adults want to learn for the sake of their own growth and improvement. There are times when these three orientations may interact with each other. For example, in providing human services, one may be goal oriented in learning particular computer skills to document the service work they have done. The goal is to be able to use the computer to document the work. The activity orientation may center around computer lab activities designed to equip the learner to accomplish the goal. Learning-oriented adults will participate in the activity to achieve the goal and in doing so meet their need to learn and grow. Houle's findings were confirmed by Boshier (1971).
who entitled the categories as cognitive interest, activity orientation and professional development. Although others have found various numbers of orientations, these studies confirm Houle's original three as the prevailing orientation into which all of the others can be categorized (Manns, 2000, p. 9).

Cervero (1991) has outlined four positions regarding how practice and knowledge interact. All four positions can be applied to adult learning and professional development. The first assertion is that much of adult learning has occurred without any reference to what is known about how adults learn. In order to effectively train people to serve the public, the facilitator should be aware of the possible learner orientations and how adults learn. Second, a systematically gathered knowledge base improves practice. If this knowledge is disseminated through academic preparation as is schools of social work and in on-going professional development then human service provision will be enhanced. Third, adult educators teach intuitively with an understanding of adult learning whether that knowledge is articulated or not. The central idea here is to describe educational practice and encourage instructors to become more reflective about their individual actions (Cervero, 1991, chap, 2). In schools of social work, instructors could
develop greater insight into how their actions impact services provided by those they have taught. Likewise, facilitators in the workplace could be encouraged to consider how their actions impact the learners and how that impact is demonstrated in the field. Practitioners who articulate meaning structure for the learners can also cause service providers to explore the meaning structures of those they serve. This would also enhance service provision because the social worker would incorporate knowledge of the client’s meaning structures into whatever situation caused the need for assistance. Fourth, theory and practice are indivisible. The focus here is on how, where, why and by whom knowledge is produced. In terms of preparing adults for service provision and in the actual provision of services, this position supports the facilitator’s role as co-learner with participants. In a professional development setting, social workers who are knowledgeable about what is occurring with the families they serve in the field may collaborate with the facilitator in order to produce knowledge that will improve service provision.

It is essential when planning for adult learners providing services to the public that the planners be aware of what motivates adult learners to participate. They should also keep in mind that the policy and curriculum designs
should be fluid to allow for perpetual reformulation. The curriculum in schools of social work should be adjustable to capitalize on what has motivated the learner to participate. Their content should allow for reformulation in order to keep up with the changing needs of service providers in the field.

**Adult Learning**

Learning opportunities for adults are found in a variety of environments ranging from one's own home or work location to formal institutions (Merriam & Cafferella, 1991, p. 43). Adults in the field of human services provision must develop a unique combination of skills and strategies to work effectively with diverse populations. This learning process is based in the adult learning constructs of (a) andragogy, (b) self-directed learning, (c) lifelong learning, (d) transformational learning, and (e) real-life learning. These constructs are essential to grasping the approaches adults use when learning how to help those in need.

The field of Adult Education has a major obligation to enthusiastically promote continuous societal change by advocating the ideals of participatory democracy which includes full-citizen participation, freedom, equality, and social justice (Cunningham, 1988, p.134). This is because
(a) society is socially constructed, (b) it is logical to assume this construction served certain functions including social control, (c) many of these social constructions fostered systematic oppression, (d) what is socially constructed can be reconstructed, and (e) education could serve to either promote the status quo and maintain these inequalities or it could be a means to promote changes to more equitable arrangements (Cunningham, 1996, p. 2). This broader purpose can be seen by contrasting the limitations of institutionalized adult education against the history in which non-formal education was used to struggle for a better society. Such non-formal adult educational programs emerged from popular, socialist, and African-American social movements as well as workers education, which grew out of its own social formations (p. 2). Guiding principles for social responsibility include building a civil society through affording ideological space for ordinary individuals (a) to become knowledge producers to build and disseminate their own scheme of knowledge and (b) to critically and in a communitarian way create a more participatory democratic society (p. 7).

Unfortunately, adult educators too often design educational programs for adults by copying the wrong educations models (Galvin & Veerman, 1997, p. 178). This can
be a tragic error for adult education. In these inappropriate uses, instructors may organize and execute the program (a) like educational programs for children as in the pedagogical model, (b) like an extension of a seminary as in the academic model, (c) like a place where knowledge is deposited in the head of the learner as in the banking model, or (d) like a debate or trial as in the adversarial model (Galvin & Veerman, 1997, p. 179). These inappropriate models do not fit the learner generally. With specific audiences, each of these approaches may be quite effective. However, just because a particular mode works well in one setting is no guarantee that it will be successful with adults generally (p. 178).

The final determination of the learning experience depends upon the learner (Knowles, 1970). "When people have the opportunity to learn by taking some initiative and perceiving the learning in the context of their own life situations, they will internalize more quickly, retain more permanently, and apply more confidently" (Knowles, 1992, p. 11).

Learning is a lifelong, enduring process for adults. They are involved in purposeful, decisive learning in occupational, familial, community activist, recreational, and interpersonal environments (Brookfield, 1986, p. 8).
There are effectual principles for facilitating adult learning in these settings. These principles apply primarily to teaching-learning transactions or to curriculum development and instructional design activities that sustain teaching-learning interactions (p. 9). The principles are (a) participation in learning is voluntary; (b) respect must be maintained among participants for each other's self-worth with no disparagement or abusive facilitation; (c) facilitation is collaborative so that facilitators and learners are engaged in a cooperative endeavor and are continually renegotiating activities, needs, and priorities; (d) learners and facilitators are involved in a continual course of activity, reflection upon activity, collaborative analysis of activity, new activity, and further reflection and collaborative analysis; (e) facilitators cultivate in adults a spirit of critical reflection so as to develop a critical frame of mind instead of the uncritical assimilation of previously defined skills or bodies of knowledge; and (f) facilitators encourage self-directed and empowered adults so they become proactive, initiating individuals engaged in an enduring recreation of their personal relationship, work arenas, and social environments (pp. 11-17). Because every group of people involved in learning will reveal a formidable diversity of abilities,
experiences, personalities, and preferred learning styles, it follows that facilitators should be prepared to try a wide range of approaches (Brookfield, 1989, p. 207).

**Andragogy**

Andragogy is the art and science of helping adults learn (Knowles, 1980, pp. 43-44). This concept should be used to guide instructional design. As adults mature they move along a continuum of becoming less dependent on the instructor to being increasingly self-directed and autonomous. People move along this continuum at different rates. The life experiences of adults become tremendous learning resources and should be highly valued by the adult educator. Adults are ready to learn when an issue or event becomes meaningful and applies to their daily existence. An adult's social roles influence their need to learn. Adult learners have a desire to grow or become more competent in their areas of interest. As people mature into adulthood, they look at themselves differently. They are no longer just learners, but they contribute to their community and society at large. They want to be able to immediately apply what is learned to their everyday lives. Educators of adults have an incumbent responsibility to know where learners are on the continuum of autonomy to promote and cultivate self-directed
learning.

Knowles added two more assumptions to these original assumptions in his later writings. In 1984, he wrote that the motivation for adults to learn is driven by internal instead of external factors (p. 12). A sixth assumption was added in 1990 regarding the importance of adults knowing why they were required to learn content material (p. 57). If adults cannot establish the significance or relevance of the knowledge or skill, they are less likely to passively assume the need to learn information simply to complete a requirement (Davis, 2000).

From these assumptions of andragogy, Knowles (1980) provides specific recommendations and applications to planning education programs and learning prospects for adults. First, the facilitator should establish a climate that is conducive to learning with regard to both physical and psychological aspects. Physically, the environment should be managed in such a way that learners are comfortable in terms of seating, temperature, and lighting. Efforts should be made to arrange seating to cultivate group and personal interaction while maintaining appropriate group size.

Psychologically, the environment should be optimized for adult learning from the instant the learners enter the
setting. This includes promoting an atmosphere of mutual respect by demonstrating through an amicable attitude that the learner's experiences are valuable and by actively listening to all individuals. The setting created should be safe, encouraging, friendly, and collaborative; the environment should promote mutual trust and responsibility from all participants. The learning atmosphere should also be learner-centered instead of teacher-centered (Knowles, 1980, p. 223).

The second step in program planning in andragogy is mutual planning of learning activities by participants and facilitator. Adult learners have been found to be more committed and deeply invested in goals and activities that they help plan. Techniques to implement mutual planning include allowing small groups to plan class activities with coordination by the facilitator, using subcommittees and nominated representatives, and having topics reviewed by the group at large for final decisions (Knowles, 1980, p. 226).

Kidd (1973) has written that the range of degrees of learner dependency on the facilitator is broad, particularly when choosing learning objectives and curriculum (p. 271). Adult learners may need help and direction at least at the beginning of the learning activity. Owning educational control may initially be a novel and uncomfortable
experience for the adult learner; however it is productive in that it causes the learner to be responsible and accountable for the direction of learning activities (p. 280).

The third stage of program planning for adult education is for the adult learners to participate in determining their own learning needs. A learning need is "a need in the sense that the learner lacks some information or skill that it is assumed he should have, or that is enjoyed by most members in society" (Kidd, 1973, p. 271). Learning needs may be related to family, health, community, recreation, consumerism, profession, or faith (p. 272). When adults diagnose their own learning needs, their incentive to learn is maximized (Knowles, 1980, p. 227). When social workers become aware of deficiencies in cultural appreciation they may identify this as a learning need. Cultural appreciation as a learning need relates directly to their profession. Social workers Recognizing the need to grow in their level of cultural appreciation could motivate social workers to maximize their learning potential in enhancing their cultural competence.

The fourth step in program planning is to plan the direction for the learning activities. Participants are encouraged to identify objectives in a manner that has
personal meaning for them and will assist them in directing their own learning (Knowles, 1980, p. 234). Social workers motivated to learn cultural appreciation may be encouraged to identify learning goals in a way that is personally and as a result professionally meaningful to them.

The next two stages of program planning involve developing the design and operation of the learning activities. Some authors advocate organizing the curriculum with sequence, continuity, and integration of essentials (Knowles, 1980, p. 235). Knowles (1980) promotes sequencing learning activities based upon the natural sequence of the task (p. 236). There are various techniques that may be used to present the material including whole group meetings, small group meetings, social interaction periods, designated reading times, individual sessions, and preparatory activities outside of the classroom (pp. 236-237). For social workers, one might start with an assessment toll to identify personal characteristics to promote a period of social interaction as participants discover things about themselves and how they relate to the group. This could in turn lead to further discussion related to concepts associated with cultural competency.

It is also essential in andragogical program planning to adapt the teaching technique to the desired outcome. For
example, when learning new skills, role playing and engaging in physically practicing the activity may be the most successful manner of delivery (Knowles, 1980, p. 240). For social workers in training, role playing can be very useful in helping learners anticipate possible situations that they may encounter with their clients. Those social workers or supervisors who have experience working with people may engage in playing the role of a hypothetical client. This kind of activity could give the social worker-in-training a chance to practice service delivery in various situations.

The final step in program planning in the andragogical model is to assess and re-evaluate the needs of the learner. This entails measuring changes from the initial performance data, determining how the learning is progressing, and deciding if a new or different direction should be selected (Knowles, 1980, p. 47).

In social work within the Oklahoma State Department of Human Services (DHS), each new employee participates in adult education by completing a new-worker academy. The role of the facilitator at this academy is to promote autonomy and self-directed learning as they relate to good social-work practice with families and knowledge of policies, protocols, and the Oklahoma statutes. To consider this through the lens of Knowles first assumption, which
deals with the constant movement toward self-direction, social workers have a psychological need and desire to be knowledgeable and competent before they start working with families. The social worker must be self-directed to keep up with ever-changing statutes, policies, and protocols within the field of social work in the DHS.

The role of the learners' experience is an essential part of social work and social-work education. Knowles' second assumption is critical when preparing individuals to engage in helping other people. Establishing a climate as Knowles recommends as the first step in planning education programs for adult learners promotes sharing personal experiences with diverse individuals. This sharing of experiences contributes greatly to the ability of learners to make meaning from what they are learning in the academy and encourages their growth. This is especially important in relationship to the degree of exposure social workers have had with other cultures and ethnicities.

For social workers, readiness to learn is established at the point learners realize they are not fully equipped to comfortably engage diverse families in helping activities. There is a specific portion of the academy training that addresses cultural diversity.

The participants' orientation to learning is driven by
identifying what they need to know. Realizing what one needs to know in order to become a better social worker is an internal factor and relates directly to Knowles fifth assumption which asserts that internal factors motivate adults to learn as opposed to external factors. This realization also has a direct relationship to Knowles sixth assumption that adults have a need to know why they are required to learn particular material. Individuals enter the practice of social work in an effort to help others. The desire to provide exceptional services is also an internal factor and one that contributes to establishing the relevance of becoming culturally competent.

Self-directed Learning

The number of individuals participating in adult education activities has increased tremendously since the 1960's. In a study of participation by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), 41% of the adults sampled, or 79 million people, reported participating in some form of educational activity (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999, pp. 48 & 51). According to participation studies conducted since the 1960's, the primary reason individual pursue adult education is related to employment for career advancement or in an effort to maintain skills and keep up with technological advances (Merriam &
Knowles (1975) was an advocate of self-directed learning. He defined self-directed learning as:

A process in which individuals take the initiative, with or without the help of others, in diagnosing their learning needs, formulating learning goals, identifying human and material resources for learning, choosing and implementing appropriate learning strategies, and evaluating learning outcomes. (p. 18)

Self-directed learning is the best method by which to learn, and assisting learners to become self-directed should be part of all teaching (p. 18). Self-directed learning can take place concurrently with various kinds of learning support from "teachers, tutors, mentors, resource people, and peers" (p. 18).

Much has been said regarding self-directed learning and its aims. Writers frequently define the aims of self-directed learning with respect to the author's particular philosophical position (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). Writings on self-directed learning can be characterized into three groups; these groups are (a) to enhance the ability of adult learners to be self-directed, (b) to promote transformational learning as key to self-directed learning, and (c) to encourage emancipatory learning and social action as part of self-directed learning.
The aim of the first group is "grounded primarily in the assumptions of humanistic philosophy, which posits personal growth as the goal of adult learning" (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999, p. 291). Authors who share this philosophy of self-directed learning include Knowles (1975, 1980), Maslow (1970), and Rogers (1969). The literature in this group describe learners as accepting of responsibility, as being proactive, as autonomous, and as having free will to make personal choices.

The aim of the second group which focuses on promoting transformational learning as key to self-directed learning is based upon the work of Mezirow (1985) and Brookfield (1985, 1986). Mezirow (1985) states that self-directed learning occurs only when participants are free to compare and contrast interests and perspective and make appropriate modifications. Brookfield's work in this area calls for the integration of self-directedness and reflection (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999, p. 291).

This self-directed learning takes place when participants obtain meaning through a blend of process and reflection (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999, p. 291). Brookfield distinguishes between two forms of self-directedness. The first type uses methods including specifying goals,
identifying resources, implementing strategies, and evaluating progress for seeking out and processing information. The second type of self-directed learning "can refer to a particular internal change of consciousness" (p. 47).

Brookfield's second type of self-directed learning can be found in the aim of the third category of encouraging emancipatory learning and social action (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999, p. 292). Authors advocating for this aim have strenuously criticized the first aim as too narrow. They endorse broadening the definition of self-directed learning to include "not only the examination by learners of the sociopolitical assumption under which they learn and function, but the incorporation of collective action as an outcome" (p. 292). Brookfield suggested that specific political atmosphere must exist for the true practice of self-directedness and that shifting to self-directed learning in a highly controlled culture such as some educational institutions would be arduous (p. 292).

Self-directed learning is vital to the best social work practice. Social workers engaging in opportunities for personal growth benefit personally and professionally. Consequentially, the families they serve benefit from more competent service provision. In today's social work world of
computer data entry, of local protocols, and of changing laws, it is paramount that social workers be able to engage in a variety of self-directed learning activities. Due to the fast-paced nature of the work and high turnover rates among staff, social workers have to take the initiative to remain current regarding services in the community, trends in treatment, and legislative initiatives. Fortunately there are resources for self-directed learning social workers who identify a discrepancy in their actual and desired competency level. There are entire journals of social work, journals devoted to particular specialties in social work, as well as literature made available through the National Association of Social Workers. These sources provide a potential avenue for social workers to expand their knowledge related to cultural competency.

