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Chapter One

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study concerns the relationships between racial identity attitudes of White counselors and their responses to White clients presenting racial issues.

Justification for the Study

Statistics on the frequency of the occurrence of racial issues with White clients before this study have apparently not been compiled; however, it can be anticipated that the increasing pluralism of American society is likely to increase White clients' needs for help with racial issues. At this time there has been little research reported that can assist White counselors to field racial questions raised directly or indirectly by White clients, although preliminary research on Whites (e.g., Carter, 1987), theoretical discussions (e.g., Katz & Ivey, 1977; Helms, 1984), and same-race counseling investigations of Black dyads (Parham & Helms, 1981) indicate the problematic nature of this topic.

Questions about race in counseling have generally been considered because of concern about providing effective services for cross-racial dyads; but more recently,
Theorists (e.g., Helms, 1984) and researchers (e.g., Carter, 1990a) have looked at racial identity as a developmental process, in which the client's and counselor's stage of racial identity development is more salient than simply their respective race membership. In this case, the stage of racial identity development of client and counselor may have effects not only in cross-race dyads but also in same-race dyads (Helms 1984, 1990a). Investigation of racial identity effects in White counseling dyads is, therefore, a prerequisite step to developing a knowledge base that is useful for White counselors working with White clients who are presenting racial issues.

At present, exploratory research (e.g., Carter, 1987, 1990a) indicates that systematic racial identity differences do exist between Whites and that they do appear to have interactive effects on counseling process and outcome in White-White dyads. The purpose of this study was to follow up this research by focusing specifically on the relationship between White counselors' racial identity attitudes and the stance counselors adopt in responding to a White client presenting a racial issue.

Theoretical Rationale

Responding to the inconsistent research findings over years of studies of the impact of race on therapeutic outcome, theorists have developed models of racial identity
development to explain same-race variation (e.g., Helms, 1984). Such models provide a basis for investigating not only cross-race interactions but also same-race interactions. Thus Helms's model and theory (1984, 1990a) provides a framework for accumulating, organizing and analyzing racial identity data that clarifies interactions between White counselors and White clients with similar and differing racial identity attitudes. Such a body of knowledge should enhance the ability of White counselors to be effective with White clients presenting racial issues.

Helms's (1984, 1990a) model of White racial identity development suggests that White clients' and counselors' perceptions of and responses to racial issues brought into counseling vary according to their stage of racial identity development. In particular, White counselors' awareness of and ability to acknowledge a White client's racial issue as well as to empathize with the client's affective response to the issue are likely to be controlled by the counselor's stage of racial consciousness. Helms also hypothesizes about the attitudinal and behavioral predispositions that are likely to be brought into the counseling relationship by clients and therapists at different stages of racial consciousness (Helms, 1984, 1990a, 1990c). Furthermore, Helms suggests that the techniques and strategies appropriate for helping a client work through a racial issue are
also likely to vary, depending on the client's stage of racial identity (Helms, 1984, 1990a).

Helms's (1984) original model of White racial identity development describes five stages; her later model (1990a) adds a sixth stage. The model is summarized as follows.

In the simplest and least developed stage of White racial identity, Contact, a White person has limited social or occupational interaction with Blacks, tends to accept societal stereotypes about Blacks, and evaluates Blacks according to White criteria. The Contact White has little or no awareness of being White and has not thought about the moral issues of White racism.

The White counselor at the Contact stage knows little about non-White cultures but believes that therapists should not be prejudiced and that therapy skills apply equally to all individuals, regardless of race. The Contact-stage counselor is likely to overlook or minimize racial issues.

At the Disintegration stage of White racial identity, a White person has become aware of the moral issues of White racism and has greater awareness and conflict about being White. Questioning inequalities and taught racial beliefs, the Disintegration-stage White may come into conflict with other Whites but is also unsure how to interact with Blacks. The emotional discomfort of this stage may include feelings of guilt, depression, helplessness, and anxiety.
The White counselor at the Disintegration stage is likely to feel that typical counseling techniques do not work with minorities but does not know what can work. The counselor may project to the client the belief that Blacks and Whites cannot interact effectively.

At the Reintegration stage of White racial identity, the White person has resolved the conflicts of the Disintegration stage by returning to beliefs in White superiority and Black inferiority. Helms suggests that Reintegration Whites are likely to feel fear and anger toward Blacks. Whites at this stage may be either passive or active about their racial attitudes.

The Reintegration-stage counselor as a professional may feel that counselors should not be prejudiced against Blacks and therefore attempts to camouflage his or her anti-Black feelings, but Helms suggests that these feelings will be communicated to the client nonverbally. In addition, the Reintegration-stage counselor is likely to be unable to see the negative implications of behaviors in cross-racial situations.

In the Pseudo-Independent stage, White persons question racism, their definition of Whiteness, and their own contributions, intended or not intended, to racism. Whereas the Disintegration stage tends to be emotional, the Pseudo-Independent stage is primarily cognitive. Actions toward
Blacks may be well-intentioned but are likely still to arise out of unrecognized ramifications of belief in White superiority and Black inferiority. Racism encountered in other Whites, the lack of models of positive White racial identity, and Black suspicions toward the Pseudo-Independent White are sources of discomfort for the individual at this racial identity stage.

