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Abstract

To account for and adjust to the diversifying communities in the United States, CACREP, the ACA, and AMCD are making strides to increase counselor competence. Their efforts have involved incorporating standards that govern counselor training and practice to ensure counselors’ development of multicultural competence. In recent literature, researchers have proposed cultural humility development to further enhance the development of counselor cultural awareness and sensitivity, however there are minimal studies exploring the relationship between current multicultural training practices and the development of cultural humility characteristics of counselor trainees’ in CACREP-accredited counselor education programs. The current study has two primary aims: (1) to review the literature on multicultural practices that specifically focus on developing counselor trainees’ cultural humility, (2) to explore the relationship between multicultural training, broaching behaviors, and development of counselor trainees’ cultural humility using a survey design study, and (3) to explore the relationship between experiencing culturally missed opportunities and cultural humility development in counselor education programs. A correlational research design using latent variable modeling will explore relationships between cultural humility development and the current training practices of counselor trainees within counselor education. Anticipated findings of this study are (1) there will be a positive relationship between current multicultural training practices and counselor trainees’ development of cultural humility; (2) there will be a positive association between broaching behaviors and counselor
trainees’ development of cultural humility and (3) culturally missed opportunities will have a mediating effect on multicultural training practices, broaching behaviors, and cultural humility development. Lastly, implications of these anticipated findings within CACREP-accredited counselor education programs and the counseling profession will be highlighted.
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Chapter One: Introduction

In the counseling profession, the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP), the American Counseling Association (ACA), and the Association of Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD) have made efforts to ensure the development of counselor multicultural competencies (ACA, 2014; CACREP, 2016; Ratts et al., 2015, 2016). Multicultural training is defined as the practice of developing cultural awareness, knowledge, and skills which can be integrated into counseling practice to attend to the intersectional identities of diverse clients (Arredondo et al., 1996; Ratts et al., 2015). In an effort to incorporate these practices within counseling programs and the counseling field, CACREP, ACA, and the AMCD have developed professional standards and cultural competencies that require counselors to develop, exhibit, and maintain cultural competence and require counselor education programs to incorporate multicultural training within program curriculum (ACA, 2014; CACREP, 2016; MSJCC, 2015).

Particularly within CACREP-accredited program curriculum, CACREP standard 2.f highlights eight areas of knowledge development that should be the focus of core curriculum within these programs (CACREP, 2016). One subcomponent of this standard focuses solely on social and diversity development (see 2.f.2), and six others explicitly incorporate the use of ethically and culturally relevant strategies to develop counselor knowledge in those areas (see 2.f.3 - 2.f.8; CACREP, 2016). ACA acknowledges the
importance of MCC throughout the code of ethics, however, there are only two specific ethical codes related to incorporating multicultural training into counselor training (see F.7.c, F.11.c; ACA, 2014). Despite the intention of these standards to foster cultural development, there are concerns about the effectiveness of current multicultural training practices under these guidelines (Ancis & Rasheed, 2005; Mosher et al., 2017; Pieterse et al., 2009; Sue et al., 2009). One critique with current multicultural training is that it poses an increased risk of creating an environment in which clinicians may “prioritize observable or performative behaviors and impression management, rather than revealing blind spots and imperfections, which is crucial to cultural learning and growth” (Zhu et al, 2021, p. 74). Another critique pertains to how current multicultural training supports social justice advocacy, noting that current practices “lack a transformative social justice agenda with assumptions that tend to ignore power relations and structural inequities” (Abe, 2020, p. 696).

Thus, AMCD, a division within ACA, acknowledged the shortcomings within the current standards, and developed the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (MSJCC; Ratts et al., 2016). The MSJCC is a framework developed to highlight the importance of multiculturalism and social justice within the counseling profession and across counseling processes (with accreditation, education, training, supervision, and clinically), and to provide clearer guidelines on how to incorporate multicultural and social justice constructs into the counseling process (Ratts et al., 2016). These competencies promote recognizing the impact that diversity and multiculturalism
has on the counseling process and therapeutic relationship. This involves acknowledging the impact that oppressive practices and other societal factors have on the mental health and well-being of individuals and acknowledging the intersectionality of individuals’ identities in the context of society and in counseling (Ratts et al., 2016). Furthermore, the MSJCC acknowledge that multicultural and social justice advocacy development require continuous learning, which also involves practicing cultural humility (Ratts et al., 2016). Similar to the MSJCC, Hook et al. (2016) proposed that focusing on counselors’ characteristics or their multicultural orientation in training can produce more culturally sensitive and effective clinicians, however counselor characteristics are often not the focus in multicultural training (Lee, 2011). Davis et al. (2018) also proposed that by focusing on counselor’s multicultural orientation it allows for counselors to develop a cultural lens from which to conceptualize client concerns and counselor-client interactions.

**Problem Statement**

Writing standards and ethical codes that acknowledge the need to implement multicultural training in counseling programs without a concrete focus or clear strategies reflects the bare minimum efforts to implement multicultural training in counselor education programs. For example, CACREP acknowledges the autonomy given to programs in how they implement the core competencies required for accreditation and on what they deem to be of most importance, stating that “at minimum, programs must address all required content, but they may choose the level of emphasis placed on each content area” (CACREP, 2016). The ambiguity surrounding the implementation of core competencies proves problematic as most programs currently implement one
multicultural course throughout the entirety of a program; and display discrepancies in what the course syllabi reflects and what transpires through teaching in the classroom setting (Pieterse et al., 2009). For example, in a review of syllabi from multicultural counseling courses in CACREP-accredited counselor education programs, Pieterse and colleagues identified discrepancies between course objectives which aligned with CACREP standards and what occurred in the classroom (Pieterse et al., 2009). Researchers also noted the lack of attention given to developing skills that would prepare counselor trainees how to adapt counseling interventions in a multiculturally appropriate way (Pieterse et al., 2009). Additional discrepancies in course syllabi were also reflected in learning assessments, noting that although majority of assignments focused on self-awareness development and some cultural exposure, less than 2% of the assessments evaluated students’ cultural sensitivity development (Pieterse et al., 2009). Furthermore, Gonzalez-Voller et al. (2020) found that while counselor trainees experienced an increase in cultural competence development in their first year of their program, that increase plateaued by the end of their program. This is problematic because it raises concerns about the effectiveness of multicultural training practices to sustain cultural development of counselor trainees.

Furthermore, Owen et al. (2016) identified a negative relationship between missing opportunities to discuss cultural content, therapist cultural humility and treatment outcomes. Knox and colleagues (2003) identified that White clinicians reported experiencing discomfort in addressing race or race-related topics which they associated with having inadequate training on how to effectively address these topics. They also noted that race or race-related topics were not being prioritized within their training.
Furthermore, marginalized populations continue to have detrimental experiences, such as experiencing microaggressions in a counseling setting, which has been attributed to negative counseling processes occurring within the counseling setting (Hook et al., 2016).

Counselor education programs have created opportunities for exposure to multicultural curriculum which is important to counselor trainee development, and the therapy process, yet it alone is not sufficient to produce culturally responsive and sensitive counselors (D’Andrea & Daniels, 1991). Therefore, this study strives to advance multicultural training research in counselor education by exploring the relationship between multicultural training practices and the development of counselor trainees’ multicultural orientation components, specifically cultural humility. Counselor multicultural orientation refers to a framework which was developed to create a cultural lens in which the focus is on the way clinicians are with clients versus the way clinicians do things in therapy (Davis et al., 2018; Owen, 2013). Multicultural orientation (MCO) is a framework, complementary to MCC, comprised of three components: (a) cultural humility, (b) cultural comfort, and (c) cultural opportunity (Davis et al., 2018; Hook et al., 2013; Owen, 2013). MCO explores the intersection between counselor and client cultural characteristics, as well as explores the role and impact of culture on the counseling process (Owen et al., 2011; Owen, 2013). In counselor education, MCO has been studied in the context of exploring client perceptions of their clinicians’ MCO (Hook et al., 2016; Owen et al., 2016) and in supervision (Hook et al., 2016), however, it has not been studied in the context of counselor training within CACREP-accredited programs.
Significance of the Study

Social Significance

Examining the components and effectiveness of multicultural training practices in counselor education is socially significant for many reasons. First, the underutilization of mental health services is a prominent issue amongst marginalized communities (Fripp & Carlson, 2017; MHA 2021). Factors contributing to the underutilization of services in these communities are rooted in oppressive sociopolitical practices (Hook et al., 2016; Moon & Sandage, 2019; Ratts et al., 2016) from which the counseling environment is not remiss. By examining multicultural training practices, it can highlight areas that can become the focus of training to reduce the barriers that perpetuate the underutilization of mental health services in marginalized communities, such as mental health stigma and cultural mistrust. Furthermore, Ratts (2009) discussed the need to increase the visibility of social justice advocacy; to improve counselors’ awareness of the role of oppressive practices on mental health and in counseling environments; and to clarify counselor roles pertaining to being actively engaged in social justice advocacy, which has also been outlined in the MSJCC (Ratts et al., 2016). One objective of multicultural training is to increase awareness around all these components. Thus, by identifying and examining multicultural training practices in Study 1 and Study 2, it may be possible to identify what practices are being implemented that inform social justice advocacy practices in counselor education, and again highlight where growth areas exist in multicultural training practices so counselors can be better prepared to engage in social justice advocacy.
Furthermore, research indicates that counselors may be ill-prepared to address cultural diversities in the counseling space. White counselors, specifically, report having more discomfort when addressing race and race-related topics within a clinical setting, which they have attributed to their training (Knox et al., 2003). Day-Vines and colleagues (2022) found similar results when examining broaching attitudes and behaviors amongst school counselors, clinical mental health counselors, and counselor trainees. Thus, by exploring the impact of not broaching racial topics in a classroom setting, Study 2 can create further opportunity to see how broaching culturally relevant topics in the classroom then translates in the context of the therapeutic relationship (i.e., by assessing how clients perceive counselor trainees’ levels of CH during practicum and internship). Study 2 may also provide information that can lead to future studies that contribute to the literature on how developing cultural responsiveness and cultural humility can impact the therapeutic outcomes of marginalized populations.

**Professional Significance**

As the counseling field continues to engage in efforts to improve counselor cultural awareness and sensitivity, Study 1 can serve to enhance knowledge development by providing insight into how current CACREP-accredited standards and practices align to develop counselor’s ways of being and not just doing. Furthermore, by assessing how current practices contribute to the development of counselor trainees’ cultural humility characteristics, Study 2 proves significant in identifying areas in which changes can occur to strengthen and tailor the focus of multicultural training that counselor trainees receive to increase their cultural responsiveness and cultural sensitivity when interacting with diverse individuals. Furthermore, research has assessed the effects of cultural missed...
opportunities on an individual basis and within the therapeutic relationship between counselor and client (Owen et al., 2013), however, by preemptively exploring this concept within a classroom setting, it may be possible to highlight strategies to foster environments in which counselor educators and counselor trainees can develop strong working relationships. Lastly, both study 1 and study 2 may provide guidance to counselor educators on how to create safe environments to have productive conversations pertaining to race, ethnicity, and culture topics.

As Study 2 explores institutional characteristics, it may offer insight on institutional policies in Counselor Education to determine if similar practices to foster counselor trainee characteristics, including CH, are being implemented and modeled on an institutional level. This is important to furthering the counseling field because the policies, procedures, and practices of a program are influential to what is being modeled for counselor trainees, which may in turn affect the development of the culturally sensitive and culturally responsive practices learned by and modeled to counselor trainees. Furthermore, if findings indicate that, on an institutional level, there is a discrepancy in what is being done for counselor trainees and what is done institutionally, then information can be provided to help CACREP-accredited programs to determine trainings, policies, and procedures that could decrease this discrepancy. Lastly, both study 1 and study 2 can influence future multicultural and social justice competency standards, offering clarity to the established guidelines that govern the counseling profession.
Theoretical Foundation

As cultural humility has interpersonal, intrapersonal, and institutional components, and has been defined in a relational context, this study will be explored through a relational-cultural theoretical lens (Abe, 2020; Owen et al., 2016; Trevalon & Murray-Garcia, 1998). Relational-cultural theory is a multicultural and social justice focused approach which highlights the development of relationships through reciprocally empathic, authentic, and empowering efforts, that also strive to dismantle oppressive practices that impeded this reciprocity in cultural contexts (Comstock et al., 2008). As CH highlights the importance of taking an other-oriented stance within the therapeutic relationship (Hook et al., 2016), relational-cultural theory highlights the concept of connectedness in a cultural context to foster relationship building to promote the psychological and emotional well-being of the clients being served (Comstock et al., 2008). This is important to consider in an institutional context as well, so that counselor trainees are exposed to interactions that foster connection and empathy building experiences which then can foster characteristics of cultural humility. Furthermore, in attending to the institutional component of CH, it is appropriate to ground this study in relational-cultural theory as it advocates for increased awareness of oppressive practices in a cultural context and on a sociopolitical level so that counselors, and ultimately counselor trainees, can be more effective in how they build relationships that may impact potential clients on a micro- and macrolevel (Comstock et al., 2008).

Cultural Humility

Cultural humility (CH), a concept introduced by Trevalon and Murray-Garcia (1998), is a construct that has become of premier focus within counseling and related
disciplines as a mediating factor that contributes to positive therapeutic outcomes and therapeutic alliances between counselors and clients who identify with a diverse, underrepresented, and minoritized population (Hook et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2021). CH is an interpersonal and intrapersonal way of being that requires clinicians to engage in self-reflection, continuous learning, advocacy, and reform of oppressive practices by (1) embodying an other’s perspective and (2) engaging empathically with marginalized and underrepresented clients (Hook et al., 2013; Mosher et al., 2017; Trevalon & Murray-Garcia, 1998). Furthermore, Foronda and colleagues (2016) identified five characteristics that comprise CH including: (1) self-awareness, (2) openness, (3) egolessness, (4) supportive interaction, and (5) self-reflection and critique. Zhu and colleagues (2021) also elaborated on the characteristics of CH, suggesting that it is the display of authenticity and vulnerability, while also focusing on teachability of openness to learning and receiving feedback, using confrontation when necessary, displaying awareness in cultural encounters that allow for embracing discomfort, prioritizing relationships, and staying attentive to cultural dynamics. In determining the importance of cultural humility in the counseling relationship, Hook et al. (2013) conducted a study assessing client perception of clinicians’ cultural humility and noted that cultural humility was of more importance than the skills, knowledge, and experience of the counselor, all components of multicultural competence training (ACA, 2014; CACREP, 2016, Pieterse et al., 2016), further supporting the need to focus on counselor trainees’ development of cultural humility.

Although CH is a newer concept in counseling and counselor education, there is current research, albeit limited, on CH including its impact on counseling outcomes,
exploring attitudes and beliefs about CH in counselor education, on CH training models that can be used in counselor education, and the relationship between CH and supervision (Davis et al., 2016; Hook et al., 2013; Hook et al., 2016; Hook et al., 2016; Upshaw et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021; Zhu et al., 2021). Most of the current literature on CH has examined perceptions of CH on an individual or relational level (Zhang et al., 2021), “reducing cultural humility to a set of individual characteristics or interpersonal behaviors” (Abe, 2020, p. 698) highlighting the loss of an important component of the original context of CH, its institutionally oriented component (Abe, 2020; Trevalon & Murray-Garcia, 1998). Along with individual efforts to exhibit CH, Trevalon and Murray-Garcia (1998) expressed the importance of addressing CH across multiple levels, including an institutional component of CH. They suggested that institutions that strive to implement programming that influences the development of cultural competence should also model those same processes on an institutional level. To date, one conceptual study has been identified which discusses cultural humility practices in a multilevel and social justice focused context in social work (Abe, 2020), and one study exploring the use of experiential learning and reflective writing to develop cultural humility in undergraduate social work students has been identified as well (Sanchez et al., 2019). There are no studies exploring the effectiveness of developing CH characteristics of counselor trainees within CACREP-accredited counselor education programs.

**Cultural Opportunities, Culturally Missed Opportunities, and Broaching**

Owen (2013) stated that there are many opportunities to acknowledge, explore, and integrate culturally relevant topics in a therapeutic setting, yet they are often avoided. As counselor educators and counselor trainees acknowledge and engage in purposeful
and meaningful conversations pertaining to cultural identity and other culturally relevant topics (i.e., racism, oppressive practices, etc.) they are embracing cultural opportunities (Owen et al., 2016). The moments in which these opportunities are avoided or unacknowledged are defined as culturally missed opportunities (Owen et al., 2016). Owen and colleagues (2016) found that addressing cultural issues in a clinical setting may vary with each client and situation, however, it was important that clients perceived a level of willingness from their clinician to address cultural concerns if needed. Therefore, it is beneficial to ensure that counselor trainees feel prepared to explore these opportunities with clients when they arise, not only for the therapeutic alliance but the therapy process as well, which begins with witnessing and developing broaching behaviors (Owen et al., 2016).