Real-Life Learning

Vital to the concept of learning is the construct of real-life learning. As important as formal education is, it is more valuable for adult learners to "learn on an ongoing basis in everyday, real world situations" (Kitazawa, 1991, p. 31). As the field of Adult Education has (a) moved toward an emphasis on individual learning rather than an organized educational programs, seen the continued
development of the concept of andragogy, and (c) seen the increased emphasis on the concept of self-direction in learning and, learning how to learn, it "has witnessed a growing emphasis on learning in real-life settings" (Fellenz & Conti, 1989, p. 23).

Real-life learning means having the facility to learn on an habitual basis in every-day, real-world situations. This learning transpires from the learner's actual real-life circumstances and requires a grasp of such "personal factors as the learner's background, language, and culture as well as social factors such as poverty and discrimination" (Fellenz & Conti, 1989, p. 25). This construct "has been used to distinguish typical adult learning from the academic learning of formal situations that is usually spoken of as studying or educating" (Fellenz & Conti, 1993, p. 3).

Considerable differences exist between real-life dilemmas and problems found in formal education (Fellenz & Conti, 1989; Sternberg, 1990). In real life, learners must acknowledge that a problem exists and have the facility to define the quandary as opposed to problem issues or models in formal education which are delineated by instructors (Sternberg, 1990, p. 35). Real-life problems are unstructured, connect directly to the learners' lives, and have multiple solutions which are in contrast to the rigid,
out-of-context, single-answer problems of formal education (pp. 37-39). Learners in academic environments are seldom challenged to probe their beliefs, and the feedback they receive is well-defined and instantaneous. On the contrary, real-life learning participants exercise the power of disconfirmation and frequently receive feedback in a muddled, untimely, and objectionable manner (pp. 39-40). Real-life problems are rarely resolved individually unlike the individual problem-solving concentration of traditional educational settings (p. 40). Thus, "the real-life learning tasks of adults are distinct for each individual, seldom follow a clear pattern, defy measurement, and often are so episodic in nature that beginnings, patterns, and outcomes are impossible to define" (Fellenz & Conti, 1989, p. 4).

Transformational Learning

Adult learners who are critical thinkers recognize that all knowledge and beliefs emerge from within a social and cultural environment and are thus inherently influenced in either a positive or negative fashion (Brookfield, 1987, p. 9). There are no absolutes in society, and challenging the usual routine is frequently necessary even if problematical. Critical thinkers enjoy a healthy skepticism regarding societal values, political dictates, and economic predictions (p. 9). People often experience an epiphany when
they realize the difference between the ideal of society and the genuine outcomes that are reachable.

Critical reflection skills apply to interpersonal relationships, workplace concerns, and ethical issues as well as political, ethnic, and cultural interactions. Adults should be able to actively think about why they make particular assumptions and reach certain conclusions. Adult education assists learners in owning responsibility for decision-making (Mezirow, 1990, p. 13).

Adulthood is the point in time for re-evaluating the assumptions of the formative years that have frequently resulted in distorted views of reality. An adult's meaning schemes may be transformed through reflection upon anomalies (Mezirow, 1990, p. 13). Perspective transformation occurs in response to an externally imposed disorienting dilemma such as the death of a loved one, a divorce, a change in job status, or some other traumatizing event (p. 14). Deviations from the norm where prior means of resolution do not make sense can become catalysts for critical reflection and transformation. Shifting social customs can make alternative perspectives much easier to face, engage, embrace, and sustain (p. 14).

Learning is successfully facilitated by opening learners up to "a sense of the culturally constructed nature
of knowledge, beliefs, values, and behaviors" (Brookfield, 1986, p. 17). Transformational learning is different than everyday learning in that it results in profound changes in individuals and actually "molds" them, their attitudes, and their future behaviors (Mezirow, 1990, p. 2). This can occur when during the introduction of new content material, adults are prompted to reflect upon their meaning schemes. Such reflection can result in a change in their worldview or perspective transformation. For this type of learning, adult educators:

Have a professional obligation to become skilled in the strategies and tactics of social action education and to share this expertise where we can. 

....We do share a rich body of experience and a proud professional legacy from community development and social action education. These are areas of specialization within adult education, and we have much to learn from social action educators like Heaney and Horton, who devote themselves to working within oppressed groups throughout the entire process of transformation, including taking collective political action themselves. (Mezirow, 1995, p. 125)

Experience

There is no substitute for experience when it comes to helping people. Life itself is made up of a continuous succession of experiences. This consecution allows people to alter, adjust, and integrate old and new patterns of behavior. The new behavior patterns are always in a state of flux due to the incessant technical and societal changes.
inherent in life. Therefore, people are ever-changing beings engaged in on-going reflection upon their experiences (Conti, 1978, p. 19).

One definition of experience is direct participation in an event (Woolf, 1976, p. 403). The concept of experience as a central element in learning can be found in the writings of Lindeman (1926), Dewey (1938), and others (Merriam & Brockett, 1996, p. 152). The idea of experience as a core aspect of adult learning is so pervasive in the theory and practice of adult education that it would be difficult to find examples that do not address the role of experience (Merriam & Brockett, 1996, p. 153).

Lindeman (1961) presented four assumptions upon which his view of adult education was based: (a) adult education is inclusive of all aspects of life, (b) "its purpose is to put meaning into the whole of life" (p. 31), (c) the approach should be through real life situations, not subjects, and (d) the learner's experiences should be the resources for learning. "Experience is, first of all, doing something; second, doing something that makes a difference; third, knowing what difference it makes, (p. 87). Vital to understanding the importance of the relationship of experience to adult education is "the idea that it is not merely that the accumulation of experience makes a
difference; it is how learners attach meanings to or make sense of their experience that matters" (Merriam & Brockett, 1996, p. 153).

Some philosophers maintain that Dewey's analysis of experience and its centrality in education is one of his greatest contributions to philosophy (Noddings, 1995, p. 30). An experience is more than an exposure. An experience has to mean something to the person undergoing it. Experience is also social and cultural.

An experience has to relate to a previous experience in order for it to be educative (Noddings, 1995, p. 30). Educators may paraphrase this into a statement that instructors should start where the learner is. There should be continuity in experience. Thus, educators should know something about their students previous experience and facilitate new learning experiences that build upon what was already experienced. The learners present experience should also be observed. The facilitator should plan future experiences designed to help learners grow toward a more sophisticated understanding of the subject. Educative experiences should have meaning for the learner immediately. There must be engagement between the learner and the objects of their study (Noddings, 1995, p. 30).

How social workers construe their experiences with
diverse individuals and diverse cultures impacts their level of cultural competence. The meanings they have attached and thus their expectations of various cultures and ethnicities will also influence how they practice serving diverse populations. As social workers engage in learning experiences to enhance their degree of cultural competence, they will also be able to share their learning experiences so others may grow more culturally appreciative.

Empowerment

Social work goes hand-in-hand with adult education and social responsibility. Adult education and social responsibility have been joined by such educators as Freire and Horton. Each used different modes in different locations, yet both sought to help empower people to enhance the quality of their lives by overcoming oppressors (Conti, 1977).

Horton engaged in working with impoverished adults in the South and founded Highlander Folk School in Tennessee in 1932. Highlander has served as a means to integrate people, ideas, and resources to fight for social, political, and economic equality. Highlander has assisted in the education and empowerment of poor people to transform their plight in the labor movement, in the Civil Rights Movement, for environmental issues, and for local poverty concerns (Conti
Highlander customs demonstrate cultural appreciation in action. One way that this demonstration can be observed is in problem-solving activities. Problem solving at Highlander entails participants engaging in group discussions regarding their own experiences (Conti & Fellenz, 1986). The concept that people have the ability within themselves to resolve their problems is fundamental at Highlander. The process comes about as people realize that they share their problems with others, that collaboration is a viable means of problem solving, and that individual problems are not settled until the common problem is satisfactorily addressed for all. The Highlander method stresses trust, human dignity, and democracy.

Freire was an educator from Brazil who was eventually exiled for his efforts to empower the poor by way of literacy. He contested what he called the "banking" concept in education. "In the banking concept of education, knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those who they consider to know nothing" (Freire, 1995, p. 139). It was Freire's belief that to preserve the oppressive society, the oppressors projected absolute ignorance onto the people and negated the inquiry of education and knowledge (p. 139). The oppressors invested in changing the consciousness of the oppressed to
acclimate to the situation rather than in changing the situation that oppressed them (p. 140). Freire (1970) asserted that when critical consciousness of the forces oppressing them is absent among the oppressed, they are powerless to fight the oppressors. Learners are empowered when they become aware of the forces controlling their lives. It is empowerment that leads to action.

The practice of social work is one in which the social worker is to serve as facilitator in assisting families in resolving their problem or crisis. The practice of social work should not engage in the "banking" concept where services are bestowed by all-knowing social workers upon families they consider ignorant. On the contrary, many families know what they need; they seek assistance in modifying their life situation. Social workers who are aware of social, economic, and cultural needs of the populations they serve can help create an environment for families to empower themselves.
CHAPTER 3

METHODODOLOGY

Design

This was a study to develop an instrument to identify levels of cultural appreciation. It sought to develop a user-friendly instrument that could be completed quickly and easily. Therefore, the design emulated that used to construct the Assessing The Learning Strategies of Adults (ATLAS). ATLAS is an instrument which identifies the learning strategy preferences of adults. It "arose out of a need for a tool that was easy to administer, that could be completed rapidly, and that could be used immediately by both facilitators and learners" (Conti & Kolody, 1999, p. 16). To accomplish this, ATLAS utilizes a flow-chart design with a limited number of questions. However, each question is very precise and based upon the results of powerful multivariate statistics.

Assessing The Learning Strategies of Adults (ATLAS) was formed by using a combination of cluster analysis and discriminant analysis. Construct validity for ATLAS was established by using the items and database from an existing valid and reliable instrument (Conti & Kolody, 1998, pp. 110-111; Conti & Kolody, 1999, pp. 16-18). The valid items from this instrument were used in a cluster analysis to
identify groups that existed in the database. The content validity dealt with constructing accurate items to differentiate these groups (Conti & Kolody, 1998, pp. 110-111; Conti & Kolody, 1999, pp. 16-18). This was accomplished by conducting a series of discriminant analyses with groups from the cluster analysis and the items from the existing instrument as the discriminating variables. The structure matrix from each of these analyses was used to construct each of the items in the instrument. Once the instrument was developed using this procedure, criterion-related validity was established by comparing responses on the new instrument to items from the previously established instrument (Conti & Kolody, 1998, pp. 112-113; Conti & Kolody, 1999, pp. 19-20) and to respondent's perception of their responses on the new instrument (Ghost Bear, 2001, pp. 83-84).

Following this procedure for instrument development, data were gathered from social workers using two existing instruments. The items from the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (Ponterotto, Reiger, Barrett, & Sparks, 1994, p. 317) and the Quick Discrimination Index (Ponterotto et al., 1995, p. 1028) were used as the pool of items for forming the new instrument. These responses from the social workers were combined with field-test results from Adult Education graduate students and vocational
rehabilitation workers to establish the validity of the new instrument.

Validity is concerned with what a test actually measures (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 457). "The core essence of validity is captured nicely by the word accuracy .... Stated differently measuring instrument is valued to the extent that it measures what it purports to measure" (Huck & Cormier, 1996, p. 88). Consequently, "validity is the most important characteristic a test or measuring instrument can possess" (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 161). Traditionally, the three major types of validity for instruments used in educational research are construct, content, and criterion-related validity (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 457). While each type of validity is separate, all three "cut across and are pertinent to each others' forces" (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 162). They interact to determine the degree to which an instrument is valid (p. 162).

Construct validity has to do with what an instrument is actually measuring (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 167). It is broad and is concerned with characteristics or behaviors that impact performance on an assessment or instrument (p. 167). Construct validity evaluates the underlying theory of the instrument. A construct is a nonobservable characteristic like intelligence (Gay, 1996, p. 140). The
construct validity of the new instrument developed by the study rests in the established validity for the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale and the Quick Discrimination Index.

Content validity is the degree to which an instrument measures a specific content area (Gay, 1996, p. 139). It pertains to the extent to which an instrument represents the total body of theory from which the items could have been drawn (French & Michael, 1968, p. 166). The content of an instrument is valid to the degree that the participant’s responses on that instrument are a representative sample of that individual’s responses to the total universe of real or hypothetical situations upon which the instrument was based (Lennon, 1968, p. 174). A series of discriminant analyses were employed to establish content validity for the new instrument.

Criterion-related validity is an indication of the relationship between the scores on a test and an independent external measure (Mehrens & Lehman, 1973, p. 125). The 1966 standards manual of the American Psychological Association recognized and documented two types of criterion-related validity. They are concurrent validity and predictive validity (French & Michael, 1968, p. 167). Criterion-related, or empirical validity, is so designated because
validity is determined by relating performance on a test to performance on another criterion (Gay, 1987, p. 139).

Concurrent validity refers to the degree to which the scores on one test are related to the scores on another already established test administered at the same time or to another valid criterion available at the same time (Gay, 1996, p. 141). Many times an instrument is developed that alleges it accomplishes the same goal as some other pre-existing tests but does it easier or more quickly. If this is the case and if concurrent validity is established, then the likelihood that the new instrument will be used instead of the pre-existing one is great (Gay, 1996, p. 141). The steps involved in establishing concurrent validity are (a) administer the new instrument to a defined group of people, (b) administer a previously established and valid instrument (or obtain such scores if already available) to the same group, (c) correlate the two sets of scores, and (d) assess the results (Gay, 1996, p. 142). The resulting number, called the validity coefficient, denotes the concurrent validity of the new test (Gay, 1996, p. 142).

Predictive validity refers to the degree to which a test predicts how well a person will perform in a future situation (Gay, 1996, p. 142). It should be noted that
the only procedural distinction between predictive validity and concurrent validity pertains to the time period when the criterion data are gathered (Mehrens & Lehman, 1973, p. 125). Concurrent validity occurs when validity data are collected at approximately the same time as the test data. Predictive validity involves collecting the data at a later date.

The criterion-related validity of the new instrument to identify cultural awareness was established at the same time that the instrument was developed. It was established by comparing the results on the new instrument to the items from the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale and the Quick Discrimination Index that were used to form the new instrument.

Sample

A population is an arbitrary universe or "entire group of persons, things, or events having at least one trait in common" but which can have more than one shared trait (Sprinthall, 1990, p. 113). The target population for this study was social workers currently employed by the Oklahoma State Department of Human Services.

A sample is a subset of the larger population that is considered to be representative of the population (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 123). The social work staff in this study
are all currently employed by the Oklahoma State Department of Human Services (DHS). They are housed in various offices spread across the 77 counties in the state. All of the staff members are connected via the DHS e-mail system.

The participants were all currently employed by the Oklahoma State Department of Human Services (DHS). The DHS is comprised of a number of divisions providing a myriad of services to children, families, and individuals. Its mission is to assist individuals and families in need to help themselves lead healthier, more independent, and productive lives (www.okdhs.org/statement/dismissingstatement.htm). According to the agency's Monthly Statistical Bulletin, social services personnel at the DHS in May of 2001 served 13,551 families receiving Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, 1,162 people needing Adult Protective Services, 144,197 people requiring Child Support Enforcement Services, and 9,728 children in need of Developmental Disability Services. Also during May, there were 730 elderly people who received adult day services, 109,441 families who received Food Stamp services, 439,787 individuals who were provided Medicaid services, and 49,106 people who received State Supplemental Disabled Services for the blind and the elderly. Additionally, there were 2,590 children who were assessed for abuse and neglect by Child Welfare Specialists,
and 6,132 children were served in foster care placements (www.okdhs.org/finances/bulletin/bulletin 0105/t33.htm).

The Department of Human Services (DHS) has approximately 5,000 employees who directly provide social services to clients. They are classified with the following titles: Social Services Specialist, Social Services Supervisor, Child Welfare Specialist, Child Welfare Supervisor, and Youth Guidance Specialist. They are located in offices throughout the state of Oklahoma. These social workers were sent an e-mail through the DHS system and invited to participate in the study. The e-mail message provided a link to a website which contained the form for participating in the study. The responses of the participants were completely anonymous because there were no identifiers in the responses that were electronically recorded. There were 768 DHS employees surveyed for this study.

Using the internal network for the Department of Human Services (DHS), 1,207 employees were contacted and asked to volunteer for the study. The participants were selected from the DHS internal e-mail system. Within the DHS e-mail system, many of the county offices are listed in such a way that one can e-mail specific staff. For example, in Tulsa County e-mail can be addressed as follows: Tulsa.all which
means the e-mail will go to all of the staff regardless of classification. Addressing an e-mail to Osage.cws means that the e-mail will only be sent to Child Welfare staff in Osage County. An e-mail addressed to Tulsa.fss will be sent only to Family Support Services staff who work with families applying for food stamps, medical assistance, and the like in Tulsa County. Some offices are not listed with this delineation. For example Roger Mills County is listed as RogerMills.all which means that all Roger Mills County staff would receive the e-mail regardless of their classification. Because some requests had to be sent to all of those in the county, the "Other" category was created in the demographic data. The "Other" category includes social work staff along with clerical and administrative staff that may not provide direct services to families.