The White counselor at the Pseudo-Independent stage is likely to provide information and guidance for understanding racial issues but is also likely to have difficulty empathizing with the White client’s feelings surrounding racial issues.

At the Autonomy stage, the White person’s focus is on internalizing and further developing a positive White identity, increasing awareness and abandonment of all forms of racism and oppression, and ongoing openness to input about race and culture.

The Autonomy-stage counselor is expected to be willing to take on and even search for a client’s racial issues. He or she can also probably empathize with the White client’s frustration, anger and other feelings surrounding racial concerns. At this stage, the White counselor is able to support the client in searching for a more tolerant world.

In the later elaboration of her model, Helms (1990a) adds a sixth stage, Immersion-Emersion, thought to precede
the Autonomy stage. The Immersion-Emersion stage involves both cognitive and emotional restructuring, with work focused on obtaining accurate information about Blacks and Whites, working through past negative emotions, developing positive feelings about White identity, and shifting from wishing to change Black people to wishing to change White people.

Helms has not offered hypotheses on the likely predispositions of the Immersion-Emersion counselor, nor is the stage measured by the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale. Presumably the Immersion-Emersion counselor would be similar to the Autonomy counselor, but with less depth and knowledge in developing a positive White identity.

To summarize, Helms's model describes a process whereby Whites are thought to move from a state of not thinking about their race to learning that thinking about their race involves recognizing and dealing with their race's negative attitudes and actions toward another race. Individuals may retreat from struggling with these issues, or move from a primarily emotion-laden process to a cognitive one, but ultimately reach a stage in which they enjoy their White racial identity without needing to believe that other races are inferior.

Helms (1990c and 1990d) also theorizes that different combinations of racial identity in counseling dyads would
produce predictable relationship types. For White-White dyads, she suggests that parallel dyads, consisting of clients and counselors at the same stage of racial identity development, would be "stable, placid, and harmonious" (Helms 1990d, p. 178), with the individuals feeling supported and understood but unlikely to change in racial attitudes. In progressive dyads, the counselor is at least one stage further developed than the client; these dyads, Helms believes, would produce the greatest growth. Tension due to the racial issues would exist, increasing with the distance between the participants' stages. A third type of dyad is the regressive dyad, in which the client is at least one stage further developed than the counselor, with conflict (overt and covert) around racial issues increasing with the distance between the participants' stages and likely to inhibit their growth. Finally, Helms predicted that certain dyads, which she labeled crossed, would be the most conflicted. For White-White dyads she identified the pairing of a White Reintegration counselor with a Contact client as a crossed dyad. This relationship type would create disharmony, fear, and conflict and would be least likely to promote growth.

Helms' model and theory state that counselors at different stages of racial identity development deal differently with racial issues and will respond differently
to clients of varying racial identity development, especially when racial concerns are a counseling issue. Helms also predicts optimal and antithetic dyadic combinations of racial identity attitudes. Using Helms’s model, this study examined the relationship of White counselors’ racial identity attitudes with their responses to a White client presenting a racial issue.

Definitions of Terms

**Crossed dyads:** relationships in which the two individuals hold opposite racial views; in White-White counseling dyads, the combination of a Reintegration counselor with an Autonomy client is considered a crossed dyad; the combination of Contact and Reintegration stages in a dyad is also considered crossed (Helms, 1990c, 1990d).

**Interaction model:** Helms’s systematic description of the anticipated dynamics and effects resulting from various combinations of racial identity development in same-race dyads (Helms, 1984, 1990c, 1990d).

**Parallel dyads:** relationships in which the two individuals share the same stage of racial identity development (Helms, 1990c, 1990d).

**Progressive dyads:** in counseling, the dyad is considered progressive if the counselor is at least one stage further advanced than the client (Helms, 1990c, 1990d).
Racial identity: "a sense of group or collective identity based on one's own perception that he or she shares a common racial heritage with a particular racial group" (Helms, 1990e, p. 3). As Helms explains, this sense of identity is distinct from a person's racial categorization. In addition, racial identity is not the same as ethnicity (Helms, 1990e, p.4).

Racial identity theory: description of the ways in which persons perceive themselves as identifying with, or not identifying with, their apparent racial group (Helms, 1990e, p. 5). Racial identity theory thus deals with psychological development and adjustment as related to racial group membership.

Regressive dyads: in counseling, a dyad is considered regressive if the client is at least one stage further advanced than the counselor (Helms, 1990c, 1990d).

Stages of racial identity: particular progressive steps through which racial identity is thought to develop; in most models, five or six stages of increasing racial awareness and adjustment are hypothesized.

Contact: Helms's first stage of White racial identity development, in which Whites have little interaction with Blacks, tend to accept stereotypes about Blacks, have little awareness of being White, and
have not thought about the moral issues of White racism.