Broaching is a behavior in which counselors or counselor educators exhibit the willingness and effort to discuss racial, ethnic, and cultural topics that are associated with client or counselor trainee’s cultural concerns (Day-Vines et al., 2021; Jones & Branco, 2020). There are four types of broaching behaviors including: (a) avoidant behaviors, (b) continuing/incongruent behaviors, (c) integrated/congruent behaviors, and (d) infusing behaviors (Day-Vines et al., 2013). Researchers conceptualize broaching as a skill needed to exhibit cultural humility and to increase receptiveness to cultural opportunities (Jones & Branco, 2020). When exhibiting cultural humility, counselor educators and counselor trainees are more likely to identify cultural opportunities, as well as implement broaching behaviors to address racial, ethnic, and cultural concerns as they arise (Jones & Branco, 2020).
Study Aims

Study 1 and Study 2 each have objectives that are discussed below. The aims for Study 1, *Developing Culturally Humble Counselors: A Systematic Review*, include:

(a) To provide a review of multicultural training literature which will be achieved through a literature review of multicultural training practices and models in counselor education.

(b) To conduct a systematic review of multicultural training practices in counselor education that focuses specifically on cultural humility development.

The aims for Study 2, *Examining the Relationship Between Multicultural Training Practices and Development of Counselor Trainees’ Cultural Humility*, include:

(c) To conduct a survey design to examine the relationship between multicultural training practices, cultural humility development, and cultural broaching behaviors.

(d) To advance multicultural training practices in CACREP-accredited counseling and related programs to foster cultural humility development of counselors and counselor trainees in counselor education.

Research Questions & Hypotheses

Below the research questions and hypotheses will be discussed where appropriate.

Study One

Study one is a systematic review identifying multicultural training practices focused on cultural humility development in counseling and counseling related fields.
The research question for study one is: How is cultural humility training implemented in counseling and counseling-related training programs?

**Study Two**

Study two is a survey design study driven by the following research question:

What is the relationship between current multicultural training practices, cultural broaching, and counselor trainees’ development of cultural humility characteristics within CACREP-accredited counselor education programs? We will also examine if missing cultural opportunities serves as a mediating factor between multicultural training, cultural broaching, and counselor trainees’ development of cultural humility. The hypothesized path model for this study is in Figure 1.1.

![Hypothesized Structural Model](image)

**Figure 1.1 Hypothesized Structural Model**

*Note:* The following abbreviations are as follows: multicultural training practices (MCT), broaching behaviors (BB), and culturally missed opportunities (CMO) has on cultural humility development (CHD).

**Hypotheses for Study Two**

We hypothesize that there will be a positive correlation between current multicultural training practices and the development of CH characteristics. The anticipated finding for this hypothesis is that multicultural training practices will have a
direct effect on the CH development of counselor trainees. We anticipate this outcome as current research on multicultural competence trainings suggests that counselor trainees’ experience some growth in their multicultural development within their first year of engaging in a program, yet this growth plateaus by the end of their program (Gonzalez-Voller et al., 2020).

We also hypothesize that counselor trainees who perceive that culturally relevant topics are broached in a classroom setting will indicate a greater rate of CH development than counselor trainees who do not. They will also indicate fewer missed opportunities to address culturally relevant topics. Owen et al. (2013) indicated that CH had moderating effects on cultural missed opportunities and noted that there was a negative and linear effect for clients who perceived their therapist as having lower cultural humility, and a positive effect for clients who perceived their therapist as having higher levels of cultural humility. Thus, the anticipated finding for this hypothesis is that there will be a positive association identified between counselor trainees’ who perceive that culturally relevant topics are being addressed within their counselor education program and CH development, and a negative effect for counselor trainees who perceive that culturally relevant topics are not addressed and CH development.

We hypothesize that counselor trainees who perceive that their counselor education programs foster the development of characteristics of CH will indicate a higher perception of exhibiting CH characteristics. Thus, the anticipated finding for this hypothesis is that counselor trainees will indicate a positive association between their counselor education program fostering cultural humility development and their level of CH characteristic exhibition, and counselor trainees who do not perceive that their
counselor education program fosters the development of CH characteristics will have a negative association between their perception of their counselor education program’s efforts and their perceived CH. A depiction of this hypothesis is found in Figure 1.2.

![Figure 1.2](image)

**Figure 1.2 Hypothesized Measurement Model with Error**

**Methodology**

**Study 1 Research Design**

Using a systematic review methodological approach, I will examine empirical studies that focus on the development of cultural humility characteristics in counseling and counseling-related programs. A systematic review approach is appropriate for this study as it allows for summarizing the available empirical literature on cultural humility development without bias (Aromataris & Pearson, 2014). Furthermore, unlike a general literature review, a systematic review allows for clear objectives to guide the review process to ensure only relevant studies pertaining to cultural humility development in
counseling and counseling-related programs are incorporated in the review (Aromataris & Pearson, 2014). Lastly, this approach allows for appraising the quality of the articles pertaining to the topic, thus ensure the relevance to the topic being explored as well. Specifically for this study, I will use the Mixed-Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) to appraise the quality of the reviewed articles and the process being used throughout the review process (Hong et al., 2018).

**Study 2 Research Design**

Utilizing a descriptive correlational survey research design using latent variable modeling, I will examine the relationship between multicultural training practices, broaching behaviors, and the development of counselor trainees’ cultural humility within counselor education. A descriptive correlational design is appropriate for this study because it allows for the identification of basic information pertaining to phenomena such as perceptions of cultural humility skill development and opportunities for cultural humility skill development in counselor education programs (Heppner et al, 2016). Also, as cultural humility has been defined as a characteristic of counselors (Hook et al, 2016), using a descriptive correlational research method would prove beneficial to gather descriptive information that may influence one’s level of cultural humility and cultural humility development. Furthermore, this research design allows for phenomena, such as cultural humility and cultural humility skill development, to be studied in its current state without manipulation (Dulock, 1993), therefore providing foundational information that can support future studies on these phenomena. Lastly, by using a descriptive correlational research design, it can highlight any differences or correlations amongst graduate level counselor trainees by surveying counselor trainees at different stages in
their counselor education program or across different counseling tracks (marriage and family counseling, school counseling, rehabilitation counseling, and clinical mental health counseling) (Dulock, 1993), creating an opportunity to identify if there are any differences in cultural humility development for trainees in different training years and programs of study.

Participants

I will use structural equation modeling (SEM) to evaluate the relationships within this study. SEM requires using a large sample to identify precise and significant effects of observed data however, determining the exact size of sample can be difficult (Kline, 2016; Wolf et al., 2013). When a sample size is too small, it can result in inaccurate parameter estimates and misconstrue the effects on the variables being studied (Kline, 2016; Lei & Wu, 2007). Thus, this can result in producing an inaccurate perspective of the relationship between the variables being studied (Kline, 2016). Researchers also indicate that there are multiple perspectives on determining an appropriate sample size for a study (Wolf et al., 2013). Researchers note that the suggested sample should have at least 200 participants, noting that a smaller sample size increases the risk of statistical error (Ding et al., 1995; Kline, 2016; Limberg et al., 2022; Wolf et al., 2013).

Furthermore, researchers suggest that sample size should be determined based on the participant to parameter ratio (Bentler & Chou, 1987; Kline, 2016; Lei & Wu, 2007). They suggest that a sample size ratio can range from five participants for every one parameter (5:1 ratio) up to 20 participants for every one parameter (20:1), however anything lower than 10:1 decreases the trustworthiness of the analysis (Kline, 2016). Therefore, following the 20:1 rationale for this study, we will aim to have at minimum
280 participants as this ratio provides the most conservative, and the largest sampling size based on a participant to parameter ratio. Furthermore, by using the largest sample size based on participant to parameter ration, we will be reducing the risk of statistical error that can occur when using (Bentler & Chou, 1987; Ding et al., 1995; Wolf et al., 2013).

**Procedures**

Participant requirement criteria includes master-level counselor education students currently enrolled in a CACREP-accredited counselor education program. Prior to conducting this study, I will seek approval from the university’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). Once approval from the university’s IRB has been granted, I will implement a purposive and snowball sampling method to recruit participants for this study. Recruitment of participants will occur via multiple forms of media, including counselor education listservs, counseling-focused social media groups (such as state counseling association social media groups), and direct emails to counselor education programs. Participants will be provided informed consent forms to participate in this study detailing the benefits, risks, and incentives associated with participating in this study. To foster participation in the study, participants will be offered a participatory incentive in the form of a $20 e-gift card upon completion of the study.

**Protection of Participant’s Rights**

Prior to conducting this study, I will seek approval from the university’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). Once approval from the university’s IRB has been granted, participation flyers will be distributed electronically through the previously identified recruitment means. Participants will be provided informed consent forms to participate in this study detailing the benefits, risks, and incentives associated with
participating in this study. Participants will be informed that they can withdraw from the study at any point via the informed consent as well. Lastly, in protecting participant’s rights, they will be informed that all data collected will remain confidential, and any identifying participant information will be de-identified.

**Instruments**

To obtain data, participants will take a series of surveys on the survey management website Qualtrics including a demographic survey, and adapted versions of (a) the Multidimensional Cultural Humility Scale (MCHS), (b) the Cultural Humility Scale (CHS), and (c) the Cultural Missed Opportunities Scale (CMO), and (d) the Broaching Attitudes and Behaviors Survey (BABS). As the MCHS, CHS, and CMO, have all been used in a clinical setting to assess client perceptions of their counselor’s cultural humility and the impact of culturally missed opportunities, they will need to be adapted to reflect counselor trainees’ perception of their counselor educator’s cultural humility, as well as to reflect the impact of culturally missed opportunities in an educational setting. Likewise, the BABS will be adapted to assess broaching behaviors in an educational setting as well.

**Demographic Survey.** Participants will complete a demographic survey (see Appendix C) that will identify participant characteristics (i.e. race, age, gender), their educational concentration (i.e. marriage and family, school, clinical mental health, and rehabilitation counseling), their multicultural training experiences (i.e. number of multicultural courses and type of multicultural curriculum (single course, integrated but not elaborated on, infused throughout course), composition of faculty diversity, and exposure to cultural-focused experiential activities. The demographic survey will provide
the indicating factors for the latent variable multicultural training practices (MCT) identified in the hypothesized model (See Figure 1.2).

Multidimensional Cultural Humility Scale. The questionnaire will also include an adapted version of the 15-item Multidimensional Cultural Humility Scale (MCHS; see Appendix D; Gonzalez et al., 2021), which is a five-factor self-assessment used to identify counselors’ perception of the cultural humility characteristics they exhibit (Gonzalez et al., 2021). The scale prompts counselors to note their position on the five characteristics of cultural humility denoted by Foronda et al., (2016) including: (1) openness, (2) self-awareness, (3) ego-less, (4) supportive interactions, and (5) self-reflection and critique. Example questions from the MCHS include “I am comfortable asking my clients about their cultural experience”, “I am known by my colleagues to seek consultation when working with diverse clients”, and “I evaluate my biases” (Gonzalez et al., 2021). The Cronbach’s alpha after an exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis, indicated internal consistency reliability at an overall score of 0.78 and 0.79 respectively (Gonzalez et al., 2021). To assess counselor trainees’ perception of these characteristics prior to participating in a counselor education program, the same questions assessed on the MCHS will be modified but added in addition to the original 15-items. Potential questions such as “Prior to being a counselor education student, I evaluated my biases”, “Prior to becoming a counselor education student, I sought to learn about the cultural background of others” will be added to assess this factor. This assessment will provide the indicating factors for the latent variable cultural humility development (CHD) in the hypothesized model (See Figure 1.2).
Cultural Humility Scale. Also, a modified version of the Cultural Humility Scale (CHS; see Appendix E; Hook et al., 2013) will be implemented to assess counselor trainees’ perception of cultural humility development in counselor education programs. This 12-item Likert scale with a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.93, supporting the measurement’s reliability, was developed to assess client perceptions of cultural humility of their clinicians (Hook et al., 2013). It assesses seven positive aspects of cultural humility as well as five negative aspects of cultural humility (Hook et al., 2013). Examples of statements on the CHS are “regarding the core aspect(s) of my cultural background, my counselor is open to explore” and “regarding the core aspect(s) of my cultural background, my counselor asks questions when he/she is uncertain” (Hook et al., 2013, pg. 366). Scale prompts will be adapted to reflect counselor trainees’ experience of cultural humility within their counselor education program. For example, the statement “regarding the core aspects of my cultural background, my counselor is open to explore” could be reworded as “regarding the core aspects of diverse cultural backgrounds, the counselor education curriculum encourages openness to explore cultural backgrounds”.

Furthermore, I will also incorporate questions to assess counselor trainees’ perceptions of cultural humility skill training in counselor education programs, and their perceptions of the importance of this construct in the field of counseling. This includes modifying the scale to include statements pertaining to perceptions of skill development experiences offered within counselor education. Example statements would include: (a) my counselor education program includes opportunities to engage with diverse communities, (b) my counselor education program has helped me develop advocacy skills, and (c) I have developed skills to assess policies that may negatively impact underrepresented
This assessment will also provide the indicating factors for the latent variable cultural humility development (CHD) in the hypothesized model (See Figure 1.2).

**Culturally Missed Opportunities Scale.** Participants will also take a modified version of the *Cultural Missed Opportunities Scale* (CMO; see Appendix F; Owen et al., 2016). The CMO is a short 4-item Likert scale, developed to assess client perceptions of counselors’ efforts to address topics related to their cultural background in session (Owen et al., 2016). This measure includes statements such as (1) “My therapist missed opportunities to discuss my cultural background”, (2) “I wish my therapist would have encouraged me to discuss my cultural background more”, (3) “My therapist avoided topics related to my cultural background”, and (4) “There were many chances to have deeper discussions about my cultural background that never happened” (Owen et al., 2016, pg. 33). The CMO measure has a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.86 supporting the reliability of the measure. As this measure assess and individual’s perspective, it would be modified to assess counselor trainees’ perception on an institutional level. Example of modified statements are: (1) “My professors missed opportunities to discuss my cultural background”, (2) “I wish my professors would have encouraged me to discuss my cultural background more”, (3) “My professors avoided topics related to my cultural background”, and (4) “There were many chances to have deeper discussions about my cultural background that never happened”. Statement four would remain the same. Each question of the CMO will be identified as the observed variables representing the latent variable culturally missed opportunities (CMO) in the hypothesized model (See Figure 1.2).

**Broaching Attitudes and Behaviors Survey.** Lastly, participants will complete a modified version of the *Broaching Attitudes and Behaviors Survey* (BABS; see Appendix
G; Day-Vines et al., 2013), a four-factor survey that examines the four types of broaching behaviors of counselors with their clients (Day-Vines et al., 2013). The BABS is a 20-item survey which uses a Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The scores for each subscale are independent of each other, thus the subscale with the highest score will be indicative of the type of broaching behavior one exhibits (Day-Vines, et al., 2013). The Cronbach alphas of each subscale are supportive of internal consistency, with values for each subscale as follows: (a) avoidant subscale is 0.88, (b) continuing/incongruent subscale is 0.88, (c) integrated/congruent subscale is 0.80, and (d) infusing subscale is 0.78. Day-Vines and colleagues (2013) also confirmed content validity of this scale by exploring the interfactor correlation between the subscales to ensure that each subscale was theoretically consistent with the expected measurable variables of the scale. This measure includes statements such as: (1) I believe the counselor should only broach racial and cultural factors when the client initiates such discussions, (2) I feel uncertain about my ability to broach cultural factors with clients of color, and (3) I generally broach racial and cultural factors throughout my counseling sessions with my clients. Examples of modified statements include: (1) I believe that my counselor educators only broach racial and cultural factors when the counselor trainees initiate such discussions, (2) Counselor educators in my program appear uncertain about broaching cultural factors with students of color, and (3) Counselor educators broach racial and cultural factors throughout our courses.

**Study 2 Data Analyses**

I will use structural equation modeling (SEM) to examine the relationships between current multicultural training practices, broaching behaviors, and development
of counselor trainees’ cultural humility. SEM is a six-step combination of statistical analyses that allows for multiple variables to be examined, and infers causal relationships between these variables (Kline, 2016; Ullman, 2006). This methodology is adequate for analyzing data in this study because it is a flexible model that “permits examination of complex associations, use of various types of data, and comparisons across alternative models” (Wolf et al., 2013, p. 914). SEM allows for examining the hypothesized effects of exogenous variables on endogenous variables, while controlling the effects of other variables on potential relationships between variables (Kline, 2016). There are two models utilized in SEM, a measurement model and a structural model (Crockett, 2012; Kline, 2016). Hypothesized relationships are denoted in a measurement model (See Figure 1.1) which depicts the hypothesized relationship between variables and does not indicate the direction of effects between variables (Crockett, 2012). The structural model is more specific in denoting the relationship between latent and observed variables and includes the estimated error of unexplained variance between latent variables (Crockett, 2012) (See Figure 1.2).