In response to these e-mail requests, 768 responses were received in a one-week period from Department of Human Services employees. This is a response rate of 70% of those invited to participate and represents approximately 15% of the 5,000 of the employees providing direct services.

Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale

The Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MKCAS) is a 32-item counselor self-rating scale initially called the Multicultural Counseling Awareness
Scale developed by Ponterotto, Sanchez, and Magids in 1991. The MKCAS uses a 7-point Likert-type format to measure multicultural knowledge/skills and awareness, with responses ranging from not at all true (1) to totally true (7). The MKCAS and accompanying demographic questionnaire require 15 to 25 minutes to complete. The MKCAS is conceptually grounded in the Division 17 competency report of the American Psychological Association (Sue et al., 1982) which states that multicultural competence consists of knowledge, awareness and skills.

With regard to reliability, coefficient alphas for the MKCAS have been reported in two studies. Ponterotto et al. (1991) reported a full-scale coefficient alpha of .93 for the MKCAS:B. They reported coefficient alphas of .93, .93, and .78 for the full-scale, Factor 1 (Knowledge), and Factor 2 (Awareness). Content validity of the MKCAS was established through experts' judgments of items in terms of clarity and conciseness and domain appropriateness (Ponterotto et al., 1991).

Using a principal components analysis with a varimax rotation, Ponterotto et al. identified up to four interpretable factor possibilities (1991). The authors then examined the one-, two-, three-, and four-factor models using oblique rotations. The two-factor solution, which accounted for 28% of the common variance, was selected as
the best-fit solution. Factor 1, which measures Knowledge/Skills, had an eigenvalue of 14.4, and Factor 2, measuring Awareness, had an eigenvalue of 5.2. The two-factor solution was also consistent with the pre-analysis independent card sorts. Ponterotto et al. (1991) and Pope-Davis et al. (1992) each found a Factor 1 (Knowledge/Skills) to Factor 2 (Awareness) correlation of .37 (Ponterotto et al., 1994, p. 319).

To assess criterion-related validity, Ponterotto et al. (1991) examined the relationship of what are now MKCAS scores to varied demographic and training variables. Using multivariate analysis of variance followed by univariate and post hoc tests where appropriate, Ponterotto et al. (1991) found with university students that on the Knowledge/Skills factor, doctoral level respondents scored significantly higher than did masters- and bachelor-level respondents, whereas masters-level respondents scored higher than did those holding only the bachelor degree. On the Awareness factor, doctoral level respondents scored significantly higher than did both masters and bachelors respondents. However, a sample of national experts scored significantly higher than did both the practicing school counselor and graduate student samples on both knowledge/Skills and Awareness. Counselors of racial-ethnic minority background
scored significantly higher on the Knowledge/Skills factor than did White American counselors. Finally, the graduate student sample overall scored significantly higher on Awareness than did the school counselor sample (Ponterotto et al., 1994, p. 320).

The Quick Discrimination Index

The Quick Discrimination Index (QDI) was developed to fill a need for a reliable, valid, and moderate-length self-report measure of attitudes regarding racial diversity and women's equality (Ponterotto et al., 1995, p. 1017). There were three coordinated studies on the development and initial validation of the QDI. Study 1 focused on item development, content validity, internal consistency reliability, and criterion-related validity. Study 2 focused on the factor structure of the QDI while further examining criterion-related validity and internal consistency. This study also assessed the stability of responses to the QDI over time. Finally, Study 3 incorporated confirmatory factor analysis to test the factor structure found in Study 2 and examined measures of convergent and discriminant validity and social desirability contamination (p. 1017).

Items were generated from the literature on discrimination, prejudice, and "modern racism" and from the development team's applied work in the area. An attempt was made to tap both the cognitive and affective components of prejudicial attitudes. Roughly 40 statements were initially
written. Each item statement was examined by the research team, and redundant, unclear, and confusing items were eliminated. Twenty-eight remaining items were placed on a 5-point Likert-type scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Not Sure; 4 = Agree; and 5 = Strongly Agree (Ponterotto et al., 1995, p. 1018).

To assess the content validity of the prototype Quick Discrimination Index, five individuals with expertise in the topical area and in psychological measurement who were not part of the development team rated each item on a 5-point Likert-type scale for domain appropriateness and clarity. Items receiving a mean of less than 4.0 a "5" rating indicated highly domain appropriate and very clear on either domain appropriateness or clarity were eliminated or rewritten. This procedure resulted in a final prototype pool of 25 items. The total score range is from 25 to 125 with higher scores indicating more positive attitudes toward multiculturalism and women's equality (Ponterotto et al., 1995, p. 1018).

The 25-item (QDI) was then the subject of a 2-hour focus group conducted by the senior author with seven graduate students in education. Focus group members completed the instrument and then discussed both their affective and cognitive reactions to the items. Focus group members completed the QDI in 6 to 13 minutes (Ponterotto et
Cronbach's alpha for the 25-item QDI was .89. With the exception of two items, corrected item-total correlations ranged from .20 to .74; the mean corrected item-total correlation for the 25 items was .45. The coefficient of variation for the QDI was 13.4%, falling within the 5% to 15% range.

A factor analysis was conducted to explore the structure of the QDI. A principal components analysis with varimax rotation yielded six factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0. A scree test, however, indicated that up to four factors were interpretable. Consequently, one, two, three, and four-factor extractions were forced to locate the most interpretable factor structure (Ponterotto et al., 1995, p. 1018).

Of the four extractions, the three-factor orthogonal model appeared the most interpretable. This extraction accounted for 45.8% of the total variance. Using .35 as the factor loading criteria and eliminating items that loaded highly on more than one factor, 21 of the 25 items loaded on one of the three factors. Factor 1 accounted for 30.3% of the total variance and loaded highly on 12 items. These items represented general, cognitive attitudes about diversity.

Factor 2 accounted for 8.7% of the total variance and
loaded highly on five items. These items revolved around more personal and affective involvement with diversity. Factor 3 accounted for 6.7% of the total variance and loaded highly on four items. These items centered on gender-based attitudes.

Given the developmental nature of this study and until the three-factor extraction model could be replicated with different samples, it was decided to use only the total score as the dependent variable in a series of logical, within-sample comparisons. Studies 2 and 3 focused on the factor structure of the QDI). One-way analysis of variance were conducted to compare QDI total scores on gender, race, geographic locale, and political affiliation. These analysis found that females scored significantly higher than males, minority respondents (all non-White groups combined) scored significantly higher than did Whites. Urban dwellers scored significantly higher than both suburban) and rural residents, and than Independents. Both Democrats and Independents scored significantly higher than Republicans (Ponterotto et al., 1995, p. 1018).

To examine the relationship of the QDI total scores to income, age, and education level, Pearson product-moment correlations were computed (Ponterotto et al., 1995, p. 1018). The correlations between QDI scores and age and
income were negligible and nonsignificant. The QDI total score correlation to education level was low.

Based on the results of the item analysis and factor analysis, two revisions to the QDI were made. First, the two items having low item-total correlations and therefore attenuating the full scale coefficient alpha were closely examined and rewritten. Second, to refine Factor 2 with five items and Factor 3 with four items, five new items were written and added to the QDI. This brought the total items in the QDI to 30.

The results of Study 1 found the QDI to have both face and content validity, and internal consistency. Within-group cohort comparisons provided initial measures of criterion-related validity (Ponterotto et al., 1995, p. 1018). The findings that females and minority persons scored significantly higher than males and White subjects on multicultural sensitivity are consistent with recent literature. The finding that urbanites were more accepting of racial diversity and women's equality may reflect the diversity of their day-to-day contact. Finally, the finding that Democrats scored higher than Independents and that both of these groups scored higher than Republicans may reflect the political conservatism/liberalism distinction common to the parties.

Study 2 used the revised 30-item QDI and found a three-
factor oblique extraction to be the best-fit factor solution (Ponterotto et al., 1995, p. 1019). This extraction was consistent with exploratory factor analyses conducted in Study 1. Study 2 found the three-factor model to be internally consistent and criterion valid. This study also supported the test-retest stability of the QDI across three samples.

Finally, Study 3 supported the three-factor extraction model through the use of confirmatory factor analytic procedures (Ponterotto et al., 1995, p. 1019). This study also established a measure of convergent validity for the QDI and found the instrument to be relatively free of social desirability contamination (Ponterotto et al., 1995, p. 1019).

The developers of the QDI suggest that it should undergo numerous replication and extension studies before researchers can be confident in the instrument's psychometric stability and pragmatic utility (Ponterotto et al., 1995, p. 1020). Further research was indicated. First, further validation of the tridimensional factor structure across diverse samples is needed. Second, the instrument needed to be assessed further for test-retest stability over variable time lengths. Research is also needed to examine the QDI's sensitivity to treatment interventions, such as in
race and gender awareness programs. Third, further tests of criterion-related validity were needed.

Procedure

Data were gathered electronically via the Internet. Those in the sample were sent an e-mail message which described the study, asked them to participate, and included a link to the form containing the items from the two established scales. Authorization to access the Oklahoma Department of Human Services (DHS) staff through the DHS e-mail system from Area Directors was obtained. The researcher's Associate Director, Administrator for Field Operations, and Area director were instrumental in facilitating this approval. A personal website was developed housing the items to which the DHS staff were to respond. A broadcast e-mail was then sent to social work staff inviting them to participate in the study by accessing the link which connected to the website.

After the data were gathered, several statistical procedures were conducted. First, a profile was constructed of the DHS participants responding to the pool of items. Univariate analyses were conducted to determine if the instruments used applied appropriately to the DHS population. In addition, a factor analysis was conducted for each instrument to confirm the use of the instrument with
the practitioner DHS populations. Once this process was completed, a cluster analysis was conducted to identify the various groups with differing levels of cultural awareness in the DHS sample. This procedure revealed four groups. A series of two-group discriminant analyses were then conducted at the two-group stage and the four-group stage of the cluster analysis to identify the process that separated the groups (Conti, 1996). These analyses provided the data for the wording of each item in the instrument. The items that were written based on this process were field tested with adults at several sites to clarify the wording of the items and the accuracy of the instrument. Finally, members of the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation were asked to complete the instrument via the Internet and to respond to the test items from the original pool of items that were used to create the items for their grouping on the new instrument. Their responses on these items were then compared to those of the DHS groups.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS

Several traditional and innovative steps were taken to develop an instrument to identify cultural awareness of social workers. The traditional steps involved the creation of a pool of items, gathering data with these items, and then using these items to develop a new instrument and to establish the construct, content, and criterion-related validity of the new instrument. Innovative steps involved using existing instruments to provide the source for the pool of items, collecting data via the Internet, and using multivariate analyses to determine the structure and content of the new instrument. The result of the combination of these steps was the creation of a new instrument with a flow-chart design that can be completed in less than two minutes and which classifies respondents into one of four groups of cultural appreciation. This instrument was named Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL) and may be referred to as CALL.

Participants

The 768 participants that provided the data for developing the Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning instrument were all currently employed by the Oklahoma State Department of Human Services (DHS). As has been the
tradition with social services in America, the overwhelming majority of respondents were female with four-fifths female and one-fifth male (see Table 1). The average age of the participants was 42.7 with a standard deviation of 10.4. Nearly three-fourths of the participants were over the age of 35 years of age (see Table 1).

The U.S. Census Bureau reported that for the State of Oklahoma the estimated ethnicity statewide for 1999 was distributed as follows: African American--7.5%, American Indian or Alaskan Native--7.5%, Asian or Pacific--1.0%, Caucasian--80%, and Hispanic--4.0% (http://www.odoc.state.ok.us). Although nearly three-fourths of the participants in this study were Caucasian (see Table 1), the sample was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>19.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>80.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>22.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>29.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>43.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>23.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>18.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>17.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>15.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
slightly more diverse than the state population. The two largest minority groups in the state are Native Americans and African Americans. Those identifying themselves as African American made up nearly 10% of the sample, and Native Americans comprised over 11% of respondents. Thus, this representative sample of Department of Human Services is somewhat more ethnically diverse than the general population of the state. At the two-cluster solution, 433 respondents perceived diversity issues as related to societal causes. Of this group, 355 (82%) of respondents in that group were female and 78 (18%) were male. The mean age was 42.78 with a standard deviation of 10.37. The median age was 44.0. The ethnic make up of the group was as follows: Caucasians made up 68.9%, African Americans represented 13.9% of this group, Native Americans represented 13.2% and
those of Hispanic/Latino descent comprised 2.1% and of this group.

The other group in the two-cluster solution contained 335 respondents who perceived diversity issues from the individual perceptive. Of these, 258 (77.5%) were female, and 75 (22.5%) were male. The mean age was 42.6 with a standard deviation of 10.50. The median age was 43.0. The ethnic make up of this group was as follows: Caucasians made up 82.2%, African Americans represented 4.5%, Native Americans represented 8.2%, and those of Hispanic/Latino descent comprised 2.7% and of this group.

The groups at the two-cluster stage each divided into two groups at the four cluster solution stage. The highest scoring group of the two groups that made up the 433 respondents that perceived diversity issues as related to societal causes was comprised of 197 people who viewed traditional values as limiting multicultural groups. Of these, 172 (87.3%) of these respondents were female and 25 (12.7%) were male. The mean age was 42.12 with a standard deviation of 10.10. The median age was 42.0. The ethnic make up of the group was as follows: Caucasians made up 69.4% African Americans represented 13.8% of this group, Native Americans represented 13.8%, and those of Hispanic/Latino descent comprised 1.5% of this group.
The second highest scoring group was comprised of 236 people who viewed traditional values as being somewhat useful to multicultural groups. Of these, 183 (77.5%) were female and 53 (22.5%) were male. The mean age was 43.33 with a standard deviation of 10.57. The median age was 45.0. The ethnic make up was as follows: Caucasians made up 68.5%, African Americans represented 14.0%, Native Americans represented 12.8%, and those of Hispanic/Latino descent comprised 2.6% and of this group.

The highest scoring group of the two groups that made up the 335 respondents that perceived diversity issues from an individual perspective was comprised of 157 people who acknowledged a lack of knowledge concerning cultural diversity. Of these, 128 (81.5%) of these respondents were female and 29 (18.5%) were male. The mean age was 41.81 with a standard deviation of 10.46. The median age was 43.0. The ethnic make up was as follows: Caucasians made up 75.2% African Americans represented 7.6% of this group, Native Americans represented 9.6%, and those of Hispanic/Latino descent comprised 5.1% of this group.

The lower scoring of these two groups was comprised of 176 people who have some knowledge of cultural issues but have selected not to support cultural diversity. Of these, 130 (73.9%) were female, and 46 (26.1%) were male. The mean
age was 43.32 with a standard deviation of 10.52. The median age was 44.5. The ethnic make up was as follows: Caucasians made up 88.5%, African Americans represented 1.7%, Native Americans represented 6.8%, and those of Hispanic/Latino descent comprised .6% of this group.

Thus, each of the groups tended to be approximately three-quarters female and one-quarter male. However, for the groups from the four-cluster solution stage that merged at the two-cluster solution stage, the highest-scoring group had more females than the lower-scoring group.

Respondents were asked to provide information as to the length of time they have been employed with the Department of Human Services (DHS) and whether or not they worked in a metro or non-metro county. Nearly one-fourth (23.5%) of the participants in this sample had less than 2 years of experience on the job while over a third (35.6%) had 8 to 10 years experience and approximately two-fifths (40.9%) have over 10 years of experience (see Table 1). Over 300 (42%) staff have worked for the DHS less than 5 years. Thus, the Department of Human Services is nearly evenly divided into a very experienced group and a much less experienced group. While 60% had over 5 years of experience as DHS employees, 40% of the staff in the sample had 5 years or less experience working in the agency. Nearly one-fourth of the
less-experienced group is comprised of new employees with less than 2 years of experience in the agency. At the two-cluster solution, the mean for the number of years of experience for the 433 participants who perceived diversity issues as related to societal causes was 9.6 with a standard deviation of 8.37. The median was 7.00 years of experience. The mean for the number of years of experience for the 335 participants who perceived diversity issues as related to the individual perspective was 10.27 with a standard deviation of 7.96. The median was 9.00 years of experience.

At the four-cluster solution the mean for the number of years of experience the 197 people who viewed traditional values as limiting multicultural groups was 8.92 with a standard deviation of 8.02. The median was 6.00 years of experience. The mean for the number of years of experience for the 236 people who viewed traditional values as being somewhat useful to multicultural groups was 10.16 with a standard deviation of 8.63. The median was 8.63 years of experience.

The mean for the number of years of experience for the 158 people who acknowledged a lack of knowledge concerning cultural diversity was 10.29 with a standard deviation of 7.64. The median was 10.0 years of experience. The mean for the number of years of experience for the 177 people who
have some knowledge of cultural issues but have chosen not to support cultural diversity was 10.25 with a standard deviation of 8.26. The median was 8.00 years of experience. While experience is a tremendous resource for adult learning, fixed habits and patterns also develop over time (Knowles, 1970, p. 44). Therefore, those newer employees may be very open to training related to cultural awareness.

Finally, there are large groups at the more-experienced level within DHS. These entered the agency during vastly different social eras. Those that had 6-10 years of experience began working with families in the Department of Human Services during the second administration of President Clinton. Those with 11-15 years of experience came to work for DHS during President Clinton’s first administration. Employees of the Department of Human Services with 16-20 years of experience were hired during President Bush’s administration, and those with 21-25 years of DHS experience came to work for the agency during the Reagan administration. Very few DHS employees remain with the agency for more than 25 years. Thus, the levels and training needs for cultural appreciation for this group may vary widely because of this diverse experience.

Nearly two-thirds (65.88%) of respondents worked in non-metro counties while the remainder work in or around the
Tulsa, Oklahoma City, or McAlester areas which are all classified as metropolitan areas within DHS (see Table 1). Those working in metropolitan areas have a greater opportunity to serve people of diverse cultures and ethnicities because more people live in the metropolitan areas than in the non-metro areas. For example, there are approximately 792,000 people living within Tulsa County and approximately 1,000,000 people living in the Oklahoma County area. At the two-cluster solution 37.1% of the respondents in the group perceiving diversity issues as related to societal causes worked in a metro location while 62.9% did not. Of those who perceived diversity issues as related to the individual perspective 30.2% worked in a metro location and 69.8% did not. At the four-cluster solution 37.2% of those in the group of 197 who viewed traditional values as limiting multicultural groups worked in a metro location while 62.8% did not. Of those 236 participants who viewed traditional values as being somewhat useful to multicultural groups, 37.0% worked in a metro location and 63.0% did not. Of those 158 participants who acknowledged a lack of knowledge concerning cultural diversity, 32.3% worked in a metro location and 67.7% did not. Of those 177 participants who have some cultural knowledge but chose not to support cultural diversity, 28.4% worked in a metro location and
71.6% did not. Thus, in each of the groupings, approximately one-third of the group worked in a metro location while about two-thirds did not. The group with the largest non-metro representation was the group that scored lowest in cultural competency.

There are several positions within the Department of Human Services. Child Welfare and Social Services Specialists are those workers providing direct services to children and families on a daily basis. Child Welfare and Social Services supervisors also provide some direct services to families on a more limited basis. Nearly two-thirds (62.66%) of the respondents were specialists who provide direct services to clients. Just over one-fourth of respondents were Child Welfare Specialists (see Table 1). A little more than one-tenth of the respondents worked in supervisor capacities. Slightly more than one-fourth of participants were Youth Guidance Specialist staff, clerical staff, and administrative personnel. While the Youth Guidance Specialists have regular direct contact with clients, the clerical and administrative staff generally do not. At the two-cluster solution Social Services Specialists comprised 38.3% of the group perceiving diversity issues as related to societal causes, Child Welfare Specialists were 27.8% and Social Services and Child Welfare Supervisors made
up 13.0% of respondents in this group. Of those who perceive diversity issues from an individual perspective Social Services Specialists comprised 36.0% of the group, Child Welfare Specialists comprised 21.9% and Social Services and Child Welfare Supervisors made up 8.7% of that group.

At the four-cluster solution there were 197 people in the highest scoring group. This group viewed traditional values as limiting multicultural groups. Of this group 35.4% were Social Services Specialists, 31.3% were Child Welfare Specialists, 11.8% worked in a supervisory capacity and less than one fourth of this group of respondents (21.5%) work in clerical, administrative or other capacities wherein they do not provide direct services. There were 236 people in the next highest scoring group. This group viewed traditional values as being somewhat useful to multicultural groups. Of this group 40.7% were Social Services Specialists, 25.0% were Child Welfare Specialists, 14.0% worked in a supervisory capacity and less than one fourth of this group of respondents (20.3%) work in clerical, administrative or other capacities wherein they do not provide direct services.

There were 158 people in the group that acknowledged a lack of knowledge concerning cultural diversity. Of this group 33.5% were Social Services Specialists, 22.2% were
Child Welfare Specialists, 10.1% worked in a supervisory capacity and 34.2% work in clerical, administrative or other capacities wherein they do not provide direct services. There were 177 people in the group that scored lower on the items, has some knowledge of cultural issues but has chosen not to support cultural diversity. Of this group 38.3% were Social Services Specialists, 21.7% were Child Welfare Specialists, 7.4% worked in a supervisory capacity and 32.6% work in clerical, administrative or other capacities wherein they do not provide direct services.

The respondents have much experience in their current positions working with people of various ethnicities. Over nine-tenths (93.2%) had from Some to Very Much experience working with people of diverse ethnicities in their current positions (see Table 2). Nearly two-thirds (61.04%) had Much or Very Much experience in this area (see Table 2). The pattern of responses for frequency of experience with people of diverse ethnicities was similar for the previous jobs as for the current positions. Less than 12% of respondents indicated they had little or no experience with those of diverse ethnicities in their previous position, and the amount of experience in their previous work is similar to that in their present jobs (see Table 2). At the two-cluster solution, .5% of respondents
perceiving diversity issues as related to societal causes had no experience working with diverse populations, 4.6% had very little experience working with those from diverse populations and 27.9% had some experience in this area. Well over half of the respondents (67%) had much to very much experience working with diverse populations. Of respondents perceiving diversity issues from an individual perspective 1.5% had no experience working with diverse populations. 7.5% had very little experience working with those from diverse populations and 37.7% had some experience in this area. Just over half of the respondents (53.3%) had much to very much experience working with diverse populations.

At the four-cluster solution the group that scored higher on the items was comprised of 197 respondents. Less that one tenth (7.1%) had none or very little experience working with diverse populations. 30.5% had some experience and more than half (62.0%) had much or very much experience working with diverse populations. The next highest scoring group had 236 respondents. Of these, .4% had no experience working with diverse populations. 2.5% had very little experience working with diverse populations. 25.8% had some experience and 71.2% had much or very much experience working with diverse populations. The group acknowledging a lack of knowledge concerning cultural diversity is comprised
of 158 people. There were no respondents reporting no
time working with diverse populations. 8.2% had very
little experience, 38.0 had some experience, 30.4% had much,
and 23.4% had very much experience working with diverse
populations. The group having some knowledge of cultural
issues but selecting not to support cultural diversity was
comprised of 177 people. 2.9% had no experience working with
diverse populations. 6.9% had very little experience, 37.4%
had some experience, 27.6% had much, and 25.3% had very much
experience working with diverse populations.

Outside of the workplace, most of the respondents have
some contact with people of diverse ethnicities in their
home communities (see Table 2). A few have very restrictive
contact with less than a percent of respondents having no
contact with people of other ethnicities, and slightly more
than one-tenth (11.68%) seldom have contact with those
outside their own ethnic group in their home community.
About one-third (32.15%) have occasional contact. However,
over half (55.91%) have frequent or very frequent contact
with people of diverse ethnicities in their home
communities. At the two-cluster solution 7.7% of respondents
who perceive diversity issues as related to societal causes
had none or very little experience working with diverse
populations in their previous employment. 25.3% of this
group had some experience working with diverse populations in their previous employment and well over half of those in this group (67.0%) had much or very much experience working with diverse populations in their previous employment. Of those who perceive issues related to diversity from an individual perspective 4.2% had no experience working with diverse populations in their previous employment. Just over a tenth (12.3%) had very little experience working with diverse populations in their previous employment. Well over half of those who perceive issues related to diversity from an individual perspective (65.2%) had some or much experience working with diverse populations in their previous employment, and 18.3% had very much experience working with diverse populations in their previous employment.

Of those who perceive diversity issues as related to societal causes .2% had no contact with diverse individuals in their home community. Less than one tenth of respondents in this group (8.6%) very seldom had contact. More than a quarter (28.7%) of respondents had occasional contact with diverse individuals in their home community. More than half of the respondents in this group (62.5%) had frequent or very frequent contact.

Of those who perceive diversity issues from an
individual perspective, .3% had no contact with diverse individuals in their home community. There were 15.6% who reported they very seldom had contact. There were 36.6% who had occasional contact with diverse individuals in their home community. There were 36.0% who reported frequent contact and just over a tenth (11.4%) reported very frequent contact with diverse individuals in their home community.

At the four-cluster solution there were 197 respondents who viewed traditional values as limiting multicultural groups. Of these, 1.5% had no experience working with diverse populations in their previous employment, 9.1% had very little, 23.3% had some experience, 21.3 had much and nearly half (45.7%) had very much experience working with diverse populations in their previous employment. There were 236 respondents who comprised the group who views traditional values as being somewhat useful to multicultural groups. Of those respondents .9% had no previous experience working with diverse populations in their previous employment, 4.3% had very little, 27.8% had some experience, 32.9% had much and 34.2% had very much experience working with diverse populations in their previous employment. There were 157 people who comprised the group who acknowledged a lack of knowledge concerning cultural diversity. Of that group 5.1% had no previous experience working with diverse
populations in their previous employment. There were 11.4% who reported very little experience, 38.0% had some, 25.3% had much and 20.3% had very much experience working with diverse populations in their previous employment.

Table 2: Frequency of Contact with Diverse Ethnicities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Current Work</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>32.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>Much</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>29.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>31.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>Very Little</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>30.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>Much</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>28.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>Very Much</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>30.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Seldom</td>
<td>Very Seldom</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>32.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>38.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Frequently</td>
<td>Very Frequently</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>17.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cultural Competence Scores

The Department of Human Services employees participating in the survey were asked to answer a total of 62 questions from the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MKCAS) and the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI). Scores for the 32 items on the MKCAS may range from 32 to 224. The distribution of scores for the MKCAS had a range from 76 to 208 (see Table 3). The mean score on the
MKCAS was 146.65 with a standard deviation of 22.98. The median score was 146. Thus, the responses were distributed across the scale with the indicators of central tendency for the group falling near but slightly above the midpoint of 128 for the scale. At the two-cluster solution those in the group perceiving diversity issues as related to societal causes had a mean score of 161.70 with a standard deviation of 9.10. The median score for this group was 161.00. Those in the group perceiving diversity issues from an individual perspective had a mean score of 127.20 with a standard deviation of 13.61. The median score for this group was 128.00.

Table 3: Distribution of Scores on MKCAS and Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Quartile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MKCAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-130</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131-146</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147-163</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164-208</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-75</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-88</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-101</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102-134</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-52</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-59</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-66</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-82</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale has two factors. These are Knowledge and Awareness (see Table 3). The Knowledge factor, which contains 20 items, had a mean of 87.72 with a standard deviation of 18.80. The median score was 88. The Awareness factor, which contains 12 items, had a mean of 58.93 with a standard deviation of 9.84. The median score was 59. At the two-cluster solution, those perceiving diversity issues as related to societal causes had a mean score of 99.61 on the Knowledge factor with a standard deviation of 12.75. The median score was 99.00. They had a mean score of 62.09 on the Awareness factor with a standard deviation of 9.10. The median was 62.00. Those perceiving issues related to diversity from an individual perspective had a mean score of 72.36 on the Knowledge factor with a standard deviation of 13.48. The median score was 73.00. This group had a mean score of 54.84 on the Awareness factor with a standard deviation of 9.24. The median score was 54.00.

The scores on the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI) may range from 30 to 150. The distribution of scores on the QDI ranged from 47 to 129 (see Table 4). The mean score on the QDI was 94.89 with a standard deviation of 14.08. The median score was 95.00. Like the overall scores for the MKCAS, the indicators of central tendency for the group were slightly
above the midpoint of 90 for the scale. At the two-cluster solution, those perceiving diversity issues as related to societal causes had a mean score of 101.69 with a standard deviation of 11.30. The median was 102.00.

Table 4: Distribution of Scores on QDI and Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Quartile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-86</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87-95</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96-105</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106-129</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-25</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-21</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-28</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-35</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-17</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Quick Discrimination Index has three factors. These are Cognitive, Attitudes Toward Minorities, and Attitudes Toward Women (see Table 4). The Cognitive factor, which contains nine items, had a mean of 29.90 with a standard deviation of 6.88. The median score was 30. The Attitudes
Toward Minorities factor, which contains seven items, had a mean of 24.10 with a standard deviation of 5.02. The median score was 25. The Attitudes Toward Women factor, which contains seven items, had a mean of 18.92 with a standard deviation of 3.17. The median score was 19.

Relationships with Demographic Variables

Univariate analysis was used to explore the differences between the demographic variables and responses on the cultural competence scales. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized to explore the relationships between instrument scores and various demographic and work-related variables.

Analysis of variance includes:

A standard set of techniques used to analyze relationships between interval- or ratio-scale dependent variables and nominal- or ordinal-scale independent variables. Its purpose is to explain variance in the dependent variable using several different independent variables at once, to identify the relative contribution of each independent variable, and to make statistical inferences about the results. (Johnson, 1988, p. 361)

Once groups are categorized, the difference or variance is analyzed by evaluating the difference between and within groups (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1985, p. 165). In this study, one-way analysis of variance was "used to determine whether there is a significant difference between two or more means at a selected probability level" (Gay, 1996, p.479). If differences were found, post hoc tests were
conducted to identify the differences among groups for analyses with more than two groups.

Gender differences were investigated on the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale, the Quick Discrimination Index, and the factors for both instruments (see Table 4). No differences were found on the overall MKCAS, the Knowledge factor, the Attitudes Toward Minorities factor, and the Attitudes Toward Women factor. However, significant differences were found on the Cognitive factor, the Awareness factor, and the QDI. On the Cognitive factor, female (30.40) respondents scored higher than males (27.90). Also, on the Awareness factor, female (59.59) respondents scored higher than males (56.27). Likewise, the female respondents (95.69) scored significantly higher than males (91.93) on the Quick Discrimination Index.

Table 4: ANOVA for Cultural Competency Scores by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>768.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>768.85</td>
<td>16.55</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>35487.61</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>46.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1354.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1354.32</td>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>72651.87</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>95.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1731.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1731.30</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>149205.70</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>195.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>33.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.68</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Although significant differences were found, the fact that results are statistically significant does not consequentially mean that they are of any educational worth. Statistical significance only means that the results would be likely to occur by chance a particular percentage of the time. This means that the observed difference is probably a real difference, but it may not necessarily an important difference (Gay, 1996, p. 521). The significant differences due to gender on each scale were each approximately three points. The Awareness factor is made up of 10 items and consequently has a range of 10 to 70 points. The 3.32 point difference between the groups only represents 4.74% of the possible number of points on the factor. In addition, on the seven-point scale for the instrument, both groups tended to select the next-to-the-highest option for each item. Likewise, on the Quick Discrimination Index the 3.76
difference between the two groups only represents 2.51% of the possible points on the instrument. Thus, while differences that were related to gender were found, their size was so small that they have doubtful practical significance.

Analysis of variance was also used to explore differences due to age. For this analysis, participants were grouped into the following age categories: 20-24, 25-35, 36-45, and 46-65. The foundation of the age groupings was influenced by the work of Daniel Levinson. Levinson theorized that the human life-cycle consists of four different areas with each having a distinctive character (Rybash, Roodin, & Hoyer, 1995, p. 302). These eras are sequential and overlap each other. The periods of overlap with each lasting about 5 years are called transitions (p. 303). The first era is called preadulthood and lasts from infancy until about 17 years of age. The second era is called early adulthood and ranges from approximately 22 to 40 years of age. The goals to be achieved during this period include forming and pursuing youthful aspirations, raising a family, and establishing a senior position in the adult world. This stage can be tremendously rewarding and stressful (p. 303). The midlife transition spans from approximately age 40 to 45. It has been suggested that the
midlife transition is a time of soul searching and crisis. It also provides an opportunity to either grow or become stagnate (p. 303). The third era is called middle adulthood and lasts from about 45 to 60 years of age. Many people in this group recognize that this is when they have the greatest potential to have a profound and positive impact on others. They take pride in the competence and productivity of younger people instead of being threatened by them. The late adult transition runs from about 60 to 65 and brings with it the anxiety of knowing one is "old" in the eyes of their culture. In the late adulthood era, people from about age 65 develop the means to cope with the realities of the past, present, and future (p. 304).