The variables in SEM are defined as latent or observed variables. Latent variables are defined as variables that are not directly observed but correspond with theoretical constructs that function on a continuum (Kline, 2016). In this study, the latent variables are cultural humility, broaching behaviors, multicultural training practices, and culturally missed opportunities. In SEM, factor variables have two or more indicators, thus in this study, the CH development factor has two indicators assessed by the MCHS and CHS assessments; the MCT factor has four indicators assessed by four demographic survey questions; the BB factor has four indicators assessed by the BABS; and the CMO factor
has four indicators assessed by the *CMO scale*. Analyses will be conducted to identify the strength of the relationship between counselor trainees’ perception of their CH development and the multicultural training practices of their CACREP-accredited programs, which will be measured using four questions on the demographic survey focused on programmatic multicultural training practices (see Appendix E). The hypothesized relationships between cultural humility development, culturally missed opportunities, broaching behaviors, and training experience of counselor trainees in CACREP-accredited counselor education programs is depicted in Figure 1.1. In Figure 1.2, circles will represent the factors or latent variables in the model, whereas the squares depict the indicator variables of the model (Ullman, 2006). The single-head arrows indicate a hypothesized relationship and direction of an effect between the variables, whereas the double-head arrows indicate a covariant relationship between variables that do not imply any direction for an effect (Ullman, 2006).

**Analysis**

Once data has been collected, both descriptive and inferential statistics will be assessed to examine the statistical significance of the hypothesized model identified in Figure 1.2. I will then determine the descriptive statistics of participants, including identifying the necessary frequencies based on participant demographic information (i.e., race, gender, training year, etc.). Furthermore, I will determine central tendency values, including mean, median, and mode to summarize the data (Johnson & Morgan, 2016). Also, variation values including standard deviation will be obtained to summarize how the sample data relates to the population (Johnson & Morgan, 2016). The analysis of the descriptive statistics of the study will be conducted using the statistical software, SPSS.
Next, I will evaluate the fit of the hypothesized model to the observed data using SEM. I will use Mplus, a statistical software that allows individuals to input different syntaxes to analyze the association between observed and latent variables (Kline, 2016). In evaluating the fit of the hypothesized model, first I will analyze the maximum likelihood value, which will be denoted by $\chi^2$. The maximum likelihood is an estimator that infers how likely the model parameters are to accurately producing the sample data (Kline, 2016). Next, I will analyze for model fit using a series of relative goodness of fit indices including: (a) the Tucker-Lewis index, (b) the Comparative Fit Index, (c) the Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and (d) the Standardized Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMR). These fit indices are called absolute fit indices and determine how well a model defines the observed data (Kline, 2016). As the minimum set of fit statistics requires including a model test statistic and at least three fit indices to determine model significance, finding the maximum likelihood and relative goodness of fit indices adheres to this requirement (Kline, 2016). Furthermore, I will identify the residual error of each parameter not accounted for within the model by calculating the residuals of each indicator in the model (depicted by the “e” in Figure 1.2; Kline, 2016; Limberg et al., 2021). Lastly, we will calculate the mediating effect of culturally missed opportunities on multicultural training and broaching behaviors by determining the indirect effects of each variable on the development of counselor trainees’ cultural humility. If there are no indirect effects, then it can be determined CMO has no mediating effect on CHD of counselor trainees, however, if direct effects are calculated, then it can be inferred that CMO does have a mediating effect on MCT and BB, thus impacting the CHD of counselor trainees.
Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following constructs are defined as:

(a) Multicultural training is defined as the educational process taken to develop counselor understanding of the intersection between: (a) diverse identities and sociopolitical and environmental factors; (b) multiculturalism and the counseling relationship; (c) oppressive systems and mental health and well-being; and (d) social justice advocacy and individual and community mental health and well-being (Ratts et al., 2016).

(b) Cultural humility is defined as the intra- and interpersonal orientation in which counselor trainees exhibit the following characteristics: self-awareness, community awareness, openness, egolessness, self-reflection and self-critique, and supportive interaction (Foronda et al., 2016; Trevalon-Murray, 1998).

(c) Cultural missed opportunities are defined as opportunities in which counselor educators miss the opportunity to integrate and explore race, ethnicity, and cultural topics or components of counselor trainees’ experiences into conversation (Owen, 2013; Owen, 2016).

(d) Broaching is defined as the ability to discuss and understand the relationship between race, ethnicity, and culture on counseling topics and client presenting concerns (Day-Vines et al., 2007).

Limitations

There are several limitations to using a correlational research design in this study. There are potential threats to construct validity, internal validity, and external validity (Limberg et al., 2021). First, if the constructs are not clearly defined and are not
supported theoretically and empirically, then the identified measures may not accurately reflect relationships between the constructs being studied (Limberg et al., 2021). Thus, it is important to clearly define the constructs being studied, as well as to ensure that the measures accurately measure the constructs being studied. This can be achieved by having an expert on the constructs review the measures and operational definitions of the constructs, as well as by conducting a confirmatory analysis to ensure the constructs are accurately being studied (Johnson & Morgan, 2016; Limberg et al., 2021).

Furthermore, threats to internal validity may occur if characteristics of the variables being studied are not accounted for by the constructs being studied, if participant answers are influenced by how they answer other items on measures, and if the measures used do not access the constructs being studied (Limberg et al., 2021). To reduce these threats, it is important to incorporate demographic information into the analyses of the data to account for any participant similarities and differences (Limberg et al., 2021). Furthermore, increasing construct validity by using expert reviewers and confirmatory factor analysis to ensure that constructs are adequately being defined and assessed by the instruments of the study can also reduce threats to internal validity.

Lastly, potential threats to external validity may be associated with participant drop out which impacts the generalizability of results across a population or the Hawthorne effect, in which participants may respond differently when completing the assessments of a study due to their perceptions around participating in a research study (Limberg et al., 2021). To reduce external validity, the study can be replicated with the same population at a different time.
Summary

In this chapter, we provided an overview of the study including discussing a brief introduction to the topic of multicultural education and cultural humility development training in Counselor Education. The rationale for why further research is warranted on this topic was also provided. Furthermore, operational definitions were provided to clearly delineate the constructs of the study. In continuation, an overview of the nature of the proposed study was discussed. Lastly, the potential significance and limitations of the study were also discussed. In subsequent chapters, we will provide a succinct literature review of the evolution of multiculturalism and multicultural education in counselor education (Chapter 2). We will also discuss a systematic review exploring multicultural training practices that foster cultural humility development in counseling and counseling-related programs, as well as identify training practices to consider when fostering counselor trainees’ cultural humility via a systematic review (Chapter 3). Lastly, we will discuss the results of a study examining the relationship between multicultural training practices, broaching, and cultural humility development of counselor trainees (Chapter 4).
Chapter Two: Literature Review

In the previous chapter, we discussed an overview of the purpose for both studies. The purpose of this chapter is to provide a comprehensive review of the literature on multiculturalism, multicultural education, and multicultural training practices in counselor education. We include the search strategy utilized to identify literature pertaining to multiculturalism and multicultural education and training in counseling. Subsequent sections will also include: (a) a review of the theoretical framework that supports multicultural training practices in counselor education and (b) an overall critique of the literature reviewed for both studies.

Search Strategy

The strategy used for this review began with identifying relevant terms that reflect the broader concept of multiculturalism, multicultural education and training. Criteria for the search included the following keywords: multicultural, multicultural education, multicultural training, counseling, and counselor education. An asterisk was used after multicultural (multicultural*) and counseling (couns*) to help with search specificity. Searches were conducted using the following databases: Google Scholar, PsychInfo, Academic Search Complete, APA PsychArticles, EBSCOhost and ERIC. Using PsychInfo, Academic Search Complete, APA PsychArticles, and ERIC, 1,599 articles were identified. After setting filter criteria to include only peer-reviewed articles and academic journals, 1,003 articles remained. Furthermore, we utilized a reverse citation approach to identify foundational articles of multicultural education from identified
articles from the initial search. Lastly, we identified additional literature by reviewing the curriculum vitae of Dr. James A. Banks, a pioneer in multicultural education.

**Evolution of Multicultural Education**

Multiculturalism is defined as the fourth force of counseling that focuses on fostering the development of more genuine and relational ways to work with diverse individuals (D’Andrea & Daniels, 1991). This multicultural movement was initiated in the counseling field to address the limitations posed by the universal approach to mental health care which failed to incorporate culturally sensitive counseling practices and dismantle oppressive systems like institutional racism (D’Andrea & Daniels, 1991; Robinson & Morris, 2000). This movement also forged the path to current approaches used in multicultural training in the counseling field.

Multicultural education has an extensive history dating back to the Civil Rights movement of the 1950s through the 1970s (Banks, 2013; Robinson & Morris, 2000) and has developed significantly over time. It is the progeny of ethnic education, which was developed in response to the Civil Rights Movement, and reflected Blacks goals to achieve equitable rights and treatment in a social, political, and educational context (Banks, 2013). Ethnic education focused on addressing the educational needs of individuals based on race and ethnicity, as researchers proposed that the educational inequities experienced by individuals from marginalized racial and ethnic groups is based primarily on race (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). This assumption was not to discredit the impact that other factors such as class and gender has on educational inequity, however, it was to acknowledge that when class and gender are controlled for, race has a greater impact on educational inequity (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). Furthermore,
ethnic education sought to incorporate Black cultural experiences in educational curriculum after the Brown v. Board of Education decision (Banks, 2013). As the first attempt to incorporate the Black experience within educational curriculum, researchers have perceived ethnic education as a quick fix to the lack of diversity within educational curriculum (Banks, 2013). This movement also involved incorporating historical and cultural figures that were less disruptive to societal norms, such as Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. versus Malcolm X or Stokely Carmichael, within course curriculum, while allowing marginalized individuals to still see representations of themselves in educational settings (Banks, 2013). A limitation to this approach, however, is that cultural information was not fully integrated into core curriculum in a way that would effect change in consciousness or praxis (Banks, 2013). Upon this realization, culturally focused educators developed the multiethnic approach to education.

The multiethnic educational approach was a more holistic approach in that it involved assessing the intersection between the academic environment (i.e., school policy, beliefs and attitudes of educators, community participation, etc.), academic achievement, and sociocultural factors of students (Banks, 2013). It is directly related to the ethnic education movement and focuses on building on the constructs of ethnic education (Banks, 1993; Banks, 2013). This approach acknowledges the importance of incorporating historical and cultural content within course curriculum and focuses on educational equality and increasing the academic achievement of diverse students (Banks, 2013). Ethnic and multiethnic educational practices were designed to address the educational needs of individuals marginalized by race and ethnicity (Banks, 2013),
however as other marginalized populations became more vocal, the multicultural field expanded yet again.

The final phase of multicultural education development occurred as other marginalized populations (i.e., based on gender, ability status, socioeconomic status, etc.) noted the lack of incorporation of their experiences in educational curriculum (Banks, 1993; Banks, 2013). The broader inclusion of the concerns of marginalized populations beyond race and ethnicity in educational curriculum became defined as multicultural education (Banks, 2013). Multicultural education involves creating theoretical frameworks, conducting research, and identifying practical strategies that intersect with race, gender, and class (Banks, 1993). There are three primary goals of multicultural education. First, multicultural education is theorized to create an equitable educational environment for racial, ethnic, and culturally diverse populations (Banks, 1993), which builds on the primary aim of ethnic studies. Secondly, multicultural education is designed to explore and understand the influence that the intersectionality of race, gender, and class has on education (Banks, 1993; Ratts et al., 2016). Lastly, multicultural education focuses on ensuring gender equality in relation to educational success and upward mobility within educational settings (Banks, 1993).

**Components of Multicultural Education**

Multicultural education was created to increase educational equality by focusing on (a) content integration, (b) the construction of knowledge, (c) modifying racial attitudes, behaviors, and values; (d) developing equity pedagogy, and (e) reforming cultural and social systems in education (Banks, 1993). Content integration refers to the who, what, when, and how to integrate cultural information into educational curriculum
(Banks, 1993). This tenet acknowledges what cultural content should be incorporated in educational curriculum, what audience should the content be geared towards, how to incorporate cultural content, and the structure by which it should be incorporated (i.e., as a separate course or within core curriculum) (Banks, 1993). The construction of knowledge tenet challenges the notion that creating knowledge is an objective process (Banks, 1993). Banks (1993) poses that knowledge construction is both a subjective and objective process that requires developing awareness of the purpose and points of view of the cultural content being explored. Also, he proposes that knowledge construction involves developing one’s own interpretation of reality, while understanding that knowledge reflects the social, cultural, and power positions that occur within society (Banks, 1993). Furthermore, Banks (1993) identifies the prejudice reduction component of multicultural education which focuses on the development of attitudes, behaviors, and values of students to identify ways to increase their racial awareness. He highlights research that supports the use of cultural content in curriculum, noting that students experienced a positive impact on their racial attitudes, behaviors, and values when exposed to cultural content (Banks, 1993). In continuation, equity pedagogy refers to the development of teaching strategies and approaches that focused on increased educational equity that would increase academic achievement for marginalized populations (Banks, 1993). Lastly, Banks (1993) poses that schools are social and cultural systems that have their own set of values and norms beyond the previously described constructs. This concept takes a systemic approach in investigating and conceptualizing academic environments so that educational equality and academic achievement can be improved for marginalized populations (Banks, 1993). Despite having these clearly defined
objectives, Banks (1993) asserts that the implementation of multicultural education is inadequate as one assumption of multicultural education is that it only involves reforming curriculum to include cultural content, negating the components that focus on environmental change and social action (Banks, 1993; Banks, 2013). Furthermore, in recent literature, multicultural education and competence has been associated with the development of knowledge, attitudes and beliefs, and skills (Pieterse et al., 2009), also negating the social action and structural reform components of multicultural education.

**Conceptual Theories and Frameworks for Multicultural Education & Training**

Prior to the development of the current multicultural and social justice competencies (MSJCC; Ratts et al., 2016) that govern the counseling profession, incorporating culturally appropriate content into counseling and counselor education was optional; failing to recognize that racial and ethnic factors cannot be separated from the person while simultaneously imposing the values of the majority on racially and ethnically diverse counselors-in-training and clients (Sue et al., 1992/1992). The push to increase multicultural education and training in counseling occurred because of the projected increase in diversity of the United States, increased awareness of the impact that sociopolitical and cultural events has on the counseling experience, and to address the increased resistance to honoring the multicultural experiences of racially and ethnically diverse populations (Sue et al., 1992/1992).

**Conceptual Frameworks**

**Multicultural Cultural Competencies**

Sue and colleagues (1992) developed the first set of multicultural counseling competencies (MCC) as early as 1991. This has been the most used multicultural model
prior to the development of newly defined competencies as outlined by Ratts and colleagues (2016). They constructed the cross-cultural conceptual matrix of multicultural-focused competencies, with the intent to encourage the counseling profession to prioritize multicultural training and practice. The two components of the cross-cultural framework for multicultural practice included: (a) characteristics of the culturally skilled counselor (i.e., being aware of self, appreciating and legitimizing the worldview of diverse clients, and developing and using culturally sensitive skills) and (b) dimensions of cultural competence (i.e., attitudes and beliefs, skills, and knowledge). Sue and colleagues (1992) identified time to develop concise competencies as a limitation to this framework and acknowledged that additional work would need to be done to establish stronger cultural competencies beyond these components. Another limitation to this framework is that it lacks the primary tenet of multiculturalism which includes ensuring equitable education (Banks, 1993; Banks, 2013); and fails to attend to a key component of counseling, the overall therapeutic relationship and the relationship between marginalized populations and the majority (Hall, et al., 2014).

**Development of Counseling Advocacy Competencies**

Using the MCC as a reference, Lewis and colleagues developed the ACA Advocacy Competencies in 2003 (as cited in ACA Advocacy Competencies, 2018; as cited in Toporek et al., 2009) to bring the advocacy component of counseling to the forefront of the profession. Toporek and colleagues (2009) elaborated on this framework clarifying the relationship between the MCC and the core counseling practice of advocacy. The ACA Advocacy Competencies is a framework that organizes advocacy involvement across two levels (extent of client involvement and level of intervention) and
six domains (client-student empowerment, client-student advocacy, community collaboration, systems advocacy, public information, and social-political advocacy) (Toporek et al., 2009). This framework also includes clear advocacy interventions that can be implemented across each domain, which require exhibiting multicultural and ethical considerations to be effectively implemented (ACA, 2018).

Due to counselor trainees having infrequent exposure to advocacy development and systemic issues during their training, Toporek and colleagues (2009) discuss the significance of incorporating the ACA Advocacy Competencies into multicultural training practices. They highlight that advocacy serves a beneficial role in eliminating social barriers that decrease the overall health and well-being of clients (Toporek et al., 2009); thus, the importance for counselors-in-training to learn how to advocate for clients ethically and culturally. Twenty-five years after the development of the MCCs and 12 years after the development of the Advocacy Competencies, these frameworks were combined to support a multicultural and social justice approach to counseling and counselor training (Ratts, 2011).