Using the logic of Levinson's stages, groups were formed to include young adults, early adulthood, the middle transition stage, and middle adulthood. There was a significant difference between the age groups on the MKCAS test. Respondents fell into two groups; the lowest scoring group was those aged 20-24. Their average score was 132.98 which was significantly lower than all other age groups in the sample. There was also a significant difference due to age on the Knowledge factor (see Table 5). On this factor, participants fell into two groups. The group aged 20-24 were significantly lower (77.10) in their mean score than the
group aged 25-35 (89.83), 36-45 (85.67), and 46-65 (89.28). No differences were found on the Awareness factor, Quick Discrimination Index (QDI), and the three factors of the QDI (see Table 5).

Table 5: ANOVA for Cultural Competency Scores by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>7026.51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2342.17</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>264168.30</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>345.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKCAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>9937.02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3312.34</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>394984.35</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>517.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>621.28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>207.09</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>73586.63</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>96.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>83.30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.77</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>19248.37</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>25.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>106.74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35.58</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>36159.33</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>47.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>7692.78</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>211.06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70.35</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>150774.56</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>197.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences were also investigated due to ethnicity. Because the Asian/Pacific Islander and Other groups were so small, they were eliminated from the analysis. Thus, for this analysis, the 727 participants were grouped as follows:
Caucasian (569), Native Americans (84), and African American (75). Significant differences were found in six of the seven analyses (see Table 6). On the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale, the Caucasian participants scored significantly lower (145.62) than the African-American respondents (155.21). On the Knowledge factor, Caucasians (86.53) and Native Americans (89.63) scored significantly lower than African Americans (96.08). Likewise, on their Attitudes Toward Women, Caucasians (18.80) and Native Americans (18.92) scored significantly lower than African Americans (19.83). On the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI) and the Cognitive factor, there was a significant difference in all three groups. On the QDI, Caucasians (92.71) scored the lowest, Native Americans (98.48) scored in the middle, and African Americans (105.65) scored the highest. On the Cognitive factor, Caucasians (28.67) scored the lowest, Native Americans (30.85) scored in the middle, and African Americans (37.65) scored the highest. Finally, on Attitudes Toward Minorities, Caucasians (23.62) scored lower than Native Americans (26.06). No differences were found on the Awareness factor.
Table 6: ANOVA of Cultural Competency Scores by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>5435.85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2717.93</td>
<td>66.55</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>29608.83</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>40.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>12441.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6220.59</td>
<td>33.99</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>132680.24</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>183.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>462.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>231.47</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>17939.05</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>24.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>6341.70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3170.85</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>247766.91</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>341.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKCAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>6334.64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3167.32</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>376167.82</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>518.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>70.13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>7146.92</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>9.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>70592.72</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>97.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When grouped according to location, differences were found on six of the seven scales (see Table 7). Those participants working in a metro location (149.39) scored significantly higher on the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale than those who work in a non-metro location (145.15). Knowledge factor scores were higher for those in metro locations (90.17) than those in non-metro locations (86.35). There was also a significant difference in scores on the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI) where
metro participants scored higher (98.28) than non-metro respondents (93.24). The metro group scored higher on the three factors of the QDI than the non-metro group with means as follows for each group: Cognition--31.46 and 29.14, Attitude Toward Minorities--24.77 and 23.75, and Attitude Toward Women--19.48 and 18.64. Thus, on all six scales where a difference was found, those at the metro location scored slightly higher than those at the non-metro location.

Table 7: ANOVA of Cultural Competency Scores by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>4377.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4377.30</td>
<td>22.84</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>146216.45</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>191.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>921.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>921.59</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>35025.74</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>45.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>121.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>121.34</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>7577.41</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2513.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2513.42</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>266895.78</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>349.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>176.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>176.91</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>19112.74</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>25.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKCAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>3091.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3091.32</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>399422.68</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>523.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>29.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.87</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>73718.71</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>96.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The relationship between position at work and cultural competency scores was explored. For this analysis, participants were grouped as follows: Social Services Specialists, Child Welfare Specialists, Supervisors, and Others. Those in the Other group were staff that may not provide direct services to clients. Differences were found on the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MKCAS) and its factors but not on the Quick Discrimination Index and its factors (see Table 8). The significant difference in MKCAS scores divided respondents into two groups. Those in the Other (139.47) group scored significantly lower than did the group containing Supervisors (151.16) and Child Welfare Specialists (152.14). On the Knowledge factor, the differences by position separated respondents into two groups. Those in the Other (82.39) group scored significantly lower than the group containing Social Services Specialists (88.30), Supervisors (90.11), and Child Welfare Specialists (91.08). On the Awareness factor, those in the Other (57.07) group scored significantly lower than did the group containing Supervisors and Child Welfare Specialists (61.06). Thus, those not providing direct services to the clients scored lowest on the scales while those providing services tended to have similar scores with each other.
Table 8: ANOVA of Cultural Competency Scores by Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MICCAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>17926.86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5975.62</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>382296.73</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>503.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>8462.97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2820.99</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>260996.72</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>343.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2134.23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>711.41</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>71148.41</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>93.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>191.93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63.98</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>19122.05</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>25.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QDI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1319.70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>439.90</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>148898.16</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>195.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>254.76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84.92</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>35912.48</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>47.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>46.69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>7600.27</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences were investigated related to experience and cultural competency. For this analysis, the participants were placed in five groups according to their years of experience at the Department of Human Services: 1-2, 3-5, 6-10, 11-15, and 16-35. Significant differences were found on five of the seven scales (see Table #). The differences were on all of the scales except for the Knowledge factor and the Attitude Toward Women factor. For all of the scales, the group with 11-15 years of experience scored lower than
others. On the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale, the 11-15 year experience group (142.09) scored lower than those with 6-10 years of experience (149.73) and those with 3-5 years of experience (150.18). On the Awareness factor, the 11-15 year experience group (56.83) scored lower than those with 3-5 years of experience (60.01). On the Quick Discrimination Index, the 11-15 year experience group (91.02) scored lower than all the other groups which had the following means: 1-2 (96.98), 3-5 (95.45), 6-10 (96.11), and 16-35 (94.47). On the Cognitive factor, the 11-15 year experience group (27.81) also scored lower than all the other groups which had the following means: 1-2 (30.59), 3-5 (30.52), 6-10 (30.51), and 16-35 (29.68). On the Attitude Toward Minorities factor, the 11-15 year experience group (23.41) scored lower than those with 6-10 years of experience (25.08). Thus, those who started with the Department of Human Services during the era of the end of the Reagan administration and the first half of the Bush administration have the lowest cultural competency scores on most of the scales.
Table #9: ANOVA of Cultural Competency Scores by Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>720.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>180.07</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>35321.23</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>47.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QDI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2838.03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>709.51</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>147010.39</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>196.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1291.16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>322.79</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>70075.78</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>93.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>288.28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>72.07</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>18345.56</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>24.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKCAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>4980.19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1245.0</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>385308.72</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>515.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>1727.07</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>431.77</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>262731.91</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>351.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>24.08</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>7557.84</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the participants in this study are all employees of the Oklahoma State Department of Human Services. The participants were asked to provide demographic data that was analyzed in the study. The relationships with demographic variables were investigated. The variables explored were length of time with the agency, work location, frequency of contact with people of diverse ethnicities,
gender, age, experience, ethnicity, and position. Some differences were found among the groups. However, these differences either had no practical significance or were logical in terms of general societal conditions. Collectively, the wide distribution of scores on the instruments and the absence of any striking differences among the groups of employees at the Department of Human Services on the norms for the instruments indicates Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale and the Quick Discrimination Index were applicable with this sample.

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was used to confirm the structure of the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale and the Quick Discrimination Index with the social worker population at the Department of Human Services. Factor analysis is "a statistical technique used to identify a relatively small number of factors that can be used to represent relationships among sets of many interrelated variables" (Norusis, 1988, p. B-41). A factor is "a construct, a hypothetical entity, that is assumed to underlie tests, scales, items, and indeed, measures of almost any kind" (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 659). There are some constructs that are derived or will emerge from the
measurement of other directly apparent variables. The identification of these underlying factors makes describing and understanding complex phenomena like social interaction much easier (Nie et al., 1975, p. 469). Factor analysis assists in distinguishing these fundamental constructs that are not directly observable. Factor analysis is a mixture of statistical analyses that have as a common objective representing "a set of variables in terms of a smaller number of hypothetical variables" (Kim & Mueller, 1978, p. 9). Factor analysis explores the relationships and interactions between variables and permits the analysis of the effects of multiple rather than individual variables (Norusis, 1988, p. B-41).

The primary assumption of factor analysis is that fundamental dimensions, or factors, can be used to describe complex phenomena. The goal of factor analysis is to isolate the not readily apparent factors based on a group of observable variables (Nie et al., 1975, p. 469). Distinguishing the fundamental concepts in an instrument can help achieve verification of construct validity (Conti & Fellenz, 1986, p. 73; Huck, 2000, p. 106).

The primary goals of factor analysis are parsimony and meaningfulness (Norusis, 1988, p. B-43). Factor analysis should describe the relationships among variables as simply
and with as much parsimony as is achievable (Lorr, 1983, p. 14). Parsimonious results assemble variables with high correlations, thus reducing the data to a more meaningful and understandable form. This is achieved by establishing a solution with the fewest number of factors possible that simplifies the data and preserves the meaning concurrently (Davis, 2000, p. 178).

**Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale**

The 32 item Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale contains two factors (Ponterotto, 1994). These factors are Knowledge and Awareness. The Knowledge factor contained items 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 31, and 32. The Awareness Factor contained items 1, 4, 7, 10, 11, 18, 20, 24, 25, 26, 29, and 30. A confirmatory factor analysis employing the principle components factoring method was conducted with the Department of Human Services sample in this study. The principle components factoring method with varimax rotation was used because this is the most commonly used technique in the social sciences (Nie et al., 1975, p. 485).

A two-factor solution was used to examine the factor structure of the MKCAS to determine if it confirmed the structure found by Ponterotto. The initial eigenvalues for the MKCAS were 7.64 for Factor 1 and 3.35 for Factor 2.
Thus, the eigenvalues for both factors were much higher than
the value of 1.0, which is the minimum value generally
considered adequate for being included in the final solution
the factors were limited to two and then rotated, the sums
of the squared loadings for the factors were 7.57 for Factor
1 and 3.42 for Factor 2. The rotated matrix indicated that
the following items loaded on Factor 1: 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9,
12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31
and 32. The following items loaded on Factor 2: 1, 4, 7, 10,
11, 18, 20, 24, 25, and 30.

The factor analysis with the Multicultural Counseling
Knowledge and Awareness Scale and social workers at the
Department of Human Services confirmed the factors in the
scale (Ponterotto et al., 1991). When limiting the factor
analysis to two factors for the MKCAS, the items loaded in
the following fashion. They were all the same for the
Knowledge factor as reported by Ponterotto. They were the
same for the Awareness factor except for Item 26 and Item
29. Item 26 dealt with the advantages held by those born
Caucasian in this society. Item 29 relates to the challenges
faced by those born a minority in this society. While
Ponterotto reported being born White carries advantages in
this society and being born a minority brings challenges and
although the verb for both statements is "aware", the responses of the social workers indicated that for them this is an established fact and therefore constitutes "knowledge".

Quick Discrimination Index

The 30 item Quick Discrimination Index contains three factors (Utsey & Ponterotto, 1999). They are Cognitive, Attitudes Toward Minorities, and Attitudes Toward Women. The Cognitive factor contains items 3, 9, 13, 18, 19, 22, 23, 26, and 27. The Attitudes Toward Minorities factor contains items 4, 8, 11, 15, 17, 24, and 29. The Attitudes Toward Women factor contains items 1, 6, 7, 14, 16, 29, and 30. Items 2, 5, 19, 12, 21, 25, and 28 are not reported as loading on any factor. As with the MCKAS, a principle components factoring method with varimax rotation was used to examine the factor structure of the Quick Discrimination Index with the Department of Human Services group.

A three-factor solution was used to examine the factor structure of the Quick Discrimination Index to determine if it confirmed the reported structure for the instrument. The initial eigenvalues for this 3-factor solution were 7.37 for Factor 1, 2.63 for Factor 2, and 1.71 for Factor 3. When these were rotated they were 4.55 for Factor 1, 4.19 for Factor 2, and 2.98 for Factor 3. Thus, all three factors had
high eigenvalues that were above the value of 1.0. The following items loaded on Factor 1: 3, 9, 13, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26, and 27. The following items loaded on Factor 2: 1, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 15, 17, 24, 28, and 29. The following items loaded on Factor 3: 2, 6, 7, 12, 14, 16, 20, 25, and 30.

The item loadings for the Quick Discrimination Index were almost identical to those reported for the instrument (Utsey & Ponterotto, 1999). All of the items in the 3-factor solution matched the previously reported factor structures except for Item 1. This item deals with the appropriateness of the mother rather than the father of a newborn baby staying home during the first year to care for the baby. Rather than loading in Factor 3 for Attitudes Toward Women, it was the weakest loading item at .24 on Factor 2 which deals with Attitudes Toward Minorities. In addition, three of the seven items which do not have any loading on the original instrument loaded on the three factors. Item 28 (.67) loaded on Factor 2, and Item 12 (.10) loaded on Factor 3. Item 21 loaded equally strong on both Factor 1 (.50) and Factor 3 (.50). Thus, the factor analysis with the Department of Human Services personnel confirms the structure of the Quick Discrimination Index.
Summary

Factor analysis was conducted in order to examine the structure of the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale and the Quick Discrimination Index to determine if the structures were confirmed with the responses of the social workers at the Department of Human Services. The principle components factoring method with varimax rotation was employed with both existing instruments. This process resulted in confirming the structure of both the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale and the Quick Discrimination Index.

Construct Validity

Construct validity addresses the underlying theory of an instrument. Following the design for the development of Assessing The Learning Strategies of Adults, the construct validity for the Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning instrument rests with the validity of the 62 items in the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale and the Quick Discrimination Index. Both of these instruments have their validity reported in published documents. The demographic data for the social workers at the Department of Human Services (DHS) and the analyses examining the relationship of the demographic variables for this group and the instruments indicate that these instruments are
appropriate for measuring cultural competency for social workers. Moreover, the factor analyses for both instruments confirm that they are measuring cultural competency in the same way for social workers as for other groups with whom the instruments have been tested. Since the items from the two instruments have established construct validity and since the instruments are useful with the DHS group, the pool of items for the Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning instrument have construct validity.

The responses to the 62 items from the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale and the Quick Discrimination Index were used in a cluster analysis to identify the various groups of cultural awareness within the 768 Department of Human Services respondents. Agglomerative hierarchical clustering was used. In this procedure,

Clusters are formed by grouping cases into bigger and bigger clusters until all cases are members of a single cluster....At every step, either individual cases are added to clusters or already existing clusters are combined. Once a cluster is formed, it cannot be split; it can only be combined with other clusters. Thus, hierarchical clustering methods do not allow cases to separate from clusters to which they have been allocated. (Norusis, 1988, p. B-73)

is unique in that it is an inductive rather than a deductive process that allows relationships inherent in the data to emerge (Conti, 1996, p. 67). Cluster analysis permits holistic examination of the data instead of oversimplifying complicated human phenomenon by viewing variables in isolation (p. 67). In cluster analysis, the number of groups and the specific makeup of the groups is unknown (Norusis, 1988, p. B-71) so the data will not have the bias of the researcher imposed upon it (Conti, 1986). Cluster analysis can be used as one method of enhancing and enriching quantitative research (Fellenz & Conti, 1989).

In the analysis for this study, the clusters were combined by the Ward's method. This method of combining clusters optimizes the minimum variance within the clusters and tends to find clusters of relatively equal sizes (Aldenderfer & Blashfield, 1984, p. 43).

A four-cluster solution was selected as the best representative of the data (see Table 9). This produced four distinct groups of relatively equal size with each one representing slightly more or slightly less than 25% of the total group. The purpose of the Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning instrument is to identify placement in one of these four cultural awareness groupings. In considering both factor analysis and cluster analysis, it should be
noted that the difference between the two is that factor analysis examines how items group while cluster analysis uncovers how people fall into naturally occurring groups.

Table 9: Distribution of Participants in Cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Content Validity

Content validity pertains to the sampling adequacy of the content of the instrument (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 458). In this study, content validity focused on developing items that accurately placed respondents in one of four groups identified in the cluster analysis. One way to statistically determine content validity is to use discriminate analysis. Discriminate analysis is a useful tool to identify the process that separates groups created by a cluster analysis.
Discriminant analysis is a statistical technique which allows the investigation of the differences between two or more groups in relationship to several variables simultaneously (Klecka, 1980, p. 7). In discriminate analysis as with other multivariate techniques, the emphasis is upon analyzing the variables together rather than individually; the purpose of multivariate procedures is to examine the interaction of the multiple variables (Conti, 1993). "Discriminate analysis requires the researcher to make meaningful decisions about the data and to impose sense upon it" (p. 90). Discriminant analysis can be used either to describe the way groups differ or to predict membership in a group. In this study, discriminate analysis was used to investigate what separated the four groups that emerged from the cluster analysis.

A series of two-group discriminant analyses were conducted to produce data for constructing the items for the
Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL) instrument. Each analysis was used to construct a page of the flow-chart design of CALL. The following figure is a summary of the differences between the groups that were revealed by these discriminant analyses and of the flow-chart design for the items (see Figure 1).
Figure 1: Differences between Groups for Each Discriminant Analysis

Total Group (768)

This group scored higher on the items and perceived diversity issues as related to societal causes. (433)

This group scored lower on the items and viewed traditional values as being somewhat useful to multi-cultural groups. (197)

This group scored lower on the items and acknowledged a lack of knowledge concerning cultural diversity. (158)

This group scored lower on the items, has some knowledge of cultural issues, but has selected not to support cultural diversity. (177)
The first discriminant analysis was conducted with the participants grouped according to the clusters at the two-cluster stage of the hierarchical cluster analysis. One group contained 433 respondents, and the other group contained 335 respondents (see Table 9). The 62 items from the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale and the Quick Discrimination Index were used as the discriminating variables.

Analyzing the results of this two-cluster solution was a two-step process. First the accuracy of the discriminant function produced by the analysis was examined. The percentage of cases correctly classified shows how accurate the discriminant function was in grouping the respondents (Klecka, 1980, p. 49). The expectation was that the accuracy would be high because the groups were artificially formed by the cluster analysis. The purpose of the analysis was not to confirm the cluster analysis; instead, it was to identify the process that separates the clusters (Conti, 1996, p. 71). This discriminant function was 91.0% accurate in classifying cases. It correctly placed 89.6% in the highest scoring group and 92.8% in the lowest scoring group (see Table 10).
Table 10: Placement of Respondents in Clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solution</th>
<th>Placement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Incorrect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Cluster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Scoring</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Scoring</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cluster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Scoring</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Scoring</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Cluster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Scoring</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Scoring</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second step was to explore the structure matrix. The structure matrix contains the coefficients which show the similarity between each individual variable and the total discriminate function. It indicates the correlation between the individual discriminating variables and the overall discriminant function (Klecka, 1980, p. 31). In this analysis, the discriminating variables were the same 62 items used in the cluster analysis. The variables with the highest coefficients have the strongest relationship to the discriminant function. These coefficients are used to name the discriminant function because they show how closely the variable and the overall discriminant function are related (p. 31). In this study, the variables from the structure matrix were used to identify the process that separates the groups and to then word the items for soliciting the placement in these groups.
The items in the structure matrix for the groups at the two-cluster stage of the cluster analysis indicated that the groups differed in their overall view of social responsibility (see Table 11). All of the items in this structure matrix were from the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale, and all of the items were from the Knowledge factor. The higher scoring group perceived diversity issues as related to societal causes. The lower scoring group perceived diversity issues as individualistic. Items related to these opposing positions were written for the first page of the flow-chart type instrument.

Table 11: Naming Variables for Groups in Two-Cluster Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure Coeff.</th>
<th>Mean High</th>
<th>Mean Low</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>27. I am aware of the value assumptions inherent in major schools of counseling and understand how these assumptions may conflict with values of culturally diverse clients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>6. I am familiar with the culturally deficient and culturally deprived depictions of minority mental health and understand how these labels serve to foster and perpetuate discrimination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>13. I understand the impact and operations of oppression and the racist concepts that have permeated the mental health profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>23. I am aware of institutional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
barriers which may inhibit minorities from using mental health services.

|   |   |   | 17. I have an understanding of the role culture and racism play in the development of identity and world views among minority groups. |
|---|---|---|
| 0.43 | 5.43 | 3.94 |

|   |   |   | 3. I am aware some research indicates that minority clients receive less preferred forms of counseling treatment than majority clients. |
|---|---|---|
| 0.41 | 4.75 | 3.09 |

An examination of the hierarchal structure for the cluster analysis revealed that each of the two clusters at the two-cluster stage of the process divided into two groups (see Table 9). Therefore, no analyses were conducted with the clusters at the three-cluster stage of the analysis. Instead, two separate two-group discriminant analyses were conducted with the groups at the four-cluster stage of the cluster analysis. One discriminant analysis was conducted with the two groups that made up the higher scoring cluster at the two-cluster stage. The higher scoring group of these two contained 197 respondents while the lower scoring group was made up of 236 respondents. The discriminant function from this analysis was also 91% accurate in placing respondents in the correct group (see Table 10).

All of the items in the structure matrix were from the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale, and all of the items were from the Awareness factor. While both
groups embraced cultural diversity, the items of the structure matrix for this analysis revealed that the two groups differed on their support of traditional values (see Table 12). The higher-scoring group viewed traditional values as limiting multicultural groups while the lower-scoring group viewed traditional values as being somewhat useful to multicultural groups. Therefore, this concept was used to write an item to separate these two groups on traditional values, and this became a page in the flow-chart design of the instrument.

Table 12: Naming Variables for Two Highest Scoring Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure Coeff.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final discriminant analysis was conducted with the two groups that made up the lower scoring group from the two-cluster stage of the cluster analysis. The higher scoring group of these two contained 158 respondents while
the lower scoring group was made up of 177 respondents. The discriminant function from this analysis was 90.4% accurate in placing respondents in the correct group (see Table 10).

The items of the structure matrix for this analysis revealed that these two groups did not strongly endorse cultural diversity (see Table 13). Six of the nine items were from the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MCKAS) and three were from the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI). Four of the items from the MCKAS were from the Awareness factor, and two were from the Knowledge factor. Two of the items from the QDI were from the Cognitive factor and the other item was from the Attitudes Toward Minorities factor. The following items were drawn from the MCKAS: 7, 16, 19, 20, 24, and 29. The following items were from the QDI: 13, 18, and 29a. While the higher scoring of the two groups acknowledged a lack of knowledge concerning cultural diversity, the lower scoring group had some knowledge but has selected not to support cultural diversity. This concept was used to write an item to separate these two groups on knowledge of cultural issues and the amount of attention being directed toward multicultural issues, and this became a page in the flow-chart design of the instrument.
Table 13: Naming Variables for Two Lowest Scoring Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure Coeff.</th>
<th>Mean High</th>
<th>Mean Low</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>7. I feel all the recent attention directed toward multicultural issues in counseling is overdone and not really warranted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>16. I am knowledgeable of acculturation models for various ethnic minority groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>13. In the past few years there has been too much attention directed toward multicultural or minority issues in education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>20. I believe that my clients should view a patriarchal structure as the ideal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>29a. I think it is better if people marry within their own race.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>19. I am aware of culture-specific, that is culturally indigenous, models of counseling for various racial/ethnic groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>24. I think that my clients should exhibit some degree of psychological mindedness and sophistication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>18. In the past few years there has been too much attention directed toward multicultural or minority issues in business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>29. I am aware that being born a minority in this society brings with it certain challenges that White people do not have to face.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the interpretation of the structure matrix for each of the discriminant analyses were used to
construct the wording of each item in the new instrument. These items were arranged in a flow-chart design similar to that used for Assessing The Learning Strategies of Adults with each item placed on a separate page of the instrument. Since the items were formed by a multivariate process in which items interact with each other, the items were arranged so that participants follow a track of questions. The tracks were divided so that the participant can only see one item at a time.

The new instrument was piloted with a number of groups of adult learners. In order to obtain feedback and suggestions regarding the wording of the questions, the structure matrices were discussed with a class of 41 graduate students in Adult Education who were studying field-based research and with 18 graduate students in Tulsa who were participating in the Make It So (MIS) doctoral research support group of Adult Education students at Oklahoma State University. It was also piloted with a graduate level Foundations of Adult Education class of 36 learners and with 6 members of the Oklahoma City MIS community. Finally, it was field-tested with 16 inmates studying counseling at the women's correctional center in Taft, Oklahoma. After completing the instrument, comments regarding the items used in the instrument were gathered by
means of individual interviews and group discussions. Suggestions were taken into consideration for improving the new instrument as well as the accompanying graphics for each of the four groups.

**Criterion-Related Validity**

Criterion-related validity involves comparing participant performance on an instrument with an external criteria. In order to establish criterion-related validity for the Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL) instrument, the initial plan was to return to the original group of Department of Human Services employees and compare their CALL scores with their responses to the items that comprised the structure matrix for CALL. Those items making up the structure matrix were from the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale and the Quick Discrimination Index. However, this process could not be conducted because a computer-related problem related to a virus that prevented the Department of Human Services (DHS) computer network from having access to the outside webpage used in this study. This technological problem was statewide within the Oklahoma Department of Human Services computer system. Since employees in DHS could not be accessed to determine criterion-related validity for CALL, an equivalent sample was found within the Oklahoma State Department of
Vocational and Rehabilitation Services.

The Department of Vocational and Rehabilitative Services is the primary agency charged with providing disability services in Oklahoma. These human services workers are called Rehabilitation Specialists. They provide a wide range of programs for approximately 87,000 individuals each year (www.okrehab.org). These services include (a) assisting students, parents, and educational staff in public schools as well as those attending rehabilitative residential schools; (b) helping employers recruit qualified employees; (c) determining medical eligibility for social security disability benefits; and (d) operating dozens of programs that help people lead more independent, productive lives. The Department of Vocational and Rehabilitative Services staff were asked to complete CALL and then to respond to the items comprising the structure matrix for the choices they made on CALL.

Nearly 400 Vocational and Rehabilitative Services employees were asked to respond to the items via e-mail, and 100 employees responded. Of these, 35% were male, and 65% were females. The mean age of respondents was 47.5 with a standard deviation of 8.3 (see Table 14). The median age was 49.
Table 14: Frequency Distribution of Vocational Rehabilitation Respondents by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24-42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-53</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequency distribution of the ethnicity of respondents revealed that the Vocational Rehabilitative respondents were very similar to the Department of Human Services respondents (see Table 15). The ethnic group representation among Department of Vocational and Rehabilitative Services staff was nearly identical to that of the Department of Human Services (DHS) sample. Thus, the Department of Vocational and Rehabilitative Services staff was an equivalent group to use to determine criterion-related validity.

Table 15: Distribution of Vocational Rehabilitation Group Respondents for Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American/Black</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to determine criterion-related validity, the
participants' responses on Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL) were compared to the items in the structure matrix that were used to form the item. In order to do this, participants first completed CALL and then were asked to respond to the items from the structure matrices that were used to form the CALL items. Each participant only responded to the items relevant to that person's group. Although the items were analyzed individually, the criterion-related validity of CALL was based on the overall pattern of the responses. Examination of the pattern in the means for each group for each page of CALL revealed that they generally followed the high-low format that was expected for each group (see Table 16). That is, the group in each dichotomy that was expected to score higher scored higher than the other group. Likewise, the group that was expected to score lower scored lower than the other group.

In addition, the mean score for each item of the vocational rehabilitation group was compared to the mean for the Department of Human Services group with a one-sample t-test. This procedure is used to compare the mean of the group of scores under study to a specific mean (Roscoe, 1975, p. 214).
### Table 16: t-test Comparison for Vocational Rehabilitation Group to DHS Standard for Groups in Two-Cluster Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>TEST MEAN</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>9.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The item on the first page of CALL is based on the two-cluster solution and separates those who perceived diversity issues to be related to societal causes from those who view these issues as individualistic. The group perceiving societal issues scored higher on all items than the individualistic group both in the Department of Human Services (DHS) sample and the vocational rehabilitation sample. There were no significant differences between the DHS group and the vocational rehabilitation group for those in the high scoring group which perceived diversity issues related to societal causes (see Table 16). Significant differences did exist on all items between the DHS group and the vocational rehabilitation group for the low scoring
group which perceived diversify issues as individualistic. The vocational rehabilitation group scored higher on all of the items. The scores for the vocational rehabilitation groups tended to be about one increment higher for each item that for the DHS group. All of the items in this analysis were from the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale which had a seven-point response scale. Unfortunately, only the end points and the middle point are labeled with a specific value on this scale. Despite their scores being higher than their comparable DHS group, the scores for those in the individualistic group were lower than both the DHS sample and the vocational rehabilitation sample in the high-scoring group. Thus, the pattern of the mean scores for the cluster groups was the same for both the DHS and vocational rehabilitation groups.

The next two pages dealt with the pairing of the groups from the four-cluster solution. The second page dealt with the higher-scoring cluster group in the two-cluster solution. This item separates those who perceive traditional values of the social structure as being limiting to multicultural groups from those who perceive traditional values as having some usefulness for multicultural groups. The group perceiving traditional values as limiting multicultural groups scored higher than did those who
perceive traditional values as being of some benefit to multicultural groups. There were no significant differences between the Department of Human Services (DHS) group and the vocational rehabilitation group on two of the items for those in the high-scoring group, but there were differences on two other items (see Table 17). On each of these, the vocational rehabilitation group scored approximately one increment on the scale lower than the DHS group. No significant differences existed between the DHS group and the vocational rehabilitation group for those in the low-scoring group which perceived traditional values as having some usefulness for multicultural groups for three of the four items. On all three of the items where differences existed between the vocational rehabilitation group and the DHS group, the item means followed the expected pattern of the group with the overall higher-scoring mean having a higher mean on the specific item. Likewise, the means for three of the four items followed the high-low expectation for the group. On the fourth item, there was a slight difference in the means.

The item on the third page of Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL) separates those who feel their knowledge of cultural issues is somewhat limited from those who feel too much attention has been directed toward
multicultural or minority issues. On all but three items, the group who felt their knowledge of cultural issues is somewhat limited scored higher than the group who felt too much attention has been directed toward multicultural and minority groups. There was a significant difference in scores between the Department of Human Resources (DHS) group and the vocational rehabilitation group on three items for those who feel their knowledge of cultural issues is somewhat limited. There was also a significant difference in scores between the DHS group and the vocational rehabilitation group on two items for those who feel too much attention has been directed towards multicultural and minority issues. In all of these cases, the vocational rehabilitation group scored higher than the DHS group. Thus, there were not differences between the vocational rehabilitation group and the DHS group on at least two-thirds of the comparisons in each group. In addition, the higher-scoring group scored as expected by having higher scores than the other group on eight of the nine items; this included the two items on which the lower-scoring group in the DHS sample had higher scores than the high-scoring group. Despite these slight differences in the sample groups, the scores of those in the vocational rehabilitation sample generally supported the pattern in the DHS sample.
Table 17: t-test Comparison for Vocational Rehabilitation Group to DHS Standard for High-Scoring Group of Two-Cluster Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>TEST MEAN</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Group (Traditional Values Not Useful)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Group (Traditional Values Useful)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: t-test Comparison for Vocational Rehabilitation Group to DHS Standard for Low-Scoring Group of Two-Cluster Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>TEST MEAN</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Group (Cultural Knowledge Limited)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>0.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Group (Multiculturalism Overemphasized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The groups identified by Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL) disagree in how accurate the instrument is in describing them. Overall, 69% of the respondents agree that CALL is accurate in describing them (see Table 19). However, those who disagree with the description identified by CALL are not evenly distributed among the four groups ($X^2 = 39.94$, $df = 3$, $p < .001$). The two clusters that perceive diversity issues as being related to individualism, Cluster 3 and Cluster 4, have significantly more who feel that CALL does not accurately describe them than does the group who perceive diversity issues as being related to societal issues, Cluster 1 and Cluster 2. While almost all of those in the societal group agree that CALL is accurate in describing them, most of those in the individualistic group feel that it is inaccurate. They registered this disagreement with the outcome of CALL even though they responded to the items from the cultural competency scales in a manner that supported the description by CALL and even though the descriptions for the groups in CALL are based upon the items from the cultural competency scales. Thus, there is inconsistency for those in the individualistic group between their responses to the objective items of the cultural competency scale items and their perception of the accuracy of the
Thus, criterion-related validity for Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL) was established by having vocational rehabilitation workers complete CALL and comparing their responses on CALL to their responses on the items used to form CALL. For this, the means of the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation employees were compared to those of the original Department of Human Services (DHS) sample. The vocational rehabilitation sample was equivalent to the DHS sample in terms of their service provision to the public. The comparisons between the groups on the items used to form CALL supported the pattern of differences that were found in the DHS sample and that were used for constructing CALL. Based on the finding that the vocational rehabilitation scores were found to be consistent with the standard provided by the DHS scores, CALL was judged to have criterion-related validity.
Reliability

Reliability is the degree to which a test consistently measures whatever it is supposed to measure (Gay, 1996, p. 145). With increased reliability of a test, the certainty also increases that the scores obtained from the administration of the test are essentially the same scores that would be obtained if the instrument were re-administered. Reliability is expressed in numeric fashion, which is usually as a coefficient. A high coefficient indicates high reliability. If a test were perfectly reliable, the coefficient would be 1.00.