**Multicultural and Social Justice Competencies**

The Association of Multicultural Counseling and Development (AMCD) charged Ratts and colleagues (2015) to update the MCC standards outlined by Sue (1992) to create the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (MSJCC). The goal for revising the MCC was to “reflect a more inclusive and broader understanding of culture and diversity that encompasses the intersection of identities” as well as “to better address the expanding role of professional counselors to include individual counseling and social justice advocacy” (Ratts et al., 2016; pg. 29). These competencies have been
affirmed by ACA and AMCD as the most up to date multicultural standards in the counseling profession. The MSJCC provide a conceptual framework that highlights philosophies to be incorporated into counseling practice including recognizing the impact that sociocultural factors, oppression, and multiculturalism has on the clinician, client, and the counseling relationship (Ratts et al., 2016).

Within the MSJCC, Ratts and colleagues (2016) present a model that addresses how power, privilege, and oppression impact the therapeutic relationship and environment. At the center of the framework is the incorporation of multicultural and social justice praxis (Ratts et al., 2016). Researchers suggest that ethical counseling requires a multicultural and social justice mindset that inform counselors on what social justice and cultural practices will best serve their clients and the counseling relationship (Ratts et al., 2016). Furthermore, they highlight the intersectionality between privileged and marginalized identities of both the counselor and client centering the impact that power, privilege, and oppression has on these identities as well (Ratts et al., 2016). Lastly, this framework promotes the philosophy that competent multicultural and social justice practice starts with counselors increasing their awareness and develops through the advocacy interventions used to create change on an individual and systemic level (Ratts et al., 2016). The comprehensive domains identified in the MSJCC fill the void created by the preliminary standards, paving the way for more intentional multicultural-focused frameworks.

**Multicultural-Focused Theoretical Frameworks**

During the multietnic stage of cultural education development, two cultural paradigms, the cultural deprivation theory, and the cultural differences theory, were
developed to conceptualize the relationship between culture and education of marginalized populations. The cultural deprivation paradigm posited that marginalized students’ ability to learn is associated with a cultural deficit because of socioenvironmental factors such as poverty and family dynamics, not a result of the culture of the academic setting (Banks, 2013). It also posited that the cognitive and social abilities of individuals within marginalized populations will only improve if the academic setting compensates for what is missing in their cultural environment (Banks, 2013). The cultural differences paradigm was developed to challenge the tenets of the cultural deprivation paradigm (Banks, 2013). This philosophy suggested that academic settings can effect change in the learning and social experiences of marginalized students by incorporating culturally responsive techniques that honor the students’ cultural strengths and differences instead of creating an environment in which they are expected to assimilate to the majority (Banks, 2013). This paradigm also focuses on the importance of shifting the academic environment by using culturally responsive pedagogies to better align and connect with students from marginalized populations (Banks, 2013). Since the development of the cultural deprivation theory and the cultural differences theory, additional frameworks have been developed to improve the development of multiculturalism in counseling education.

To account for the limitations of the tripartite model of multiculturalism, Hall and colleagues (2014) proposed the relational-cultural theory to increase counselor awareness of cultural characteristics and contextual factors to strengthen the development of multiculturalism in counseling. This model focuses on two components. First, the relational-cultural framework focuses on the importance of counselor educators to
acknowledge and emphasize culture and empathy within counseling (Hall et al., 2014). Secondly, the relational-cultural framework focuses on teaching counselor trainees how to establish therapeutic relationships in a culturally sensitive way (Hall et al., 2014). This framework is grounded in feminist perspectives, and has several tenets (Hall et al., 2014). First, this framework shifts the lens of counseling conceptualization from an internalized and mental illness perspective to a relational and external factors perspective (Hall et al., 2014). Furthermore, this framework focuses on establishing mutuality and authenticity within the counselor-client relationship, noting the importance of developing shared meaning and experiences within the counseling relationship (Hall et al., 2014). Lastly, this framework normalizes that a client may experience moments of disconnect within counseling, however their ability to move through a rupture result in how they build relational resilience and experience relational growth (Hall et al., 2014).

Irvine and colleagues (2021) integrated relational-cultural theory with Adlerian theory to propose the Relational-Cultural and Adlerian Multicultural Framework (RAMF). This framework’s focus is to close the gaps in multicultural education and to increase the multicultural competence of counselor trainees (Irvine et al., 2021). RAMF is proposed as a “decolonizing pedagogical approach to multicultural education that fosters an equitable learning environment and overall inclusive program culture” (Irvine et al., 2021, p. 238). RAMF is composed of three tenets which include ensuring that there is an equitable learning environment, honoring individual and relational dynamics that impact the learning and program experience within counseling programs, and ensuring that active engagement is a key component in multicultural education and training (Irvine et al., 2021). This theoretical framework strives to account for counselor trainees’ low
self-efficacy when working with culturally diverse populations by striving to develop both counselor trainees’ clinical competency and efficacy pertaining to multicultural constructs (Irvine et al., 2021).

Review of Empirical Studies of Multicultural Education & Training

There are a significant number of studies assessing the effectiveness of multiculturalism via multicultural education or training, however, Tomlinson-Clark (2000) asserts that there is a paucity of information on the mechanisms of multicultural training being assessed within these studies. Furthermore, the available research on multicultural education and training aims to further the knowledge base on multicultural training experiences that can increase counselor cultural development, yet Pieterse and colleagues (2016) indicate that there is a “modest amount of research focusing on students’ experiences of multicultural training” (p. 29) (Tomlinson-Clark, 2000).

In reviewing the empirical research on multicultural education and training in counseling, we identified that researchers have utilized many different qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-method approaches to examine the effectiveness of multicultural education in counseling (Chao, 2013; Johnson & Lambie, 2012; Pieterse et al., 2016; Rivas & Hill, 2018; Tomlinson-Clark, 2000). Researchers also conducted studies using different levels of graduate training including master’s level and doctoral level, with a variety of concentrations including school counseling, clinical mental health, marriage and family, and rehabilitation counseling. Lastly, findings of the reviewed studies indicated mixed outcomes. For example, Tomlinson-Clark (2000) indicated that counseling students found their multicultural courses to be helpful in developing their multicultural competence, however, students expressed the need to have additional
multicultural experiences to be more multiculturally prepared. Also, Rivas and Hill (2018) and Chao (2013) identified that when counselor trainees experienced inconsistent exposure to cultural content, it was reflected in their multicultural practice.

Multicultural Education & Training Research Critique

In reviewing the empirical studies of multiculturalism, many of the studies did not explore the development of participants’ ways of being, but instead examined the frequency, placement, and exposure to cultural content in their counseling training. The focus of the studies aligned with assessing the efficacy of the three principles of the MCC, awareness, skills, and knowledge, however they do not examine the social justice components deemed just as important as the three principles. Furthermore, all the studies reviewed strive to understand the impact of multicultural training on counselor competence, however, none of the studies reviewed address the development of cultural humility characteristics specifically of the counselor or counselor trainees. In continuation, studies lacked diversity in their participant pool with only one study being more racially diverse while the others had primarily white, female participants. The studies were also limited to mostly counselor trainees’ overall training experience, suggesting the need to extend the research to the training experiences of practicing clinicians as well. Lastly, many of the studies were limited to the multicultural courses counselor trainees were taking, with the exception of the Tomlinson-Clark (2000) study, which briefly addressed the multicultural representation of faculty and staff on a programmatic level. These limitations are important to note as they highlight the need to further examine if current multicultural training practices have implications for the development of cultural humility characteristics of counselor trainees.
Conclusion

Chapter two provides a thorough review of the literature on multiculturalism. It highlights the foundational philosophy of multiculturalism, detailing how the concept has evolved from its inception with ethnic education during the Civil Rights Movement to the development of multicultural education. We review the primary goal of multicultural education, to increase educational equity for marginalized populations and its integration into the counseling profession. Furthermore, chapter two reviews theories of pedagogy in multiculturalism. This section describes the two initial pedagogical theories of multiculturalism, the cultural deprivation theory and cultural differences theory, as well as highlights newer theoretical frameworks such as the Relational-Cultural and Adlerian Multicultural Framework, that serve to decolonize counseling multicultural pedagogy and increase educational equity within the counseling field. Also, this chapter reviews five multicultural training-focused empirical studies that utilize different research methodologies ranging from qualitative to mixed-methods. From the review of these studies, limitations to these studies identified how current methodologies fail to answer how current multicultural training practices contribution to the cultural humility characteristics of counselors. Thus, in chapter three, a detailed discussion on a proposed methodology to assess the relationship between multicultural training and cultural humility development will be discussed.
Chapter Three

Cultural Humility and Counselor Training: A Systematic Review

\footnote{Johnson, S. M., S. Jerideau, T. Jackson, and R.G. Carlson. Submitted to \textit{Teaching and Supervision in Counseling}, 02/15/ 2023.}
Abstract

The Multicultural and Social Justice Competencies call for understanding counselors’ multicultural orientation to improve cultural practice in counseling education, training, and practice. Thus, we conducted a systematic review that aimed to identify empirical studies that explored the development of cultural humility in counselor trainees. We provide a thorough review of study outcomes and practices that contribute to cultural humility development.

The outcomes summarized in this systematic review are important as they inform the general public of best training practices aimed at improving the multicultural training practices counselor trainees receive. These outcomes are also important as they inform the general public of the counseling professions efforts to increase counselor cultural openness and sensitivity.

Keywords: Cultural humility, multicultural training, counseling
Cultural Humility and Counselor Training: A Systematic Review

The transformation of multicultural competencies in the counseling profession has led to a shift in how counselors implement multicultural constructs and develop cultural understanding (Ratts et al., 2016). This shift has also encouraged developing an understanding of counselors’ ways of being with culturally diverse clients, as well as understanding the impact that cultural factors and intersecting identities has on the therapeutic relationship, mental health outcomes, and overall health disparities (Davis et al., 2018; Ratts et al., 2016). The focus on counselors’ ways of being refers to the orientation or lens in which counselors view the role of cultural factors on a client’s experience (Davis et al., 2018; Owen, 2013); this is called multicultural orientation (MCO) (Davis et al., 2018; Owen, 2013; Owen et al., 2011).

Overview of Multicultural Orientation

The MCO framework is comprised of three constructs, cultural humility, cultural opportunities, and cultural comfort (Davis et al., 2018; Owen et al., 2011). Cultural humility reflects an inter- and intra-personal perspective in which counselors adopt an other’s perspective, decrease the presence of one’s ego, and recognize one’s strengths and limitations (Owen, 2013). Cultural opportunities and cultural comfort have been defined as “behavioral expressions of cultural humility” (Davis et al., 2018, pg. 92). Cultural opportunities refer to instances in which cultural beliefs, values, and experiences are presented, explored, and integrated into the counseling experience (Davis et al., 2018; Owen, 2013). Cultural comfort refers to the feelings associated with exploring cultural beliefs, values, and experiences when a cultural opportunity occurs, and the quality of the cultural conversation (Davis et al., 2018; Owen, 2013). Cultural humility is defined as the
“organizing virtue of MCO” and the “inherent spirit of MCO” (Davis et al., 2018, pg. 91), therefore it is important to note how this construct is being developed in counseling as researchers have identified cultural humility as a crucial element to the therapeutic alliance and outcomes (Hook et al., 2016; Owen et al., 2016).

**Cultural Humility**

Tervalon and Murray-Garcia (1998) initially discussed the term cultural humility in the context of the medical profession. They defined cultural humility as a constructive process that involves: (a) honoring a patient’s perspective and values, (b) establishing relationships with the community in which one works by implementing training in these communities, (c) serving as an advocate in the community in which one works, and (d) engaging in self-critique and reflection on an individual and institutional level (Tervalon & Murray-Garcia, 1998). Foronda and colleagues (2016) conducted a concept analysis of cultural humility to further identify characteristics that reflect cultural humility. They identified cultural humility characteristics as displaying: (a) openness, (b) self-awareness, (c) egoless, (d) supportive interaction, and (e) self-reflection and critique. Since being adopted by the counseling field, researchers have explored the inter-personal component of cultural humility in counseling settings. Specifically, Hook and colleagues (2013) identified a positive relationship between the therapeutic alliance and therapy outcomes when clients perceived counselors to exhibit cultural humility. Researchers have also explored cultural humility in a supervisory context. Cook and colleagues (2020) found a statistically significant correlation between counselor supervisors’ cultural humility and its influence on post-master’s level supervisees’ intentional non-disclosure. Researchers have also identified limitations on how to effectively use and apply cultural humility in
counseling due to not having clear conceptual frameworks to guide its application (Hook et al., 2013; Mosher et al., 2017; Zhu et al., 2021). Research on cultural humility effectiveness in counseling is novel, meanwhile exploring practices that develop cultural humility characteristics are minimal in the counseling and counselor education literature.

One purpose of the MSJCC is to improve counseling education, training, and practice, including focusing on counselors’ ways of being (Ratts et al., 2016), therefore exploring how counseling and counseling-related fields foster cultural humility development in counselor trainees is warranted. Thus, we conducted a systematic review to explore what practices counseling and counseling-related programs implement to foster cultural humility development of counselor trainees.

Method

In this systematic review, we examined empirical studies that discussed the development of cultural humility characteristics in counselor trainees attending counseling and counseling-related programs. A systematic review is a methodological approach that aims to capture and summarize knowledge about a question in an unbiased manner (Aromataris & Pearson, 2014). The systematic review differs from the literature review in that it is a more organized and structured approach used to identify the results of all empirical studies on a topic (Aromataris & Pearson, 2014). Conducting a systematic review on the topic of practices that promote cultural humility development is appropriate because it requires adhering to clear objectives and is guided by inclusion and exclusion criteria to ensure that only relevant information for this topic is reviewed and discussed (Aromataris & Pearson, 2014). It also requires the appraisal of the articles to ensure the quality and appropriateness of any identified studies pertaining to this topic.
Databases Searched

The databases searched for this article included: Academic Search Complete, APA PsychArticles, APA PsychInfo, EBSCOHost, Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), Social Sciences Full Text (H.W. Wilson), & Social Work Abstracts. The key search terms for this review include counseling, cultural humility, multicultural training, and education. To ensure counseling-related fields were also included in the search, truncation (coun*; train*) was used to include articles with the root word “coun”. Furthermore, additional search strategies were implemented including using quotations around multicultural training (“multicultural training”) to ensure the articles included were specifically focused on multicultural training.

Search Criteria & Strategy

This systematic review only included empirical and peer-reviewed academic journals. The initial database search yielded 2,554 articles using the search criteria cultural humility OR humility AND multicultural training OR train* OR education. Upon refining the search by including search terms counseling or coun*, adjusting publication dates to 2007-2022, and implementing filters for peer-reviewed and academic journals, the database yielded 379 articles. Upon the removal of 98 duplicate articles, the final search resulted in a total of 281 articles left for review. The final articles were imported into Zotero in the RIS format, and then converted into a CSV file to be exported into Microsoft Excel for further review. Once organized in Microsoft Excel, we reviewed the accepted articles in three phases. Articles were denoted with green, yellow, and red highlighting if they were deemed eligible, a possible article, or ineligible based on study
criteria. Articles highlighted in green and yellow were moved to the next phase for further screening.

Eligible studies focused on cultural humility training and/or development in counseling or counseling-related educational programs. Additional eligibility criteria included being empirical studies, focusing on educational level (undergraduate, masters, and doctoral), being peer-reviewed, and training level (normal coursework, practicum, and internship).

During the first and second screening phase, we reviewed article titles and abstracts to determine article eligibility based on the described criteria and relevancy to the research question. We eliminated 231 articles during phase one screening, and 24 articles were eliminated during phase two screening. The third screening phase involved reading the remaining articles to be screened for study eligibility and relevancy to the research question. Thus, the primary author and two doctoral students assessed the remaining 26 articles. Articles were eliminated if they did not focus on cultural humility training or development in counseling or counseling-related programs, were not empirical studies, were duplicate articles, were book reviews, or were not peer-reviewed articles. Upon completing the third phase of screening, we eliminated another 21 articles, leaving six articles. We added one additional article based on review of references from one of the accepted articles, bringing the total number of articles reviewed to six. The flowchart of the article screening process is depicted in Figure 3.1 (Shamseer et al., 2015).

**Quality Assessment**

There are many critical appraisal tools that can be applied to assess the process used in a systematic review (Hong et al., 2018). The purpose of a critical appraisal tool is
to standardize the systematic review process and ensure it is a clear and replicable process (Hong et al., 2018). Because there are many critical appraisal tools to choose from, we determined that the Mixed-Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) would be the most appropriate tool to critically appraise the quality of the articles and review process used in this study. The MMAT is a common tool that involves examining the quality of the process and methodologies in systematic reviews that include qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-method studies (Hong et al., 2018). In using this tool, study appraisal occurs in two phases. First, two screening questions are used to determine if a study is suitable for appraisal. Answering yes to the two screening items indicates studies are suitable to move to the second phase of appraisal, which includes a set of questions assessing methodology quality and is based on study design (qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-method). Answering “no” or “can’t tell” suggests that further appraisal of the methodology quality may not be possible or necessary (Hong et al., 2018). Limitations to using this tool include having usability concerns for some methodologies (i.e., single-group studies), however, overall the tool is “easy to use, comprehensive, quick, short and accessible online” (Hong et al., pg. 464). The critical appraisal of this systematic review is in Table 3.1.