There are two types of reliability. They are stability over time and internal consistency. Stability over time is established by the test-retest process. "Test-retest reliability is the degree to which scores are consistent over time. It indicates score variation that occurs from testing session to testing session as a result of errors of measurement" (Gay, 1987, p. 136). Internal consistency examines the parts of an instrument to determine whether or not they are the same. For the Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning instrument, the stability over time method was applied. Therefore a test-retest method was used.

In order to determine reliability for CALL, the test-retest process was employed with 22 graduate students in the
Adult Education program at Oklahoma State University. CALL was administered to these students and then re-administered 3 weeks later. For a finding of reliability, a correlation of at least .7 must be obtained for acceptability. The correlation coefficient for those taking CALL was .86. Thus, CALL was judged to be a reliable instrument to measure cultural appreciation.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Background

Those in the helping professions such as social workers, physicians, educators, and therapists are continually challenged to demonstrate cultural appreciation in service provision. The single most important explanation for the problems in service delivery involves the inability of helping professionals to provide culturally appreciative assistance (Sue, 1987, p. 37). This phenomenon is evident in the over-representation of children of color in out-of-home placements when compared to their numbers in the general population.

The argument for addressing multicultural issues in the helping professions is at least 40 years old. Recent studies have documented inequalities in services to children and families of color when compared to services received by Caucasian children and families (Graham, 1999, p. 103, Greene, 1986; Sue & Sue, 1990, Turner & Kramer, 1995; Willie, Kramer, & Brown, 1973; Willie, Rieker, Kramer, & Brown, 1995,). As the statutes and protocols regarding serving people continue to change at a rapid pace, it is essential that adult educators practice building enhanced
awareness of social cultural context among helping professionals. Transformative learning is part of this process.

Transformative learning involves a particular function of reflection: re-assessing the presuppositions on which one's beliefs are based and acting on insights derived from the transformed meaning perspective that results from such reassessments. This learning may occur in the domains of either instrumental or communicative learning (Mezirow, 1990, p. 18). Instrumental learning occurs when participants engage in task-oriented problem solving. Instrumental learning has to do with how to do something or how to perform. Instrumental learning is concerned with exercising control over cause-and-effect relationships to improve performance. The primary concern of communicative learning is achieving coherence (p. 8). Understanding the meaning of what others communicate about values, ideals, feelings, moral decisions, and concepts such as freedom, justice, love, labor, autonomy, commitment, and democracy is paramount to communicative learning.

Workplaces are typically associated with instrumental learning rather than with reflection or critical self-reflection. Reflection or critical self reflection are ideas that are often considered "soft" and somewhat irrelevant to
the hard-nosed, bottom-line, and results-oriented world of business (Marsick, 1990, p. 23). Today, workers at all levels are called upon to think differently and more deeply about themselves, their work, and their relationship to the organization (p.23). In other words, workers today are challenged to participate in communicative learning. In order to equip adult learners so they can engage in achieving understanding with regard to what others communicate about themselves, the learner should first be assessed.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to develop and establish validity and reliability for an instrument to measure cultural appreciation in human services workers. Development of the items included review and application of items from the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale (MCKAS) and the Quick Discrimination Index (QDI). The study involved examining the items on the MCKAS and the QDI to gain insight in order to develop a valid and reliable instrument that was user friendly. One instrument has already been developed in the field of Adult Education related to learning strategies that is user friendly and brief in duration. The new instrument was modeled after this existing instrument.

Data were collected for developing the instrument from
a variety of sources. Data for establishing construct
validity was gathered via the Internet by using two existing
instruments with Department of Human Services employees.
Content validity data were gathered by using discriminant
analysis to construct the items for the instrument and field
testing these items with various adult groups. Criterion-
related validity data were gathered via the Internet with
Department of Vocational Rehabilitation personnel.
Reliability data were gathered from adult education
practitioners. These procedures were used to develop the
Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning instrument that
can be referred to as CALL.

Findings

Construct validity assesses the fundamental theory of
the instrument. It is the degree to which the test can be
used to measure hypothetical concepts that elucidates some
aspect of human behavior (Borg & Gall, 1983, p. 280). Data
for construct validity were gathered by administering the 62
items of the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and
Awareness Scale (MCKAS) and the Quick Discrimination Index
(QDI) to 756 participants in the Department of Human
Services. The construct validity of Cultural Appreciation in
Lifelong Learning is rooted in the validity of these two
established instruments. Various analyses using the scores
form the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale and the Quick Discrimination Index and demographic data revealed that the instruments applied to the Department of Human Services personnel in a manner similar to other groups with which the instruments have been used. In addition, a confirmatory factor analysis was completed on each of the instruments. These analyses confirmed the construct validity for both instruments indicating that they apply to this population in a way similar to other populations with which the instruments have been used. Finally, a cluster analysis was conducted using the 62 items from the two instruments. This analysis produced four groups which differ in their levels of cultural appreciation. Those in one group enthusiastically embrace cultural diversity. Those in another group appreciate cultural diversity. Those in another group do not eagerly embrace cultural diversity. Finally, those in another group oppose cultural diversity. The four groups are fairly equal in size.

Content validity has to do with the sampling adequacy of the content of the instrument (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 458). For Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning, content validity focused on developing a precise item to be used in a flow-chart format for the cultural appreciation level of each of the four groups that emerged from the cluster
analysis. A series of discriminant analyses were conducted to determine what separated the four groups. At each stage of this process, the findings from the structure matrix for the discriminant analysis was employed to determine the wording of the items. These items were arranged in a flow-chart design. The analysis for the two-cluster stage revealed one group interpreting events and discerning experiences through a societal-forces lens. The other group was found to observe and have experiences related to an individual perspective. Each of these groups was made up of two of the groups from the four cluster stage of the analysis. The two groups that made up those that interpreted events through an inherent societal-forces lens were the most supportive of cultural diversity. The group that enthusiastically embraced cultural diversity felt that mainstream traditional values limited multicultural groups while the group that appreciated cultural diversity felt that these values offered some usefulness to multicultural groups. The two groups that related experiences to an individual perspective were the least supportive of cultural issues while the group that approved cultural diversity felt that too much attention has been directed toward multicultural issues. The differences between each of these sets of two groups were used to form the items for two pages.
of the instrument. The exact wording of these items was field tested with various groups of adult learners.

The Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning instrument was judged to have criterion-related validity. This judgement was reached following a comparison of the means of the original sample of Department of Human Services participants with those of a second sample group. The second sample was composed of state employees working for the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational Rehabilitative Services. One-sample $t$-test comparisons of the means for both groups were made. The scores of the second sample were found to be congruous with the standard set by the original sample.

The reliability of the Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning instrument was established by measuring stability over time. Graduate students from the Oklahoma State University Adult Education program participated in the test-retest process which had a 3-week interval. This process yielded a correlation coefficient of .86 confirming its reliability.

Conclusions

A valid and reliable instrument exists that measures cultural appreciation. Four distinct groups exist related to cultural appreciation.

Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL) is a
valid and reliable instrument for identifying cultural appreciation. Its design and development procedure was patterned after that of Assessing the Learning Strategies of Adults (Conti & Kolody, 1999). The paper version of CALL has three pages that use a flow-chart design, two pages that describe the four groups identified by the instrument, and a page with directions. CALL is printed on colored cards that are half page sheets of a standard-sized, 8.5 "x 11" page. Six colored cards pages are bound at the top to form a small booklet. Like Assessing the Learning Strategies of Adults, "sentence stems, which are in the top box on the page, lead to options in other boxes which complete the stem. Connecting arrows direct the respondent to the options. Each option leads the respondent to another box which either instructs the respondent to proceed to another colored card or which provides information about the respondent's correct group placement" (Conti & Kolody, 1999, p. 16). These pages make up the entire packet for the CALL instrument. CALL can be completed by professionals in one to two minutes. In the model packet printed for the field testing of CALL, the pages that linked to choices on the first item were printed on orange and yellow paper. These pages can be any color as long as they are coordinated with the option boxes on the first item. Also, since some people have difficulty
discerning various colors, either page numbers or some other coding system may be used.

The computer version of CALL utilizes a similar format but is not color coded. Each of the choices, which appear on the paper version is linked to its correct response so that participants can quickly move through the instrument by simply selecting their choices and allowing the computer program to take them to their next choice and eventually to the description of the group in which they are placed.

The first page in CALL separates participants into two groups (see Figure 2). One group sees and is aware of inherent social forces oppressing people in marginalized populations. This group looks externally to society as a
In our society:

Inherent forces such as oppression and racial discrimination are firmly rooted in the social structure.

Go to Orange Card

Individual actions rather than inherent social forces determine people's social situation.

Go to Yellow Card

whole. Its members recognize oppressive forces and see them firmly established in our society. The other group looks internally to the individual. Its members view oppressive forces as influences or actions that one person exercises over another person. These two groups differ in terms of their fundamental ideas regarding societal forces versus the individual choices perspective. Those in the group acknowledging oppression in the social structure score higher in terms of their appreciation for cultural diversity than do those who feel oppression is inflicted upon individuals by individuals. In the test version of CALL Only
those who selected the social-forces option on the first card go to the orange card. Those that selected the individual actions option are directed to the yellow card.

When referring to the interaction of cultures, sociologists use the terms assimilation and acculturation (Korzenny, 1998). Assimilation has to do with the conversion of one cultural group by another group that is dominant in the society. Acculturation is concerned with maintaining the identity and integrity of various cultures while allowing intercultural borrowing among diverse peoples. Acculturation is the process of learning a second culture, and assimilation is the abandonment of one’s first culture in favor of a second culture. The position of the group that is aware of the role of social forces in influencing diversity issues is compatible with the concept of acculturation while the position of the group supporting an individual approach is compatible with the concept of assimilation.

The second page in Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning separates those who enthusiastically embrace cultural diversity from those who appreciate cultural diversity (see Figure 3). In the test version, this card was on orange paper to match the instructions on the first card.
I believe that:

Mainstream traditional values of the social structure limit multicultural groups.

Mainstream traditional values offer some usefulness to multicultural groups.

You are in Group 1

You are in Group 2

The process that separated these two groups was their commitment to traditional values. Those in the higher-scoring group, who enthusiastically embrace cultural diversity view traditional values as limiting multicultural groups understand that these values may be imposed on diverse groups in an effort to promote conformity to the social forces inherent in our society. However, those in the lower-scoring group in this cluster appreciate cultural diversity but believe that multicultural groups can benefit by integrating some mainstream values into their life style.
The third page in Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning separates participants into two groups. Options chosen on this page separate those who do not readily embrace cultural diversity in Group 3 from those who oppose cultural diversity in Group 4 (see Figure 4). Both groups do not recognize inherent societal forces and their impact on people. Instead, they believe that individual choices rather than societal forces are the major factors influencing a persons social situation. Those in Group 3 accept mainstream traditional values, are unaware of many institutional barriers restricting minority groups, and acknowledge that they have limited knowledge concerning ethnic groups. Those in Group 4 oppose valuing cultural diversity and believe too much attention has been given to multicultural issues and oppose valuing cultural diversity. Those in Group 3 and Group 4 scored lower on the items used to form CALL than those in Group 1 and Group 2. However, Group 3 scores were routinely lower than those of Group 4 scores on knowledge of cultural groups. Group 4 participants have some knowledge of various cultures and ethnicities, but they choose not to use it to further the understanding of other groups. It should also be noted that while Group 4 scores exceeded those of Group 3, they were below the scores of Group 1 and Group 2.
My knowledge of cultural issues is somewhat limited.

Too much attention has been directed toward multicultural or minority issues.

Your are in Group 3

You are in Group 4

participants.

At the two-cluster solution the higher scoring group contained 433 respondents. These respondents tended to perceive diversity issues as related to societal causes. The lower scoring of the two groups contained 335 respondents. These respondents perceive diversity issues from the individual perspective. The discriminate analysis conducted at this two-cluster stage revealed that knowledge separated these two groups. At the four-cluster stage of the cluster analysis two separate two-group discriminate analyses were performed. The discriminate analysis conducted with the two
groups that comprised the higher scoring cluster at the two-cluster stage revealed that attitude separated the two higher scoring groups. Of the two higher scoring groups, the higher of the two contained 197 respondents and the lower scoring group contained 236 respondents from the Department of Human Services sample. Both groups were aware and knowledgeable regarding cultural diversity in society. However, all four of the items in the structure matrix for the discriminant analysis which described the process that separated these groups were from the Awareness factor of the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale. Thus, it is their attitudes toward diversity issues that separate them.

The discriminant analysis conducted with the two groups that comprised the lower-scoring cluster at the two-cluster stage revealed that both attitudes and knowledge separated the groups. Of the two lower scoring groups, the higher scoring group contained 158 respondents and the lower scoring group contained 177 respondents. Of the nine items in the structure matrix above .3, five dealt with attitudes and four dealt with knowledge or cognition. Six items were from the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale, and three were from the Quick Discrimination Index. The group that scored higher acknowledged a lack of
knowledge related to cultural diversity while the lower scoring group had knowledge regarding cultural issues, its members chose not to support cultural diversity.

Cultural appreciation can be identified by exploring the concepts of knowledge and awareness.

Awareness and knowledge are two components of cultural competence (Ponterotto et al., 1994, p. 17). Awareness is concerned with one's own cultural socialization and accompanying predispositions. Knowledge has to do with the learner's knowledge of the worldviews and value patterns of culturally diverse people. These two components interact to create four distinct groups in terms of the appreciation of cultural diversity.

For the Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning instrument, each of the four groups was given a name that would not reflect any type of bias toward the group. The method for naming the groups was patterned after the work of Sternberg with intelligence. Sternberg has characterized adult intelligence into three groups of learners who possess three different types of intelligence: Alice-Type Learners, Barbara-Type Learners, and Celia-Type Learners (Sternberg, 1990, pp. 3-11). The naming of these intelligence types not only personalized each type of learner but also served to further illustrate the triarchic theory of intelligence. The
first letter of the name of each group can be associated with the type of grades each group received in traditional schools. Further, giving names to the inanimate intelligence types served to remove any dehumanizing effects that may possibly occur as a result of placing people into groups according to their characteristics.

In a similar fashion as used by Sternberg, the four distinct groups identified in Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning were given non-gender-specific names to thwart personalizing any characteristics of each group that could be associated with gender. The four names selected for each group are (a) Group 1-Chris; (b) Group 2-Alex; (c) Group 3-Lee; and (d) Group 4-Lynn. The first initials of each group combine to form the word CALL. In addition, Group 3 and Group 4 have the mnemonic characteristic of having the same number of letters in the name as the number of the group. The following descriptors are given for each group in the Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning booklet. Each description is based upon the items from the structure matrix that was used to form the groups.

Chris: Those in this group enthusiastically embrace cultural diversity. They feel that societal forces are firmly established that are often repressive to culturally diverse groups. They are very familiar with the impact and operations of oppression and realize that racial discrimination is deeply rooted in society. They understand the role culture has played in the
development of an identity and worldview of those in culturally diverse groups.

Alex: Those in this group appreciate cultural diversity. They feel that societal forces have greatly impacted and have limited opportunities for culturally diverse groups. They understand the role culture has played in the development of an identity and worldview of those in culturally diverse groups but believe that culturally diverse groups can benefit from assuming some mainstream traditional values.

Lee: Those in this group do not eagerly embrace cultural diversity. They believe that the individual rather than societal forces is the major factor influencing a person's social situation. They do not believe that forces such as oppression and racism are deeply rooted in society and are not aware of many institutional barriers that restrict minority groups. They accept mainstream traditional values. They acknowledge that they have very little knowledge of ways for various ethnic groups to adopt the cultural traits of other groups, but they are aware that being born a minority in this society brings with it far more challenges than faced by White people.