**Study Characteristics**

**Population**

The total number of participants in the reviewed articles was 361. The variation in racial and ethnic composition and gender identity of the studied populations was minimal. Of the six reviewed studies, four articles indicated that majority of the study participants identified as white (ranging from 60.3% - 85.7% of participants) and female
ranging from 6 – 141 participants). Two articles did not include the racial/ethnic or gender identity of participants. The ages of study participants in four studies ranged from 18 to 64 years, while two studies did not identify the age ranges of study participants. The populations examined in the reviewed articles varied in educational level and program of study. The educational level of the study participants included undergraduate students (3 studies), master’s level (2 studies), and doctoral level (1 study). The programs of study for research participants included social work (3 articles), clinical psychology (2 articles), and CACREP-accredited counseling programs (1 article). Multicultural coursework and training experiences varied amongst study participants as well. A review of the articles indicated that participants were either currently enrolled in or completed one or more multicultural counseling or culturally competent courses (2 studies), had completed diversity training (1 study), were enrolled in an international social work class at the time of the study which focused on integrating “transformative multicultural education” into the course curriculum (1 study), or had completed a human behavior and social environment course (1 study). Lastly, two studies included participants who were currently enrolled in practicum, had completed practicum but not internship, or were enrolled in or had completed an internship counseling course.

**Methodology**

Of the six articles reviewed, there were two quantitative articles, two qualitative articles, and two mixed-method articles. One quantitative article utilized a nonexperimental correlation design, and the other utilized a quasi-experimental, pre- and post-test design. One mixed-method study was a pilot study using surveys and focus-group interviews to gather data, while the other mixed-method study utilized thematic
analyses and post hoc analysis to examine date. Lastly, the qualitative articles utilized a case study and focus group approach, as well as a literary analysis to gather and identify themes amongst the data.

**Measurements**

Researchers utilized two different measures to assess the cultural humility development of study participants. Researchers implemented the Multidimensional Cultural Humility Scale (MCHS) developed by Gonzalez and colleagues (2020) in one study, whereas in another study researchers included subscales from the Diversity and Oppression Scale (DOS) to measure cultural humility characteristics (Kondili et al., 2022; Trull & Myers, 2020). The MCHS is utilized to assess counselor’s self-awareness of their cultural humility (Gonzalez et al., 2020). Kondili and colleagues (2020) utilized the MCHS to measure counselor trainees’ perceptions of their cultural humility. The DOS is a self-report measure that assesses how students learn about diversity and oppression (Windsor et al., 2015). Researchers utilized cultural diversity, self-confidence, and awareness subscales to measure participants’ cultural humility (Trull & Myers, 2020).

**Outcomes**

**Mixed Methods Outcomes**

The outcomes of the mixed methods study addressed the development of cultural humility characteristics by using a focus-group to discuss and provide feedback pertaining to participants’ implicit attitudes outcomes. Researchers specifically identified the following themes that were relevant to the development of cultural humility characteristics including: participant’s receptiveness to feedback, displaying openness,
and displaying the desire to engage in knowledge, awareness, and self-monitoring development (Black & Gold, 2019). Black and Gold indicated that in the context of cultural humility development, participants displayed more receptiveness to receiving feedback the more time they spent processing feedback amongst their peers. Black and Gold also found that participants struggled with being open for various reasons including: perceiving that their level of cultural competence would be questioned, desiring to be right versus competent, and fearing that they may be perceived as racist. Lastly, they identified that participants expressed the desire to increase their self-awareness when practicing therapy, yet they did not identify using any resources outside of self-monitoring. The self-monitoring behaviors included being mindful of their language and behaviors and rewatching sessions. Furthermore, Tormala and colleagues (2018) analyzed the changes psychology trainees exhibited in their cultural formulations by measuring the frequency of changes and assessing assignments for identified themes related to cultural competence and cultural humility. In both studies, researchers utilized qualitative and quantitative methodologies allowing for researchers to inductively and deductively analyze the data obtained from the study (Black & Gold, 2019). The outcomes for the mixed-method study can be found in Table 3.2.

**Quantitative Outcomes**

Outcomes of the quantitative studies indicated that cultural humility development may be influenced by multicultural training level and the type of multicultural training counselors receive. Researchers defined multicultural training level as the number of multicultural courses taken at the time of participating in the study (ranging from one to two or more) (Kondili et al., 2022). Kondili and colleagues found a positive correlation
between the number of multicultural courses taken and cultural humility development. Conversely, they also found no statistically significant changes in cultural humility development based on training level, having taken either practicum or internship. In a separate study, researchers found statistically significant differences in cultural humility development over the course of participating in a social work program using an infused diversity curriculum (Trull & Myers, 2020). Results were statistically significant specifically for developing cultural awareness and displaying openness to being lifelong learners (Trull & Myers, 2020). The summary of outcomes for these two quantitative articles can be found in Table 3.

**Qualitative Outcomes**

Overall, the outcomes of the qualitative studies indicated an increase in cultural awareness for self and others, taking an other’s perspective, recognition of power-privilege dynamics, display of openness and egolessness, and a desire to help and engage in advocacy for others. In one study, researchers found that about half of the participants showed an increase in cultural awareness development when using the outline for cultural formulation assessment (Tormala et al., 2018). Furthermore, Harindranathan and colleagues (2021) found that participants developed cultural awareness, including recognizing barriers to understanding different cultures, by exploring equity and social justice issues in their courses. Researchers also found an increase in cultural awareness as evident by 80% of participants showing a reduction in using language that perpetuated stereotypes in their case write-ups (Tormala et al., 2018).

Furthermore, researchers identified that participants adopted an other’s perspective as evidenced by experiencing an increase in empathy for other cultures and
increasing the use of client’s own expression of views and feelings (Harindranathan et al., 2021; Tormala et al., 2018). With respect to recognizing power-privilege dynamics, 80% of participants in one study did not address the power-privilege dynamics between counselor and client (Tormala et al., 2018); whereas participants in other studies displayed the ability to recognize their own privilege and expressed the desire to correct the power imbalances they noticed (Harindranathan et al., 2021; Sloan & Petra, 2021). Outcomes also indicated participants’ willingness to decrease ego and increase openness as evidenced by participant’s engagement in re-evaluating their own culture (Sloan & Petra, 2021), challenging their own assumptions and biases, and being open to alternative, culture driven development models (Harindranathan et al., 2021). Lastly, participants indicated efforts to advocate for others upon recognizing power imbalances (Sloan & Petra 2021). The summary of these outcomes can be found in Table 3.4.

**Discussion**

Researchers have discussed the impact that exhibiting cultural humility has on the therapeutic relationship (Davis et al., 2016; Owen et al., 2011), however identifying best practices to develop these characteristics in counseling is still novel (Trull & Myers, 2020). A majority of the studies revealed that counselor trainees can develop cultural humility characteristics over time when there is alignment in the number of multicultural courses, style of course implementation, access resources, and pedagogical opportunities present. Furthermore, upon reviewing empirical studies focused on cultural humility development, some best practices to consider when developing cultural humility in counselor trainees include:
(a) Normalize providing and processing cultural-focused feedback (i.e., feedback on implicit attitudes and biases noted in coursework)

(b) Create a safe and unbiased environment that encourages increasing self-awareness, and promotes identifying and challenging one’s own assumptions and biases

(c) Consider the number of multicultural courses and how multicultural content is implemented programmatically

(d) Utilize structured cultural frameworks (i.e., the Outline of Cultural Formulation or the MSJCC framework) as resources to increase cultural conceptualizations;

(e) Incorporate cultural and social justice issues into coursework

(f) Address and account for power-privilege imbalances in the classroom and in the therapeutic relationship, and

(g) Implement practices, content, and opportunities that develop counselors’ community-building and advocacy skills.

**Implications for Practice**

With the increase in population diversity, encouraging an understanding of cultural factors and intersecting identities has become even more imperative. The MSJCC highlight the importance of “understanding individuals in the context of their social environment” (Ratts et al., 2016). Identifying and implementing practices that foster cultural humility development can encourage counselor trainees to be more intentional in understanding self and others in the context of their environment. Furthermore, identifying best practices that contribute to cultural humility development can provide
information that can help in curriculum development and implementation. Currently, most CACREP-accredited counseling programs implement a one-course approach for their multicultural courses (Abe, 2020; D’Andrea & Daniels, 1991; Pieterse et al., 2009) however, researchers have identified some benefit in having more than one multicultural course, using a cultural and social injustice infused curriculum, and using culture specific curriculum (Kondili et al., 2022; Ramirez & St. David; 2021; Trull & Myers, 2020). This increases opportunities to develop counselor trainees’ culturally relevant perspectives that can increase trust and safety within the therapeutic relationship (Owen et al., 2011).

Furthermore, identifying practices that help foster cultural humility development in a classroom setting creates opportunities to identify and challenge assumptions and biases at multiple points.

**Limitations**

As with any study, there are limitations with this review. One limitation was isolating the search to include only cultural humility development. Cultural humility is one of three components of counselors’ multicultural orientation; therefore, the review is limited in identifying studies that may focus on overall multicultural orientation development. As a result, the studies not included may have additional practices that could foster cultural humility development. Furthermore, we only used empirical articles (quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods) that focused on cultural humility development of counselors in training within counseling and counseling-related programs. Therefore, many studies were eliminated due to being conceptual and non-empirical, not being relevant to counseling or counseling-related fields or being from the practicing clinicians’ perspective.
Implications for Future Research

In this systematic review, we provide an extensive review of the literature on strategies and tools that can be implemented to develop cultural humility characteristics in counselor trainees. Counselors and counselor educators may be interested in using this information as a framework to guide clinical practice and curriculum development. Furthermore, a review of the literature provided limited insight on strategies and interventions that focus on developing social justice, advocacy and community building components of cultural humility. Therefore, researchers may be interested in further exploring factors that can cultivate these characteristics of cultural humility as well. Lastly, there were very few quantitative studies exploring the efficacy of strategies and interventions that contribute to cultural humility development. Therefore, it would be beneficial to have more quantitative studies to examine the efficacy of strategies and interventions that support cultural humility development.

Conclusion

Researchers have identified cultural humility as a contributing factor for obtaining better treatment outcomes and therapeutic relationships when working with diverse and marginalized populations (Hook et al., 2016; Owen et al., 2011). This study provides insight on training practices that can develop this essential characteristic in counselor trainees. Furthermore, it provides support for counselor educators to reassess and implement multicultural training practices that focus on developing counselor trainees’ (a) commitment to lifelong learning, (b) increased awareness of biases, (c) advocacy skills, (d) increased awareness of power and privilege dynamics, and (e) increased cultural and social justice awareness. As the counseling profession strives for the
advancement of multiculturalism to attend to the needs of a more diverse population, we recommend that the training practices in CACREP-accredited programs should reflect these efforts consistently to ensure counselor trainees are better equipped and comfortable when working with individuals from diverse and marginalized communities.
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Figure 3.1 Article Search Flowchart
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Appraisals</th>
<th>Mixed Method Appraisal</th>
<th>5.1. Is there an adequate rationale for using a mixed methods design to address the research question?</th>
<th>5.2. Are the different components of the study effectively integrated to answer the research question?</th>
<th>5.3. Are the outputs of the integration of qualitative and quantitative components adequately interpreted?</th>
<th>5.4. Are divergences and inconsistencies between quantitative and qualitative results adequately addressed?</th>
<th>5.5. Do the different components of the study adhere to the quality criteria of each tradition of the methods involved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black, &amp; Gold, (2019)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tormala, et al., (2018)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Appraisal (Non-Randomized)</td>
<td>3.1 Are the participants representative of the target population?</td>
<td>3.2 Are measurements appropriate regarding both the outcome and intervention (or exposure)?</td>
<td>3.3. Are there complete outcome data?</td>
<td>3.4. Are the confounders accounted for in the design and analysis?</td>
<td>3.5. During the study period, is the intervention administered (or exposure occurred) as intended?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kondili et al., (2022)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trull &amp; Myers, (2020)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Appraisal</td>
<td>1.1. Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research question?</td>
<td>1.2. Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?</td>
<td>1.3. Are the findings adequately derived from the data?</td>
<td>1.4. Is the interpretation of results sufficiently substantiated by data?</td>
<td>1.5. Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis, and interpretation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harindranathan et al., (2021)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan &amp; Petra, (2021)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.2 Mixed Methods Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author &amp; Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Measurements/Interventions</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black &amp; Gold, (2019)</td>
<td>Trainees’ cultural humility and implicit associations about clients and religious and spiritual identities: A mixed-method investigation.</td>
<td>Clinical psychology master’s level CIT</td>
<td>Mixed-method pilot study using survey &amp; focus group interviews</td>
<td>Multicultural Orientation Rating Form</td>
<td>Experienced difficulty with being open &amp; displaying cultural competence; experienced increase in curiosity in group setting; experienced increase in openness to feedback in group setting; expressed desire to increase self-awareness but did not indicate using outside resources to do so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tormala, et al., (2018)</td>
<td>Developing measurable cultural competence and cultural humility: An application of the cultural formulation</td>
<td>Doctoral level clinical psychology trainees</td>
<td>Qualitative – thematic analysis &amp; tallied &amp; compared thematic categories</td>
<td>Outline for cultural formulation found in the DSM, 5th edition</td>
<td>Increased cultural self-awareness; more complex discussion on intersectionality; less perspective taking; use of less stereotypical &amp; unsupported cultural statements; minimal to no recognition of power and privilege dynamics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.3 Quantitative Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author &amp; Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Measurements/Interventions</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kondili et al., (2022)</td>
<td>Predictors of cultural humility in counselors-in-training</td>
<td>Master’s level CIT</td>
<td>Nonexperimental correlation design</td>
<td>Multidimensional cultural humility scale</td>
<td>Clinical training level (practicum or internship) did not change trainees’ CH development; participants who had multiple MCT courses also had higher CH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author &amp; Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Measurements/Interventions</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harindranathan et al., (2021)</td>
<td>Developing cultural humility in an international social work classroom</td>
<td>Undergraduate social work students</td>
<td>Qualitative – case study &amp; focus group interviews</td>
<td>Two reflection papers focused on international approaches to addressing social issues; participant observation for 15 weeks; 40 min to 1 hr. focus group interviews</td>
<td>Increased self-awareness, self-evaluation, development of CH, &amp; understanding of culture in relation to power, equity, and privilege.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan &amp; Petra, (2021)</td>
<td>Modeling cultural humility: Listening to students’ stories of religious identity</td>
<td>Undergraduate social work students</td>
<td>Qualitative – literary analysis</td>
<td>Shadow-Beast assignment; used literary analysis method to focus on statements pertaining to religion/spirituality &amp; identified examples of CH characteristics including taking an other’s perspective, openness, &amp; implementing advocacy to address power imbalances</td>
<td>Indicated developing cultural humility noted by cultural re-evaluation, displaying a desire to help others; questioning of one’s spiritual/religious beliefs; engaging in advocacy of others; and displaying a desire to correct power imbalances impacting others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract

The Multicultural and Social Justice Competences call for understanding the intersection between counselor and client identities, however understanding counselor characteristics such as their cultural humility, and how they are developed is sparse. Using structural equation modeling, we explore the relationship between multicultural training practices, broaching behaviors, and cultural humility development for counselor trainees (N=311) enrolled in CACREP-accredited counseling programs. Results indicate that counselor educators’ broaching practices have an influence on the development of counselor trainees’ cultural humility, while multicultural training practices do not. We discuss implications for counselor education as well as directions for future research.
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Examining the Relationship Between Multicultural Training Practices and Development of Counselor Trainees’ Cultural Humility

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s Office of Minority Health and Health Equity (2022) projects that by 2030, society will begin to reflect its most racially and ethnically diverse population, with majority of individuals identifying with more than one race or ethnicity. Ratts and colleagues (2016) contended that as society becomes more diverse, the counseling profession should also adapt counselors’ training to effectively address the mental health needs of a diversifying population. Over the years, counseling organizations have established standards, guidelines, and frameworks that specifically focus on counselor multicultural development. For example, the American Counseling Association (ACA, 2014) calls for counselors to acknowledge and respect human diversity, while also incorporating multicultural issues and practices in counselor training (Standards F.2.b. and F.7.c). The Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2016) and the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (MSJCC; Ratts et al., 2016) include standards that call for the counseling profession to incorporate multiculturalism and sociocultural diversity as foundational principles in counselor training curriculum as well (see CACREP standard II. F. 2).

Although counseling organizations have made strides to adjust multicultural training and development by implementing culturally focused frameworks, the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (MSJCC) specifically implored that an additional priority in multicultural development is understanding the impact of counselor and client intersecting identities on the counseling relationship (Ratts
et al., 2016). Researchers have conducted outcome research on the impact of counselor characteristics on treatment outcomes, however, research focusing on the development of counselor characteristics that influence counselor receptiveness to cultural perspectives is sparse (Hook et al., 2016; Owen et al., 2016; Zhu et al., 2021). Thus, in the following section, we review current multicultural training practices and counselor characteristics that may improve counselor trainees’ competence during their training in CACREP-accredited counselor programs.

**Multicultural Training in Counselor Education**

Cultural competence is an integral component of counseling, yet there are mixed reviews concerning the efficacy of multicultural training practices in counselor education and no systems to assess the implementation of multiculturalism in counseling curricula (Ancis & Rasheed, 2005; Brooks et al., 2015; CACREP, 2016; Mosher et al., 2017; Pieterse et al., 2009; Sue et al., 2009). Most counselor education programs implement one multicultural course in a program with inconsistencies. For example, Pieterse and colleagues (2009) found discrepancies in what course syllabi reflects and what actually transpires in the classroom setting, suggesting that course syllabi demonstrate intent to incorporate multiculturalism in courses, yet coursework does not align with that intention. Furthermore, Brooks and colleagues (2015) described incongruencies in multicultural training practices, noting that counselor educators with minimal knowledge and skills on integrating cultural content are assigned to teach multicultural courses, increasing the risk of inadequately addressing sociocultural issues such as racism and oppression that affect marginalized populations. Also, Gonzalez-Voller and colleagues (2020) found that while counselor trainees experienced an increase in cultural
competence development in their first year of their counseling program, their cultural competence development plateaued by the end of the program. They also found no significant difference in cultural competence growth based on program track (i.e., school counseling, marriage and family, or clinical mental health) suggesting that the stagnant growth may be associated with adhering to the standardized CACREP training standards which has no clear implementation guidelines (Gonzalez-Voller et al., 2020). Conversely, Ramirez and St. David (2021) explored the use of a culture-specific curriculum within a CACREP-accredited program and found that students expressed significant interest in an immersive and experiential approach to developing cultural awareness. They also found that using a more immersive curriculum contributed to increased development of cultural sensitivity and culture-specific skills of counselor trainees.

D’Andrea and Daniels (1991) identified characteristics of multicultural training which we included in this study and are defined by: (a) the number of multicultural courses taken in a program, (b) faculty diversity, (c) exposure to culturally focused experiential activities, and (d) the style of curriculum utilized to address multicultural content in the classroom (one course approach, multiple courses, integrated, or infused).

**Counselor Trainees and Multicultural Orientation**

Researchers have shifted their focus to understand the development and impact of counselors’ characteristics that influence cultural receptiveness and sensitivity including cultural humility, cultural comfort, and cultural opportunity (Black & Gold, 2019; Day-Vines et al., 2022; Harindranathan et al., 2021; Hook et al., 2016; Kondili et al., 2020; Trull & Myers, 2020). These characteristics are collectively defined as counselors’ multicultural orientation and have implications for counselors’ ways of being in the
counseling relationship (Davis et al., 2018; Hook et al., 2013; Hook et al., 2016; Owen et al., 2011; Owen, 2013). Prior to the counseling field shifting focus to counselors’ multicultural orientation, counselors and counselor educators focused primarily on developing counselor’s attitudes and beliefs, knowledge, and skills, also known as their multicultural competence, striving to prepare counselors to effectively work with diverse populations (Sue et al., 1992). Focusing only on counselors’ multicultural competence proves detrimental, however, as this approach positions counselors’ to further perpetuate stereotypes about diverse populations (Zhu et al., 2021). Focusing on cultural humility, however, provides a more effective approach at developing counselors’ cultural sensitivity and awareness.

**Cultural Humility**

Trevalon and Murray-Garcia (1998) coined the term cultural humility as an orientation that involves being a life-long learner who engages in self-reflection, community advocacy, institutional change, and honors the perspectives of culturally diverse individuals. Foronda and colleagues (2016) identified characteristics of individuals who display cultural humility including: (1) openness, (2) self-awareness, (3) ego-less, (4) supportive interactions, and (5) self-reflection and critique. Kondili and colleagues (2022) examined the influence that multicultural training, intellectual humility, and quiet ego has on predicting the development of cultural humility in counselor trainees. They found a strong correlation between multicultural training and cultural humility development. They also identified a relationship between intellectual humility, quiet ego, and cultural humility development encouraging counselor educators to develop and implement curricula that foster these characteristics in counselor trainees.
Furthermore, Owen and colleagues (2016) found a negative relationship between client perception of clinicians’ cultural humility and cultural opportunities, stating that when clinicians missed opportunities to address cultural topics such as race, clients’ perceived clinicians to have lower cultural humility, which also had negative implications for client treatment outcomes as well (Owen et al., 2016).

**Cultural Opportunity, Cultural Comfort, & Broaching**

Cultural opportunity refers to the opportunities in which cultural content is acknowledged and addressed in a counseling setting (Owen, 2013). Cultural comfort refers to counselors’ likelihood and efficacy with initiating and engaging in cultural conversations (Owen, 2013). Knox and colleagues (2003) found that counselors reported discomfort with broaching racial, ethnic, and cultural topics, attributing this discomfort with receiving inadequate multicultural training during their counseling training, thus suggesting an increase in missed cultural opportunities in clinical settings. Day-Vines and colleagues (2007) suggested that cultural comfort can be explored through counselors’ broaching behaviors, or their commitment to use and encourage cultural conversations as a tool to navigate counseling interactions. There are five styles of broaching behaviors including: (a) avoidant, (b) isolating, (c) continuing-incongruent, (d) integrated-congruent, and (e) infusing (Day-Vines, et al., 2017). These interaction styles reflect a counselor’s perspective and willingness to address cultural factors, such as racial differences, and incorporate these factors in the therapeutic relationship (Day-Vines, et al., 2007). Lastly, Day-Vines and colleagues (2022) also found that school counselors, in comparison to clinical mental health counselors and counselor trainees; and White
counselors, in comparison to minority counselors were more avoidant in broaching racial, ethnic, and cultural topics with clients.

Although there are promising shifts in the development of multiculturalism, such as incorporating perspectives that go beyond counselor’s skills to counselor identity in counselor education (Hays, 2008), there are still many inconsistencies that remain in multicultural training practices, including understanding how multicultural training practices contribute to the development of counselor characteristics. Owen (2013) suggested that exhibiting multicultural competence is important, however, it alone is not sufficient to produce effective counselors or better treatment outcomes, thus the need to focus on the development of counselor trainees’ multicultural orientation (Hook et al., 2016). Lastly, Brooks and colleagues (2015) stated that the most ideal time for counselors to develop multiculturally is during a graduate level program, however, the research on cultural humility development of counselor trainees is limited.

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between current multicultural training practices, broaching practices, and the development of cultural humility characteristics for counselor trainees enrolled in CACREP-accredited counselor education programs. The research questions are: (a) what is the relationship between current multicultural training practices and the development of cultural humility of counselor trainees in CACREP-accredited counselor education programs; (b) What is the relationship between counselor trainees’ perceptions of counselor educators’ broaching behaviors and the development of cultural humility characteristics of counselor trainees; and (c) are culturally missed opportunities a mediating factor between multicultural
training, perceived broaching behaviors, and counselor trainees’ development of cultural humility characteristics?

We hypothesize the following:

(a) Counselor trainees’ cultural humility development will be positively associated with multicultural training.

(b) Counseling trainees’ cultural humility development will be positively associated with counselor educators’ broaching behaviors.

(c) Cultural missed opportunities will mediate the relationship between multicultural training, broaching behaviors, and counselor trainees’ cultural humility development.

The model diagram representing the hypothesized relationship between multicultural training, broaching behaviors, and development of counselor trainees’ cultural humility characteristics is found in Figure 4.1. The symbols of the diagram are based on the McArdle-McDonald reticular action model (RAM), in which: (a) squares represent the observed variables, (b) circles represent the latent or unobservable variables; (c) single-headed arrows represent a directional, direct effect on the dependent variable; and (d) curved, double-headed arrows represent a covariance between variables (Kline, 2016). Next, we provide an overview of the methodology and analyses utilized for this study.

**Method**

This study utilized a correlational research design allowing for the examination of relationships between multiple variables without manipulating the variables (Heppner et al., 2016; Limberg et al., 2021). Data was collected using a purposive sampling method,
and structural equation modeling (SEM) was utilized to analyze the collected data. After receiving institutional review board approval from our university, a recruitment email was sent to faculty of CACREP-accredited counselor education programs. Programs were determined to be CACREP-accredited based on their status on CACREP’s website. The recruitment email included a flyer, QR code, and link to a 92-item web-based survey housed on the platform Qualtrics. Participants completed a consent form acknowledging their rights, risks, and benefits of participating in this study, and were offered a chance to receive a participatory incentive in the form of a $10 gift card upon completion of the study. Recruitment emails were sent to department chairs and faculty of 409 CACREP-accredited programs, however, faculty from 24 programs responded to the request to identify the number of students the recruitment email would be sent to in their program listserv (N = 2,689 students). Due to this, response rate could not be accurately determined.

**Participants**

Master’s-level counselor education students enrolled in a CACREP-accredited program participated in this study. The overall number of participants in this study was N = 311. There was missing data within the data set, which is accounted for in the n values and percentages indicated in the results. The majority of the participants confirmed attending a CACREP-accredited university (n = 215, 69.1%), and identified as White (n=151, 69.6%) and female (n=175, 80.6%). The majority of participants were also enrolled in clinical mental health programs (n=148, 68.8%). Participants were enrolled in various programs of study including clinical mental health (n=148, 68.8%); school counseling (n=35, 16.3%); marriage, couples, & family counseling (n=19, 8.8%);
rehabilitation counseling \((n=12, 5.6\%)\); and college counseling \((n=1, 0.05\%)\). Please see Table 4.1 for full description of demographic information.

**Instruments**

**Demographic survey.** This survey assessed characteristics of participants’ identity including their age, race, ethnicity, and gender identity. We also included survey items to examine participants’ multicultural training experience including: (a) their program of study, (b) the number of multicultural courses taken and if the courses were required or elective, (c) the diversity of their counselor education faculty, (e) the style of curriculum (single course, more than one course, infused curriculum, or integrated curriculum), and (f) type of cultural-based experiential activities they have engaged in during their program.

**Multidimensional Cultural Humility Scale.** We utilized an adapted version of Gonzalez and colleagues (2021) 15-item *Multidimensional Cultural Humility Scale* (MCHS), which is a five-factor self-assessment used to identify counselors’ self-perception of cultural humility characteristics. The scale prompts counselors to note their position on five characteristics of cultural humility identified by Foronda and colleagues (2016) including: (1) openness, (2) self-awareness, (3) ego-less, (4) supportive interactions, and (5) self-reflection and critique (Gonzalez et al., 2021). The Cronbach’s alpha indicates internal consistency reliability at an overall score of 0.78 and 0.79 (Gonzalez et al., 2021). Higher scores on the MCHS were indicative of higher levels of cultural humility characteristics (Gonzalez et al., 2021). Convergent validity and discriminant validity of this scale was established by examining the relationship of the MCHS and other scales including the *Situational Self-Awareness Scale* (SSAS, Govern &
Marsch, 2001) and the *Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale Short-Form (MCSDS-Short Form, Reynolds, 1982)*. Construct validity was determined by conducting a bivariate correlation examination of the *MCHS, SSAS*, and the *MCSDS-Short Form* factors (Gonzalez et al., 2021). As the scale is written to assess counselors’ perceptions of their cultural humility, we modified it to examine counselor trainees’ perceptions of their cultural humility. For example, we modified “I am comfortable asking my clients about their cultural experience” (Gonzalez et al., 2021) to “I am comfortable asking my professors about their cultural experience”; and “I believe the resolution of cultural conflict in a counseling is the client’s responsibility” to “I believe the resolution of cultural conflict in the classroom is the professors’ responsibility”. To ensure construct validity and internal consistency of the adapted scale, we had subject matter experts review the adapted scale. The Cronbach’s alpha of the adapted scale was 0.81.

**Cultural Humility Scale.** Hook and colleagues (2013) developed the 12-item *Cultural Humility Scale (CHS)*. This 12-item Likert scale assesses seven positive aspects of cultural humility as well as five negative aspects of cultural humility (Hook et al., 2013). The scale was developed to assess client perceptions of cultural humility of their clinicians (Hook et al., 2013). The Cronbach’s alpha for the positive factor of the scale is 0.93, and for the negative factor it is 0.90 (Hook et al., 2013). As the *CHS* examines both negative and positive aspects of cultural humility, the negative components of the survey were reverse scored. Scoring includes responses ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5), and the higher the score, the greater the perception of cultural humility (Hook et al., 2013). This scale was adapted to measure counselor trainees’ perceptions of their counselor educators’ cultural humility. For example, the basis of all questions on the
original CHS is “regarding the core aspect(s) of my cultural background, my counselor …” and was modified to regarding the core aspect(s) of my cultural background, my professor is …”. This scale was also reviewed by subject matter experts prior to administration and results indicated Cronbach’s alpha of 0.92 and 0.84 for the positive and negative factors of the scale respectively.

**Cultural Missed Opportunities Scale.** The *Cultural Missed Opportunities Scale* (CMO) is a short 4-item Likert scale developed to assess client perceptions of counselors’ efforts to address topics related to their cultural background in session (Owen et al., 2016). The CMO has a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.86 supporting the reliability of the measure. Content validity of this instrument was confirmed by using expert reviewers on the topic to confirm that content matched the nature of the construct being studied (Owen et al., 2016). This instrument has five ratings ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The scale is scored straight, suggesting that the higher the score, the greater the client perception of their clinician’s display of cultural humility. The scale was modified to assess counselor trainees’ perception of missed opportunities to address cultural content in a counselor education setting. For example, the following statement “My therapist avoided topics related to my cultural background” was modified to “my counselor educator avoided topics related to my cultural background”; and the statement “I wish my therapist would have encouraged me to discuss my cultural background more” was modified to “I wish my professor would have encouraged me to discuss my cultural background more”. The Cronbach’s alpha of the adapted scale was 0.85, and scale validity was ensured by subject matter expert review.
Broaching Attitude and Behavior Survey. The Broaching Attitude and Behavior Survey (BABS; Day-Vines et al., 2013) was developed to examine the broaching behaviors of counselors with their clients using a four-factor structured instrument (Day-Vines et al., 2013). This instrument measures broaching behaviors across four subscales including: (a) avoidant, (b) continuing/incongruent, (c) integrated/congruent, and (d) infusing (Day-Vines et al., 2013). It is a 20-item scale, using a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Scores on this instrument are individually calculated based on each subscale, and the subscale with the highest score is indicative of the type of broaching behavior one uses (Day-Vines et al., 2013). The Cronbach alphas for each subscale is as follows: (a) avoidant subscale = 0.88, (b) continuing/incongruent subscale = 0.88, (c) integrated/congruent subscale = 0.80, and (d) infusing subscale = 0.78. These values indicate that there is internal consistency amongst the subscales of this instrument (Johnson & Morgan, 2006). Content validity was confirmed for this instrument by identifying the patterns of interfactor correlation between the subscales, which identified that the relationships between the subscales were theoretically consistent with what would be expected when using the broaching scale (Day-Vines et al., 2013). Example modifications to this scale included changing “I believe that the counselor should only broach racial and cultural factors when the client initiates such discussions” to “I believe the professors in my program only broach racial, ethnic, and cultural topics when students initiate such discussions”; and “I generally broach racial and cultural factors throughout my counseling sessions with clients” to “My professors generally broach
racial and cultural factors throughout our courses”. The Cronbach alphas of each subscale after adaptation was 0.50, 0.81, 0.91, and 0.86 respectively.

**Data Analysis**

We utilized the five steps of SEM to examine the hypothesized relationships among the variables of interest. SEM is composed of a series of analyses including, a priori regressions, path analyses and confirmatory factor analyses (Kline, 2016; Ullman, 2006). SEM is an appropriate analytical approach for this study because it examines the interaction between observed and latent (factor) variables, or variables that may be harder to measure by exploring the association between characteristics of the latent variables and observed variables (Ullman, 2006). It also allows for depicting the relationships between variables of a theoretical model using a causal inference framework (Kline, 2016; Limberg et al., 2016). We utilized two statistical software programs to analyze the data including *IBM SPSS Statistics* (Version 29) to obtain descriptive and inferential statistics, and *Mplus* (Version 8.8) to conduct SEM. The five steps of SEM used to examine the hypothesized model included: (a) model specification, (b) model identification, (c) model estimation, (d) model evaluation, and (e) model modification or re-specification (Crockett, 2012; Kline, 2016; Ullman, 2006). We specified the proposed theoretical model using theory and previous empirical studies as depicted in the path diagram (see Figure 4.1 and Figure 4.2) (Kline, 2016; Limberg et al., 2021).