Lynn: Those in this group are opposed to cultural diversity. They strongly believe that the individual rather than societal forces is the major factor influencing a person's social situation. They do not believe that forces such as oppression and racism are deeply rooted in society, and they feel that far too much attention has been directed toward multicultural or minority issues in society. They are somewhat aware that being born a minority in this society brings with it more challenges than faced by White people and have some knowledge of ways for various ethnic groups to adopt the cultural traits of other groups. Despite this awareness and knowledge, they reject concepts related to cultural diversity and firmly believe that people should marry within their own race.

Within the four groups there is clear distinction as each
group demonstrates varying degrees of knowledge and awareness regarding cultural appreciation. Attitude may also have an impact on how the degree of cultural appreciation may be acted upon. Those in the Lee group for example who may be lacking in knowledge of cultural issues may have an attitude that causes them to be open to developing greater cultural appreciation. While possessing some knowledge about ethnicity and culture appear, those in the Lynn group do not recognize the value of enhancing their degree of cultural appreciation.

The Assessing The Learning Strategies of Adults (ATLAS) model worked in the development of the Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL) instrument.

The flow-chart format is an effective style for organizing a user-friendly instrument that can be completed quickly.

The Assessing The Learning Strategies of Adults (ATLAS) instrument was developed in response to the need for an easily administered tool that could be completed quickly and that could be readily implemented by learners and facilitators (Conti & Kolody, 1999, p. 16). ATLAS uses a flow-chart design. Elements are printed on colored cards. Sentence roots appear in the top box on the page. Each root or stem leads to choices in other boxes that complete the thought for that element and leads the learner to the next card or presents information about the learners placement in
the correct group. Since it's development, this instrument has been used in numerous research studies (e.g., James, 2000; Ghost Bear, 2001; Willyard, 2001) and presentations. It's applicability is demonstrated by the fact that over 90% of those who are asked agree that it accurately describes them (Ghost Bear, 2001, p. 83).

The Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL) instrument was designed in an effort to have a tool to rapidly and easily assess cultural appreciation levels in adults. By incorporating The Assessing The Learning Strategies of Adults (ATLAS) model, CALL was designed in the flow-chart style. Like ATLAS, each card is a different color representing a particular stage of the instrument. Everyone begins on the first card with one sentence stem which leads the respondent to two options to complete the sentence. This process concludes when the respondents choose the option that places them in the correct group according to their degree of cultural appreciation. The flow-chart design is simple. It is easily manageable and frees the respondent from having to use writing implements.

The procedure used to design The Assessing The Learning Strategies of Adults (ATLAS) instrument is an effective procedure to develop other instruments.

The Assessing The Learning Strategies of Adults (ATLAS)
instrument used a combination of innovative procedures to
develop an instrument that identified groups of people and
which could be completed quickly. Then procedures involved
(a) using an existing set of items for the initial pool of
items from which to develop the new instrument, (b) using
cluster analysis to identify the groups that existed based
upon responses to the items in the pool, (c) using
discriminant analysis with the pool of items and the cluster
groups to determine the process that separates the groups at
each relevant stage of the cluster analysis, (d) using the
structure matrix from the discriminant analysis to guide the
writing of one precise item that would correctly identify
placement in each group, and (e) field testing the new
instrument with practitioners to assess its applicability
and usefulness. The items from this procedure were then
arranged into a colorful booklet and posted on a website for
general use.

This same procedure was used to develop Cultural
Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL). CALL is used to
facilitate correct placement in groups formed by the
Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale and
the Quick Discrimination Index. The responses from
practitioners in the Department of Human Services were used
to conduct the cluster analysis to uncover the groups with
varying levels of cultural appreciation. The use of discriminant analysis allowed for identifying the processes that separated these groups and provided the structure matrix of items for writing the precise item for identifying placement in the group. Field testing with practitioners provided clarity and feedback on these items. Finally, the items were organized into a booklet that could easily be administered, and a website was created for the instrument (http://members.aol.com/atlasgroups/call.htm). Thus, the format and process for creating ATLAS was also very effective for creating CALL. This overall process is currently being used to create a similar instrument for identifying educational philosophy. Philosophy Held by Instructors of Lifelong Learners (PHIL) facilitates placement of learners in correct educational philosophy groups formed by The Philosophy of Adult Education Inventory (http://members.aol.com/atlasgroups/phil.htm).

Cultural appreciation is the interaction of the knowledge and awareness components of cultural competence.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1994) described cultural competence as being comprised of a set of academic and interpersonal skills. The American Psychological Association streamlined this definition by referring to the academic and interpersonal skills as the
components of knowledge and awareness. Ponterotto identified these same components as factors in the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale and the Quick Discrimination Index.

Cultural appreciation is made up of knowledge and awareness. Multivariate analysis was used to examine the interaction between knowledge and awareness. This analysis confirmed knowledge as a component of cultural appreciation. This can be seen by examination of the items at the two-group solution which supports the first factor of both the Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale and the Quick Discrimination Index. Furthermore, cultural appreciation has an attitudinal aspect. It is the attitude component of cultural appreciation that separates the Chris and Alex groups. Additionally, attitude plays a role in separating the Lee and Lynn groups. Thus, cultural competence is comprised of knowledge and awareness. Cultural appreciation is how these components interact to form four distinct groups. These distinct groups combine the two components differently to reveal different degrees of cultural appreciation. Thus, cultural appreciation is distinguishable from cultural awareness.
Recommendations

Too many children of color are in out-of-home placements given their percentages in the general population. Valuing cultural diversity training has been available for social workers and other helping professionals for more than 20 years, yet there is still an over-representation of children of color being removed from their homes. Situations such as this show a need for training related to cultural appreciation.

In the past, training in cultural appreciation has been hampered by the lack of a means to quickly and easily assess the degree of cultural appreciation in learners before they are placed in diversity training settings. With Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL), there is now a means to assess the degree of cultural appreciation in adult learners prior to beginning diversity training. Therefore, this instrument can be used in both practice, and research.

Practice

People have unique ways of learning. People can change. Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL) should be used to identify where people are with regard to cultural appreciation. Training sessions for cultural appreciation should stimulate discussions within and between the groups to get participants reflecting about how they arrived at
their current attitudinal positions. The facilitator has a responsibility here to be aware of and discourage what is known as Groupthink. Groupthink is a phenomenon that may occur when any cohesive groups are formed. This phenomenon is "a mindset that takes over when the desire for agreement in a group overrides the ability of the group to accurately assess a problem and consider a full range of decision options" (Bloom, 2000, p. 66). In this case the challenge for the facilitator would be to promote constructive discussion regarding group placement via CALL which avoiding the Groupthink phenomenon. While groupthink may present a challenge in group settings, it serves to shoulder the responsibility for particular characteristics of participants placed into a group by an instrument such as CALL.

When creating an instrument that places participants in groups, a lesson from Adult Education is appropriately implemented. An example of one such lesson is found in the principles of effective adult facilitation (Brookfield, 1986, p. 11). One of the principle tenants of effective facilitation is mutual respect (pp. 12-13). This mutual respect occurs when "participants feel that they are valued as separate, unique individuals deserving of respect" (p. 13). Adults need to know that they are "free to challenge
one another and can feel comfortable with being challenged" (p. 14). While their ideas may be discussed or even attacked, it is vital for adult participants to relax in the security of knowing they will not be attacked personally. It is impossible to separate one's professional, work-related knowledge and skills from the rest of oneself (Marsick, 1990, p. 24).

Social services are an area that requires cultural appreciation because of working with diverse populations. Therefore, the Chris group is the desired behavior model for which social services providers should be striving. Social Cognitive Theory, which was formerly called Social Learning Theory and which was developed by Bandura in the early 1960's, suggests that behavior changes can be facilitated through observation.

Learning would be exceedingly laborious, not to mention hazardous if people had to rely solely on the effects of their own actions to inform them what to do. Fortunately, most human behavior is learned observationally through modeling: from observing others one forms an idea of how new behaviors are performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for action. (Bandura, 1977, p. 22)

The effectiveness of this modeling depends on the characteristics of the model. In other words, the message is best received when the messenger holds the same values and beliefs as those contained in the message. If the social
services worker has a mentor who embraces cultural appreciation, then the mentor would be seen by the social services worker as authentic and thus more credible.

Training should be designed to meet the need of the group. Before the Lee and Lynn groups can benefit from mentoring, they must first be provided knowledge. Thus, knowledge-oriented training activities should be planned for the Lee and Lynn groups. The dissemination of knowledge can start using techniques such as lecture, readings, and video tapes. As knowledge is presented to the Lee and Lynn groups, it should be related to cultural ways, diversity, and the role of culture in social services. Furthermore, it should address current events related to culture and the way cultures have been oppressed and eliminated by the dominant culture. Additionally, exemplars from the Chris group can model the desired behavior through experience-based storytelling activities using case studies and role-play exercisers. The exemplars can use their experiences to provide knowledge related to what the impact of the oppression and elimination of cultures has been and how family structures have been destroyed as a result of cultural oppression and elimination. Exemplar panel discussions can also enrich this dissemination of knowledge. Exemplar panelists can model the desired behavior during the
fielding of questions from participants. Small group discussions can be facilitated by placing one or two exemplars within each group. This could provide a safe environment for Lee and Lynn group participants to share their own experiences and obtain clarification related to appropriate interaction with diverse populations.

Those in the Alex group already have a higher level of knowledge related to cultural diversity, and they differ from the exemplar Chris group only in attitudes. Therefore, the Alex group could benefit from learning activities related to how meaning schemes are developed and to the examination of their personal meaning schemes or worldview and how their meaning schemes impact interactions with diverse populations. The role of the exemplars would be to share their meaning schemes, describe their experiences with diverse populations, and show how their meaning schemes facilitated quality service provision to the family. Exemplar panels can be used to field questions and provide clarification. Exemplars and Alex participants can engage in role-play activities to allow Alex participants to practice the desired behavior following the re-evaluation of their meaning schemes.

Thus, the Chris group exemplars can function in social services training as teachers in this learning process.
Their experiences can be used to facilitate the training activities of the other group participants. The interaction by the exemplars with participants through sharing of their own knowledge, experiences, and meaning schemes can stimulate their reflection by providing new insights and new experiences. The training activities recommended utilize the adult learning principles of participation, self-direction, giving meaning to experience, real-life learning, and lifelong learning.

Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning can be used by those conducting the training as well as by those receiving training. In this way, it can be utilized to raise the educator’s awareness regarding the personal degree of cultural appreciation. The educator may as a result of using the instrument begin to reflect inwardly. This could lead to an examination of personal worldviews, which in turn could lead to an opportunity for a perspective transformation. Such opportunities involve learning through making meaning.

To make meaning means to make sense of an experience; to make an interpretation of it. When this interpretation is subsequently used to guide decision making or action, then making meaning becomes learning. People learn differently when they are learning to perform than when
they are learning to understand what is being communicated to them. Reflection enables learners to correct distortions in their beliefs and errors in problem solving. Critical reflection involves a critique of the presuppositions on which adult beliefs have been built (Mezirow, 1990, p. 1).

Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL) can also be used to stimulate a plethora of discussions around how those that are exemplary in a particular area became that way. This would include people such as former President Jimmy Carter, Martin Luther King Jr., Samuel Clemens, Harriet Tubman, and Marva Collins. Exploration as to what the common denominator is among those distinguished in a certain area can occur. It is through dialogue that adults attempt to understand and to learn what is valid in the assertions made by others and attempt to achieve consensual validation for our own assertions (Mezirow, 1990, p. 354).

The Oklahoma State Department of Human Services (DHS) should include Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL) in the initial academy activities of the Social Services and Child Welfare Specialists training. It should also be included in the supervisor and County Director training academies upon promotion to these positions. CALL should be incorporated in to the DHS Leadership Institute as well as the Certified Public Managers Program. CALL should
be used to stimulate thinking and dialogue on the issue of cultural diversity in social services provision, the attitudes of the workers, managers, and administrators and how these attitudes impact the quality of the services being provided. Regardless of group placement, everyone has the potential to grow in cultural appreciation. Dialogue should be encouraged as to how that growth can be cultivated.

It is also recommended that the Commission on Human Services and the Oklahoma Commission on Children and Youth be made aware of and administered Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL). This would be a probing means to stimulate examination and discussion as to what relationship valuing cultural and ethnic diversity has to the Department of Human Services (DHS) mission. From there, further exploration should occur to determine how diversity and the DHS' mission relate to the personnel as well as to the various commissions charged with oversight of that mission.

Research

Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL) is the result of a product-oriented study. It was developed with adult participants from the United States. CALL warrants further study to find out if it is applicable in international arenas. Research should be conducted to determine how social services workers are prepared to work
with the general population outside of the United States and how ethnic diversity is addressed during that preparation.

Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL) was developed to promote consciousness raising among those charged with providing services to people and their families. Providing learners with the consciousness-raising opportunities can lead to perspective transformation. Studies should be conducted to explore consciousness raising related to cultural appreciation and how it relates to perspective transformation. This sort of inquiry should also address whether people can or have the desire to change.

Inquiry is warranted as a result of this study to determine how adult educators might cultivate the desire to change within learners. There are various characteristics that make one learner more amenable to change than another. The attitude of the learner needs to be studied to determine its' role in amenability to change. Additionally, the origin of people's attitudes toward various cultures and ethnicities is worthy of study. Research should examine and seek to determine not only where attitudes come from, but whether or not they are fixed.

Finally, further study is warranted to generate alternatives for how the Chris, Alex, Lee and Lynn groups may interact with each other to collectively enhance their
cultural appreciation. This study should include discussion regarding what role the facilitator plays in stimulating such interaction. Such research should also explore the attitudinal posture of the facilitator and how it would impact interaction between the groups.

The Oklahoma State Department of Human Services (DHS) should include Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL) in the initial academy activities of the Social Services and Child Welfare Specialists training. It should also be included in the supervisor and County Director training academies upon promotion to these positions. CALL should be incorporated in to the DHS Leadership Institute as well as the Certified Public Managers Program. CALL should be used to stimulate thinking and dialogue on the issue of cultural diversity in social services provision, the attitudes of the workers, managers, and administrators and how these attitudes impact the quality of the services being provided. Regardless of group placement, everyone has the potential to grow in cultural appreciation. Dialogue should be encouraged as to how that growth can be cultivated.

It is also recommended that the Commission on Human Services and the Oklahoma Commission on Children and Youth be made aware of and administered Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning (CALL). This would be a probing means to
stimulate examination and discussion as to what relationship valuing cultural and ethnic diversity has to the Department of Human Services (DHS) mission. From there, further exploration should occur to determine how diversity and the DHS' mission relate to the personnel as well as to the various commissions charged with oversight of that mission.

Commencement

Cultural appreciation refers to the interaction of the cultural-competency components of knowledge and awareness within each individual. While people may vary in their degree of cultural appreciation, those in the social service profession tend to form four distinct groups. The Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning instrument identifies placement in one of these groups and provides a general description of cultural appreciation for this group. It should be noted that such naming of the group can be valuable when it is used to focus on enhancing understanding, discussion, and reflective thought regarding the learner; however, it can be hurtful and deleterious if utilized to bypass critical thinking about the learners (Conti & Kolody, 1998, p. 137).

One's level of cultural appreciation is a personal choice based on a person's actions and attitudes related to knowledge and awareness concerning cultural diversity. In a
democratic society, people may privately practice any level of cultural appreciation which they choose. However, in the public arena and especially in the workforce, various contextual situations require different minimum levels of cultural appreciation. The field of social work requires a high level of cultural appreciation because of the nature of the profession and the makeup of the clientele. In the helping professions, this high level is needed for the efficient delivery of social services. This level of cultural appreciation can be achieved through self-awareness and learning based on increased knowledge related to cultural diversity and on attitudinal changes concerning multicultural issues. The Cultural Appreciation in Lifelong Learning instrument can be used as an initial device to raise this awareness and to identify the type of education that is needed.

The study of relationships and diverse cultures has been examined in many disciplines including television. Gene Roddenbury experimented with cultural appreciation when his hit show Star Trek presented the first interracial kiss on American Television back in the 1960's. A primary premise of that show was an examination of culturally diverse relationships among the crew of the Enterprise as well as their interactions with new life forms. As their mission was
"to seek out new life and new civilizations" and to go
"where no man has gone before" adult educators and learners
should continue to engage in such research activities that
promote growth in becoming more appreciative of each others
differences in culture and ethnicity. A continuing mission
should be embarked upon to embrace opportunities to extend
the study of cultural appreciation from this point forward.
Human beings grow richer from gaining insight about
themselves. People grow better when they are open to learn
about and appreciate each other. As Captain Jean Luc Picard,
captain of a later version of the Enterprise oft said, "Make
it so."
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