**Goodness of Fit Indices, Mediation, and Missing Data**

Kline (2016) suggests that a model test statistic and at least three fit indices should be reported upon assessing a model fit. To determine the accuracy of the hypothesized model, we utilized five model fit indices to evaluate the overall goodness of
fit of the data to the hypothesized model. The Chi-square ($\chi^2$) test depicts the overall likelihood that the hypothesized model predicts the observed covariance matrices and should have a $\chi^2$ to $df$ ratio of $\leq 2$ (Crockett, 2012; Limberg et al., 2016). Two relative goodness of fit indices, the Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) and the Comparative Fit index (CFI), depicts model improvement in comparison with a baseline model, and indicates an excellent model fit with a value $\geq 0.95$ (an acceptable model fit requires a value of $\geq 0.90$) (Kline, 2016). Lastly, two absolute fit indices, the root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA) and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), depict the fit of an independent model with no relating variables to that of the estimated model, and indicates a good-fitting model when values are $\leq 0.06$, or close to 0 (Kline, 2016; Limberg et al., 2016). Missing data existed (1% - 33.4%) due largely to people closing out the survey prior to completion. We utilized Little’s missing completely at random (MCAR) test to examine the differences in missing value mean patterns within the data, and to determine how missing values relates to the observed data (Enders, 2022; Li, 2013). Little’s MCAR test resulted in a chi-square, $\chi^2 = 133.691$ ($df = 99$, $p = 0.09$), indicating that data was not MCAR. We conducted additional tests, including a MANOVA (Wilks’ $\lambda <.001$), examining differences among dependent variables between those who completed the entire survey and those who did not. We found no significant differences indicating that data is likely missing at random. To address missing data, we used full information maximum likelihood (FIML). Lastly, we examined the mediating effect of CMO using causal mediation analysis to determine its indirect effect within the model.
Results

Measurement Model

Before analyzing the hypothesized structural model, two-step modeling was utilized in which the original hypothesized measurement model was respecified into a confirmatory factor analysis model to decrease the likelihood of model misspecification (Kline, 2016). The original measurement model (OMM) consisted of four latent factors (MCT, BB, CMO, and CHD) and 14 indicators (see Figure 2.1). The OMM produced a chi-square, $\chi^2 = 133.691$ ($df = 71$, $p = 0.00$) and a RMSEA of 0.053, indicating poor fit. Additional fit indices produced a $CFI = 0.943$, $TLI = 0.926$, and $SRMR = 0.050$, indicating good model fit. We respecified the model based on review of factor loadings and the modification indices, resulting in the removal of three indicators due to low factor loadings ($\leq 0.4$) (# of multicultural courses = 0.299; faculty diversity, = 0.240; avoidant subscale = 0.311), and two indicators cross-loading. The respecified model was determined to be over-justified based on ratio between the number of useable items and the number of estimated parameters in the model (Byrne, 2012). The respecified model produced a chi-square, $\chi^2 = 73.656$ ($df = 38$, $p = 0.0005$). The model also produced a $RMSEA = 0.005$ ($90CI = 0.036$ to 0.074, $p = 0.310$), $CFI = 0.965$, $TLI = 0.95$, and $SRMR = 0.041$, indicating good fit of the model.

Structural Model

Using the respecified model obtained after analyzing the measurement model using CFA, we then respecified the model as the structural model and conducted SEM. Multicultural training practices (MCT) and broaching behaviors (BB) were identified as latent, exogenous variables (independent variables), and culturally missed opportunities
(CMO) and cultural humility development (CHD) were identified as latent, endogenous variables (dependent variables). We also reviewed the modification indices for suggested modifications; however, no additional suggestions were identified. The respecified structural model held as the best fitting model, with a chi-square, $\chi^2 = 73.656$ ($df = 38, p = 0.0005$), a $RMSEA = 0.055$ ($p = 0.310; 90CI = 0.036$ to $0.074$), $CFI = 0.965$, $TLI = 0.95$, and $SRMR = 0.041$.

Results indicated a moderately strong, positive correlation between MCT and counselor trainees’ perceptions of counselor educators’ broaching behaviors ($r = 0.639$) which was statistically significant ($p = 0, p \leq 0.05$). Furthermore, results indicated a negative association between MCT and CHD (PE = -0.140, $p = 0.841, p \leq 0.05$), while CMO positively predicted CHD (PE = 0.553, $p = 0.338, p \leq 0.05$) but neither variable reached statistical significance. Results also indicated a positive association between BB and CHD that was not statistically significant (PE = 1.146, $p = 0.268, p \leq 0.05$). Lastly, results indicated that the two indicators loading for MCT, type of multicultural course (COURSST) and use of experiential activities (EA), accounted for 51.5% and 45.9%, respectively, of variance on CHD, with statistical significance. CI, IC, and INF subscales of the BB factor account for 76.5%, 80.7%, and 83% variance, respectively, on CHD, with statistical significance. Lastly, each indicator for CMO exhibited statistically significant variance on CHD as well (MISSOP – 80%; ENCDISC – 78.5%; AVDTOP – 73.9%; DEEPDIS – 76.6%).

**Mediation**

Causal mediation analysis was conducted to identify the mediating effects of CMO between MCT, BB, and CHD. The bootstrap method was utilized to analyze the
mediation effect between the latent variables as it does not rely on normality and predicts accurate confidence levels amongst different mediation analyses (Cheung & Lau, 2008).

**MCT to CHD.** Upon conducting the causal mediation analysis to explore the mediating effects of CMO between MCT and CHD, results indicated a negative direct effect between MCT and CHD (DE = -0.140; \( p = 0.841 \)). Results also indicated a positive direct effect between MCT and CMO (DE = 0.164; \( p = 0.435 \)), and CMO and CHD (DE = 0.553; \( p = 0.338 \)). Results indicated that the overall indirect effect between MCT and CHD with CMO as a mediating factor was positive and did not reach statistical significance (IDE = 0.091; 95CI = -0.05 to 1.49; \( p = 0.858 \)). Therefore, CMO does not mediate the relationship between multicultural training practices and cultural humility development.

**BB to CHD.** Results indicated a positive direct effect between BB and CHD (DE = 1.146; \( p = 0.268 \)) and CMO and CHD (DE = 0.553; \( p = 0.338 \)) with statistical significance. Results also indicated a positive direct effect between BB & CMO (DE = 0.267; \( p = 0 \)) with statistical significance. The overall indirect effect between BB and CHD with CMO as a mediating variable was negative (IDE = -0.499; \( p = 0.568 \); 95CI = -2.109 to 0.094) but non-significant, suggesting that CMO is not a mediating variable.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between multicultural training practices, counselor trainees’ perceptions of counselor educators’ broaching behaviors, and cultural humility development of counselor trainees. The findings of this study suggest that multicultural training practices, including the type of course style and use of culturally focused experiential activities, may have a negative impact on counselor
trainees’ cultural humility development, although small. However, we found a significant association between counselor trainees’ perception of their counselor educators broaching behaviors and culturally missed opportunities. This association implies that in counselor education training, if counselor educators are perceived to have a more integrated or infused broaching style, counselor trainees also perceive counselor educators to have less missed opportunities to address cultural issues in the classroom. Furthermore, the strong positive correlation between perceptions of counselor educators’ broaching behaviors and cultural humility development implies that the development of counselor trainees’ cultural humility development may be influenced by counselor educators’ broaching behaviors. This is in alignment with the multicultural expectations of counselor educators to be able to address racial, ethnic, and cultural topics in a clinical setting with culturally diverse populations, to better prepare counselor trainees to be culturally aware and sensitive.

Additionally, cultural missed opportunities as a predictor of cultural humility development is important because it informs counselor educators of the impact that failing to incorporate and engage with cultural content has on the overall cultural development of counselor trainees. The MSJCC focuses on addressing the intersection between counselor and client identity and the counseling experience (Ratts et al., 2016), yet if counselor educators fail to embrace cultural opportunities in the classroom, counselor trainees may not develop the awareness or skills to emulate this behavior in their personal development or clinical practice as well. Findings also suggest that culturally missed opportunities do not mediate the relationship between multicultural training practices, broaching behaviors, and counselor trainees’ cultural humility.
development; however, it further supports the direct relationship between counselor educators’ broaching practices and the development of counselor trainees’ cultural humility development. Results support the idea that counselor trainees’ find value in counselor educators’ ability to openly discuss and reflect on their own cultural awareness, comfort, and experiences, as well as their ability to amplify positive racial, ethnic, and cultural environments in the classroom. Seward (2014) validates this notion as they identified that when counselor educators aim to improve the racial environment within the classroom through their pedagogical approach and openness to discuss cultural experiences, it improved the development of cultural awareness and sensitivity of students. Furthermore, the lack of association between training practices and cultural humility development aligns with the lack of clarity around effective multicultural training curriculum and practices within counselor education. Researchers have identified the benefit of using a one-course multicultural approach to multicultural training, while others have argued that requiring more than one course and using an infused or integrated approach to multicultural training is more sustainable (Celinska & Swazo, 2016; Kondili et al., 2022; Pieterse et al., 2009; Trull & Myers, 2020), yet this study could not substantiate which approach would be most effective.

**Limitations & Future Research**

A limitation in this study was the overall missing data rate. The number of missing data per item response was greater than anticipated for some response items which may have been associated with participant test fatigue, uncertainty, or discomfort with answering specific questions. The lack of response for some items also may have negatively influenced the factor structure of latent variables such as the multicultural
training factor. However, we used FIML to address missing data, which is considered one of the most unbiased methods to address missing data. Furthermore, the inability to calculate response rate was also a limitation. Response rate is an indicator of the appropriateness, quality, and representativeness of a sample (Holtom et al., 2022; Fan & Yan, 2010), thus the lack of data to calculate this value inhibits the ability to assess the overall quality of the sample. The standardized path coefficient of exceeding 1 when cultural humility development is regressed on broaching behaviors may also be a limitation, as it suggests that there may be a suppressor effect occurring between variables; however, other inferential statistics indicate that the model stands suggesting that perceived broaching behaviors are strongly correlated with the cultural humility development of counselor trainees.

Future researchers should consider the lack of generalizability of this study and examine multicultural training practices that contribute to doctoral level students’ cultural humility development by conducting a survey design to explore the relationship between their perceptions of their counselor educators broaching behaviors and their cultural humility development. Additionally, researchers should consider ways to examine what constitutes effective multicultural training practices in counselor education by conducting mixed method research in which they examine the correlation between counselor trainees’ multicultural training and client outcomes and gather feedback regarding aspects of the multicultural training practices that were most effective for counselor trainees. Lastly, future researchers should consider examining effective multicultural curriculum styles and practices that improve other components of counselors’ multicultural orientation. This can be achieved using correlational research to evaluate the association
between multicultural curriculum styles and other components of counselors’ multicultural orientation.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, this study examined the relationship between multicultural training practices and counselor trainees’ cultural humility development. Findings support the need to clarify what constitutes effective multicultural training practices in counselor education. The findings also support counselor educators addressing multicultural content via broaching practices to help develop counselor trainees’ cultural humility development. Researchers have indicated that broaching, when effectively implemented in a counseling setting, can result in an increase in trust and openness to discuss experiences related to one’s cultural identities (Bayne & Bronco, 2018). Therefore, when counselor educators effectively implement and model broaching racial, cultural, and ethnic topics in the classroom, it creates opportunities that allow for the development of counselor trainees’ cultural humility characteristics including their (a) levels of openness, (b) ability to engage in and experience supportive interaction, and (c) development of their self-awareness.
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Figure 4.1 Hypothesized Structural Model

Figure 4.2 Final Model
### Table 4.1 Demographics Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to Self-Describe</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer Not to Say</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 5.58  Std Dv. 1.511 Range| Min 1 Max 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genderqueer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonbinary/3rd Gender</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to self-describe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 3.33  Std Dv. 1.131 Range| Min 2 Max 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program of Study</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Mental Health</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage, Couples, &amp; Family</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Counseling</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Counseling</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 2.65  Std Dv. 0.834 Range| Min 1 Max 95

| Age                                   | Mean 30.71  Std Dv. 10.167 Range| Min 21 Max 68 |

### Table 4.2 Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original SM</td>
<td>133.691</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.926</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Model</td>
<td>73.656</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Five: Discussion

Counseling governing boards and organizations promote the integration of multicultural constructs and content into counseling education, practice, and scholarship through the set of competencies and professional guidelines established for the profession (ACA, 2014; CACREP, 2016; Ratts et al., 2016). Current literature highlights several critiques regarding the effective integration of multicultural content in counselor education, as well as raises questions regarding current multicultural training practices and their effectiveness in developing counselor trainees’ cultural awareness and sensitivity (Ancis & Rasheed, 2005; Mosher et al., 2017; Pieterse et al., 2009; Ratts et al., 2016; Sue et al., 2009). Ratts and colleagues (2016) developed the Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies (MSJCC) with the intent to clarify these concerns pertaining to multicultural development by promoting the examination of counselor and client inter- and intrapersonal intersectionality through a multicultural and social justice lens.

The collective purpose of the research in this dissertation was to advance multicultural training research in counselor education, which was achieved through two aims. The focus of study one was to examine current multicultural training literature in counseling and counseling-related fields to identify multicultural training practices that focus on developing counselor characteristics, specifically counselor trainees’ cultural humility. Building from the study one, the purpose of study two was to then examine the
relationship between multicultural training practices, broaching practices, and the cultural humility development of counselor trainees. Following I summarize the research questions, methodologies, results, and implications of the studies conducted.

**Research Questions**

The research question examined in study one was “how is cultural humility training implemented in counseling and counseling-related training programs?” The research questions of study two were: (a) “What is the relationship between current multicultural training practices, cultural broaching, and counselor trainees’ development of cultural humility characteristics within CACREP-accredited counselor education programs?” and (b) “do culturally missed opportunities serve as a mediating factor between multicultural training, cultural broaching, and counselor trainees’ development of cultural humility?”

**Methodology**

The methodology utilized in the first study was a systematic review. Following the preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P), I documented the processes used to identify articles examining multicultural training practices that focused on cultural humility development in counseling and counseling related fields. I also utilized the Mixed-Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) to evaluate the review process of the systematic review and the quality of the articles retained in the study. The methodology utilized in study two was a correlational survey design. In using this methodology, I examined the relationship between multicultural training practices, broaching practices, and cultural humility.
development. I also utilized structural equation modeling (SEM) to analyze the collected data.

**Summary of Results**

**Study One**

In study one, I found that researchers are exploring multicultural training practices that strive to develop counselor trainees’ cultural humility. A review of the literature resulted in the identification of six empirical articles (2 qualitative, 2 quantitative, and 2 mixed-method) that focused on cultural humility training and/or development in counseling or counseling-related educational programs. Outcomes of this systematic review indicate that fostering cultural humility development is a longitudinal process and requires intentional implementation of cultural content in educational practice. Intentional implementation of multicultural training practices may include (a) being mindful of the number of multicultural courses taken, (b) considering how cultural content is implemented within multicultural courses, (c) choosing pedagogical approaches that are multicultural and social justice focused and address power and privilege dynamics within the counseling experience, and (d) increasing access to resources that promote advocacy, and cultural awareness of social systems, self, and others.

**Study Two**

In study two, I utilized SEM to examine the extent to which the collected data supported the hypothesized model reflecting the potential relationship between cultural humility development, multicultural training, broaching behaviors, and culturally missed opportunities (see Figure 1.1). I also examined the hypothesized mediating effect of
culturally missed opportunities on cultural humility development, multicultural training practices, and broaching behaviors. The results of the study indicated that multicultural training practices, specifically the style of the course and completion of experiential activities, as well as culturally missed opportunities did not strongly predict counselor trainees’ cultural humility development. The relationship between culturally missed opportunities and multicultural training practices on cultural humility development were not statistically significant, suggesting that the small prediction observed may have occurred by chance or another factor. The results did indicate, however, that broaching behaviors predicted counselor trainees’ cultural humility development, and that there is a negative, statistically significant correlation between these two factors. Lastly, the results indicated that culturally missed opportunities did not have a mediating effect between multicultural training practices, broaching behaviors, and counselor trainees’ cultural humility development.

Implications of Research

Although none of our hypotheses were affirmed in study two, there are several implications that can still be discerned from this collection of studies. First, the hypothesis that counselor trainees’ cultural humility development was positively associated with multicultural training was not supported in study two, yet the review of existing literature in study one suggested that multicultural training practices does influence cultural humility development. This discrepancy is consistent with the multicultural training literature that highlights the lack of clarity regarding what constitutes effective multicultural training practices. The summarized outcomes of study one and results of study two collectively imply possible multicultural training practices
that counselor educators can implement to develop counselor trainees’ cultural humility that include: (a) intentionally implementing multicultural skills such as broaching, (b) using multiculturally grounded pedagogical tools, such as the cultural formulation tool, (c) acknowledging social justice issues, advocacy, and power and privilege dynamics within the counseling setting, (d) implementing curriculum that encourages self-monitoring, cultural re-evaluation (specifically of one’s own culture), and feedback processing, and (e) openly and effectively addressing cultural conversations that examine cultural identity when they occur (Harindranathan et al., 2021; Owen et al., 2016; Tormala et al., 2018). These strategies represent an active multicultural training approach focused on fostering the characteristics of cultural humility as outlined by Foronda and colleagues (2016), while also attending to the multicultural and social justice constructs outlined by the MSJCC (Ratts et al., 2016).

Furthermore, the results of study two did not support our hypothesis that cultural humility development was positively associated with counselor trainees’ perspectives of their counselor educators’ broaching behaviors. This result may be due to examining the relationship between counselor trainees’ overall perspectives of counselor educators’ broaching practices instead of their specific broaching styles. We did, however, find that there was a negative and statistically significant correlation between counselor trainees’ overall perspective of counselor educators’ broaching practices and cultural humility development. From this, we can imply that the broaching practices of counselor educators in fostering the cultural humility development of counselor trainees is imperative, and that counselor trainees’ cultural humility development is impacted by their perspective of their counselor educators’ broaching behaviors. Thus, study two implies that counselor
educators should also embody a level of willingness to actively engage with cultural content, which can influence the cultural development of counselor trainees. Day-Vines and colleagues (2007) describe the practice of broaching as the willingness to consider and address cultural content such as racial, ethnic, and cultural experiences in the counseling process, which includes the educational processes of counselor trainees. Thus, broaching in the classroom is a two-fold process that requires counselor educators to (a) embody a self-as-learner perspective rather than self-as-educator perspective so as to hear the cultural experiences of others and to then (b) effectively model how to address cultural content in the classroom, accounting for the differences in the perceived training experiences of counselor trainees of color and White counselor trainees as broaching has historically been centered around the multicultural development of White counselor trainees (Bayne & Bronco, 2018). This can help create equity in counseling training, better preparing counselor trainees to navigate the complexities associated with acknowledging, addressing, and effectively examining the intersectionality between race, culture, and experience in a counseling environment (Bayne & Bronco, 2018). Therefore, counselor educators should (a) effectively infuse racial, ethnic, and cultural content into their pedagogical and supervision approaches, (b) engage in facilitative conversation regarding cultural topics (Day-Vines et al., 2007), and (c) promote and assess counselor trainees’ characteristics and receptiveness to this practice in every stage of their development as future counselors.

The rejection of culturally missed opportunities as a mediator between broaching practices and cultural humility development was unexpected. Nonetheless, results of study two indicated a negative, significant association between culturally missed
opportunities and cultural humility development, implying that counselor educators who miss opportunities to engage with racial, ethnic, and cultural content has an impact on the cultural humility development of counselor trainees. This is concerning as outcomes from study one indicates counselor trainees feel less open to discuss racial, ethnic, and cultural content with group facilitators in comparison to feeling more open to discuss racial, ethnic, and cultural content with their peers, which resulted in improvement in counselor trainees’ cultural humility (Black & Gold, 2019). This suggests that counselor educators should assess barriers to openness when discussing racial, ethnic, and cultural content in the classroom. It also suggests that counselor educators should display (a) efforts to interact relationally with diverse cultures and (b) efforts to acknowledge and work through one’s limitations regarding cultural content (Hook et al., 2016), presenting with a level of humanness that counselor trainees may relate to and that will prompt them to engage with culturally diverse experiences in a culturally responsive and pragmatic way.

Researchers have also affirmed that being culturally humble is a life-long learning process (Foronda et al., 2016; Ratts et al., 2016). Therefore, studies one and two further affirm the call to continue to ensure counselor trainees are prepared to engage in multicultural and social justice-focused education, practice, and supervision that support (a) expanding cultural sensitivity, (b) awareness of privilege and power dynamics, (c) dismantling of personal biases, and (d) advocacy implementation. This is imperative to counselor education as legislation is currently being implemented on state levels that affect the ability to discuss and address multicultural and social justice issues in higher education (Morgan, 2022; Thomason, 2023). Counselors and counselor educators have an
ethical responsibility to examine the intersectionality between counselor and client identities and their experiences as part of their multicultural training and development. Thus, by recognizing the association between broaching racial, ethnic, and cultural content and missing opportunities, it reinforces the need to intentionally engage and effectively navigate cultural conversations when opportunities arise. This is important because it positions counselor trainees and counselor educators to (a) remain abreast to the impact of multiculturalism on the counseling experience (Ratts et al., 2016), (b) to address the intersecting identities experienced by racial, ethnic, and culturally diverse populations, and (c) to challenge policies and legislation that negate the ethical responsibilities of the counseling profession and further marginalize underrepresented populations.

**Limitations**

A limitation of this study surrounds the lack of clarity regarding what aspects of a counselor education program constitutes adequate multicultural implementation from a programmatic sense. In previous studies, researchers have indicated that the underrepresentation of racially and culturally diverse faculty and students decreases exposure to different cultural experiences and may maintain racial and cultural biases and stereotypes (Tomlinson-Clarke, 2000). Furthermore, researchers have suggested that cultural humility development is influenced by the number of multicultural courses taken, and the type of multicultural training received (Kondili et al., 2022; Trull & Myers, 2020), yet factors such as faculty diversity and course style were not supported as predicting indicators of cultural humility in this study. Researchers have also indicated the benefit of implementing culturally immersive experiential activities including
acknowledging the opportunities for increased awareness of self and others (Tomlinson-Clarke, 2000). This study failed to predict culturally immersive experiential activities as a factor for cultural humility development, however. Therefore, this study implies that further clarity is needed to determine what constitutes a strong, multicultural and social justice-focused counselor education program and how effective multicultural training can be implemented.

**Future Research**

Developing culturally humble clinicians is a necessity when considering the diversifying population and the needs they may experience because of their multicultural experiences. Therefore, future researchers may examine the correlation between the cultural humility of counselor educators and the development of counselor trainees’ cultural humility. Researchers may then examine the therapeutic outcomes of students under the supervision and guidance of culturally humble counselor educators and supervisors. Furthermore, researchers may also examine the effectiveness of multicultural training practices in counselor education programs that may be more traditional (including similar faculty, one-course curriculum, etc.) in comparison to those that may be more multicultural and social justice intensive (racially, ethnically, and culturally diverse faculty, use an infused multicultural and social justice curriculum, etc.). Lastly, researchers may explore the effectiveness of multicultural training practices on the remaining components of counselor’s multicultural orientation, cultural openness, and cultural comfort.
Conclusion

This research contributes to the counseling profession through the exploration of the relationship between multicultural training practices in CACREP-accredited counselor education programs and counselor trainees’ cultural humility. We highlighted the rationale for examining this relationship and provided a literature review of past and current scholarship regarding multiculturalism and cultural humility development in counselor education and supervision. Through a systematic review and empirical research study, we were able to conclude that there are effective strategies, that when implemented, may contribute to the development of counselor’s characteristics, such as their cultural humility. With the continually diversifying world in which we live, at minimum the outcome of this study provides specific practices that can be better outlined in the competencies and standards that govern the counseling profession. At most, it supports (a) broaching racial, ethnic, and cultural topics in the classroom and to use other multicultural strategies consistently when preparing future counselors at each level of development, (b) evaluating the characteristics of counselor educators and supervisors as this may influence the cultural humility development of counselor trainees, and to (c) examine programmatic practices to ensure that they are ethical and multicultural and social justice aligned in curriculum and practice.
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Lisa M. Johnson
ORC Assistant Director and IRB Manager
Appendix B: Initial Request for Participation

My name is Sabrina Johnson, and I am a doctoral candidate in the Counselor Education & Supervision program at the University of South Carolina, currently conducting my dissertation study. Can you please share the following information with the master’s level students in your Counselor Education program.

CALLING ALL MASTERS LEVEL COUNSELING STUDENTS ENROLLED IN A CACREP-ACCREDITED PROGRAM!!!

I would like to invite YOU to participate in a research study examining the relationship between multicultural training practices and cultural humility development. This survey should take you about 10-15 minutes to complete, and upon completing the survey you will be entered into a drawing to win a $10 Amazon gift card. Please complete the survey using the following link: https://uofsc.co1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0pr1kUidSRmN3oy.

I thank you in advance for your participation in this study, and if you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at john2379@mailbox.sc.edu.
Appendix C: Demographic Questionnaire

Demographic Items

1. What is your gender?
   - Agender
   - Cisgender
   - Female
   - Genderqueer
   - Male
   - Non-binary/3rd Gender
   - Transgender
   - Prefer to self-describe __________
   - Prefer not to say
   - Gender not listed

2. What is your age? _______ (open-ended question)

3. What is your racial identity?
   - African American
   - American Indian or Native American
   - Asian
   - Black
   - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   - White
   - Prefer to self-describe __________
   - Prefer not to say

4. Are you of Hispanic, Latino/a/x, or of Spanish origin?
   - Yes
   - No

5. If yes, what is your ethnicity.
   - Cuban
   - Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano/a/x
   - Puerto Rican
   - Another Hispanic, Latino/a/x or Spanish origin
   - Some other ethnicity, or origin
   - Prefer to self-describe __________
   - Prefer not to say
6. What is your program of study?
   School Counseling
   Marriage, Couples, & Family Counseling
   Clinical Mental Health
   Rehabilitation Counseling
   College Counseling

7. Is your program CACREP-accredited?
   Yes
   No
   I don’t know

8. What region is your counselor education program located?
   North Central Region
   Southern Region
   North Atlantic Region
   Western Region
   Rocky Mountain Region

9. Have you taken one or more multicultural course(s)?
   Yes
   No

10. Have the multicultural course(s) you have taken been required or elective?
    Required
    Elective
    I don’t know

11. How many multicultural courses have you taken? _________

12. Specify the style of multicultural training you have received in your program?
    (Integrated curriculum involves presenting cultural content that dismantles inaccurate information about culturally diverse groups. Infused curriculum involves all classes having a multicultural focus, and supports programming that attends to the culture-specific needs of special populations).
    One mandatory course
    More than one multicultural course
    Integrated curriculum
    Infused curriculum

13. Have you participated in an immersive cultural experiential activity (e.g., guest speakers with a culture-specific background, read culture-specific literature, etc.) in your multicultural course?
    Yes
    No
14. If so, choose the experiential activities that apply.
   - Culture-specific reading material
   - Guest speakers
   - Media (i.e., documentaries, films, podcasts, etc.)
   - All of the above
   - None of the above
   - Other __________

15. Have you participated in immersive cultural experiential activities in your other counseling course(s)?
   - Yes
   - No

16. If so, choose all experiential activities that apply.
   - Culture-specific reading material
   - Guest speakers
   - Media (i.e. documentaries, films, podcasts, etc.)
   - All of the above
   - None of the above
   - Other __________

17. How racial/ethnically diverse is the faculty in your counselor education program?
   - Not at all diverse in racial or ethnic identity (no racial/ethnically diverse faculty)
   - Minimally diverse in racial or ethnic identity (1-2 racial/ethnically diverse faculty)
   - Somewhat diverse in racial or ethnic identity (3-4 racial/ethnically diverse faculty)
   - Very diverse in racial or ethnic identity (5 or more racial/ethnically diverse faculty)

18. How many White faculty are in your counselor education program? _____

19. How many Black/African American faculty are in your counselor education program? _____

20. How many Asian/Asian American faculty are in your counselor education program? _____

21. How many Native American/Alaska Native/Hawaiian Pacific Islander faculty are in your counselor education program? _____

22. How many Hispanic/Latino/Latino faculty are in your counselor education program? _____

23. How gender diverse is the faculty in your counselor education program?
Not at all diverse in gender identity (All faculty identify as male and/or female)
Minimally diverse in gender identity (1-2 faculty identify as a gender other than
male and/or female)
Somewhat diverse in gender identity (3-4 faculty identify as a gender other than
male and/or female)
Very diverse in gender identity (5 or more faculty identify as a gender other than
male and/or female)

24. How many male faculty are in your counselor education program? ______
25. How many female faculty are in your counselor education program? ______
26. How many trans-identifying faculty are in your counselor education program?
   ______
27. How many gender queer identifying faculty are in your counselor education
   program? ______
28. How many agender faculty are in your counselor education program? ______

29. How diverse is the faculty in your counselor education program based on sexual
   orientation?
   Not at all diverse in sexual orientation
   Minimally diverse in sexual orientation
   Somewhat diverse in sexual orientation
   Very diverse in sexual orientation
Appendix D: Adapted Multidimensional Cultural Humility Scale

Each Section will use the following response items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted MCHS Scale Items

1. I am comfortable asking my professors about their cultural experience
2. I am comfortable asking my peers about their cultural experience.
3. I seek to learn about my professors’ cultural background.
4. I seek to learn about my peers’ cultural background
5. I believe that learning about different cultural backgrounds will allow me to be a better counselor
6. I seek feedback from my professors regarding working with diverse populations.
7. I seek feedback from my peers regarding working with diverse populations.
8. I incorporate feedback I receive from my professors when I am faced with problems regarding cultural interactions with diverse individuals
9. I incorporate feedback I receive from my peers when I am faced with problems regarding cultural interactions with diverse individuals
10. I am known by my professors to seek consultation when working with diverse individuals
11. I ask my professors about their cultural perspective on topics discussed in class
12. I ask my peers about their cultural perspective on topics discussed in class
13. I ask my professors to describe a problem based on their cultural background
14. I ask my peers to describe a problem based on their cultural background
15. I ask my professors how they cope with problems in their culture
16. I ask my peers how they cope with problems in their culture
17. I wait for others to ask about my biases before I discuss them
18. I do not necessarily need to resolve cultural conflicts with my peers
19. I do not necessarily need to resolve cultural conflicts with my professors
20. I believe the resolution of cultural conflict in the classroom is the professors’ responsibility
21. I enjoy learning from my weaknesses
22. I value feedback that improve my clinical skills
23. I evaluate my biases
Appendix E: Adapted Cultural Humility Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted Cultural Humility Scale (Other awareness)

Regarding the core aspect(s) of cultural content and discussion, my professor
1. Is respectful
2. Is open to explore
3. Assumes they already know a lot
4. Is considerate
5. Displays genuine interest in learning more about different cultures
6. Acts as if the dominant cultural perspective is superior
7. Is open to seeing things from different perspectives
8. Makes assumptions about different races, ethnicities, and cultures
9. Is open-minded
10. Is a know-it-all
11. Thinks they understand more than they actually do
12. Asks questions when they are uncertain
Appendix F: Adapted Culturally Missed Opportunity Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted CMO Scale

1. The counselor educators in my program missed opportunities to discuss my cultural background
2. I wish my professors encouraged discussion about my cultural background more
3. My professors avoided topics related to my cultural background
4. There were many chances to have deeper discussion about my cultural background that never happened
Appendix G: Adapted Broaching Attitudes and Behavior Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree or disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adapted Broaching Attitudes & Behaviors Scale

#### Avoidant Subscale
1. Broaching racial, ethnic, and cultural topics is not appropriate for problem solving in counselor education
2. I believe that the professors in my program only broach racial & cultural topics when students initiate such discussions
3. The racial identity of the professor does not matter when broaching racial & cultural topics
4. I am not sure that broaching is an effective pedagogical strategy
5. Discussions of race, ethnicity, and culture divert students from learning real counseling techniques and objective

#### Continuing/Incongruent Subscale
6. The professors in my program present with a sense of awkwardness when racial and cultural topics are discussed in class
7. I feel uncertain about my professors’ ability to broach racial and cultural topics with my peers who identify as a racial/ethnic minority
8. I feel uncertain about my professors’ ability to broach cultural factors with my peers who identify as White.
9. Sometimes my professors have difficulty identifying culturally aware responses when my peers who identify as a racial/ethnic minority talk about racial and cultural issues.
10. Sometimes my professors have difficulty identifying culturally aware responses when my peers who identify as White talk about racial and cultural issues.
11. Sometimes I have difficulty translating my professors’ broaching efforts into culturally responsive action.
12. I believe that observing my professors’ broaching behaviors impacts my effectiveness in broaching racial and cultural issues.

#### Integrated/Congruent Subscale
13. My professors generally broach racial and cultural factors throughout my courses
14. I believe that my professors have integrated the concept of broaching into their professional identity.
15. My professors encourage me to integrate the concept of broaching into my professional identity.
16. When my professors engaging with my peers who identify as racial/ethnic minorities, they broach issues of race and ethnicity.
17. When my professors engaging with my peers who identify as White, they broach issues of race and ethnicity.
18. My professors initiate discussions that help my peers understand that some issues may be connected to race and culture.
19. My professors typically broach racial and cultural factors over the course of the semester.

**Infusing Subscale**
20. My professors are socially & politically committed to the eradication of all forms of oppression.
21. My professors display the willingness to engage in advocacy and systemic change efforts.
22. My professors actively show commitment to eradicate all forms of oppression.
23. My professors act as change agents and advocates when students are the victim of overt or institutional racism
24. Professors should appreciate the daily experiences and challenges of their students who are culturally diverse.