**Disintegration:** Helms's second stage of White racial identity development, in which Whites become aware of the moral issues of White racism, question inequalities and racist beliefs, and experience feelings of guilt, depression, helplessness, and anxiety.

**Reintegration:** Helms's third stage of White racial identity development, in which Whites resolve the conflicts of the second stage by returning to beliefs in White superiority and Black inferiority and experience feelings of fear of and anger against Blacks.

**Pseudo-Independence:** Helms's fourth stage of White racial identity development, in which Whites work intellectually on issues of racism, their White identity, and their own contributions to racism.

**Immersion-Emersion:** In Helms's fifth stage of White racial identity development, Whites work on obtaining accurate information about Blacks, developing positive feelings about White identity, and shifting from wishing to change Black people to seeing a need to change White people.
Autonomy: Helms's sixth stage of White racial identity development, in which Whites focus on a positive White identity, increase their awareness and abandon all forms of racism and oppression, and maintain openness to input about race and culture.

Research Questions

This study collected data that focused on the following research questions:

(1) Do White counselors' attitudes toward, and thinking about, a White client presenting a racial issue differ, depending on the counselor's racial identity development?

(2) Do White counselors' attitudes toward, and thinking about, a White client presenting a racial issue differ in the following predictable ways:

(a) Does a counselor with a client at a parallel stage of racial identity development reflect harmony with the client rather than conflict, but little inclination toward change in racial attitudes (parallel dyad)?

(b) Does a counselor with a client at a less advanced stage of development reflect some tension but also more intent and hope for growth related to the racial issue (progressive dyad)?

(c) Does a counselor with a client at a more advanced stage of development reflect tension and no hope for growth related to the racial issue (regressive dyad)?
(d) Does a counselor with a client holding views about Blacks and Whites opposite to the counselor’s views reflect tension and no hope for growth related to the racial issue (crossed dyad)?

(3) Do older, more experienced counselors differ from younger, less experienced counselors in their degree of racial identity development?

Sample Description and General Data Gathering Procedure

Samples previously studied in this research, as will be detailed in Chapters Two and Three, have been limited to university students or volunteers at multicultural counseling workshops; the general population of counselors in the field has not been tapped. The accessible population of working counselors used for this study is the membership of the National Board of Certified Counselors. Nonwhite counselors certified by the Board in the three selected states of Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania comprise about 1,635 professionals. These counselors hold at least a master’s degree in counseling or an equivalent degree and have fulfilled other qualifications to obtain certification.

The sample was asked to respond to a mail survey, consisting of a demographics and background sheet, a brief survey of counseling-related racial concerns, a case description, a case questionnaire, and the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale (WRIAS).
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Review of the Literature

Chapter Two

Historical and Theoretical Development: Racial Identity

Studies of the impact of race on therapeutic outcomes have yielded inconsistent findings, as noted by a number of reviewers (e.g., Parloff, Waskow & Wolfe, 1978; Atkinson & Schein, 1986). These inconsistencies have led to the conclusion that the significant variable related to race may not be simply the race of client and therapist but rather their attitudes about race (e.g., see Parloff et al., 1978). More specific explanations of racial variability have been offered by typologists (e.g., see Vontress, 1971, or Terry, 1977) and next by developmental theorists, who have proposed stage models of racial identity development (e.g., Carney & Kahn, 1984; Helms, 1984). Stage theories in particular provide a systematic framework for examining attitudes related to race.

The earliest racial identity development theories, reviewed by Helms (1990b), proposed stages of Black racial consciousness development. As observed by Sabnani, Ponterotto, and Borodovsky (1991), most racial identity research has been directed to Black racial identity
development. However, three stage models of White racial identity development have been proposed. The earliest of these stage models was offered by Hardiman (cited in Helms, 1990a), who described White persons as experiencing four stages of racial identity development: an initial stage of Acceptance, in which White persons unconsciously accept identification with Whiteness and also accept stereotypes about their own and other groups; a second stage of Resistance, during which White individuals question assumptions about Whites and begin to face racial issues; a third stage called Redefinition, in which White persons work on developing a nonracist White identity and recognize the uniqueness of all races; and a fourth stage, in which White individuals work on internalizing their nonracist White identity.

The second model of White racial identity development was proposed by Helms (1984) and is described in Chapter One.

The third model of White racial identity development presented by Sabnani et al. (1991) describes Ponterotto’s (1988) five-stage model. In the Preexposure stage, White individuals have not explored their own ethnic identities and have given little thought to racial discrimination or multicultural issues. During the Exposure stage, White persons begin to examine their roles as Whites in society,
as well as questioning their cultural values and issues of racism. This stage is accompanied by guilt and anger. White individuals may next enter the Zealot stage, in which they take a prominority stance, or the Defensive stage, in which they retreat from intercultural contact and issues and seek only same-race relations. In the final stage of Integration, White individuals experience greater balance in multicultural interests as well as respect for and appreciation of cultural differences.

These three models have been examined and compared by Sabnani et al. (1991). They note that, although the models were developed in three different contexts (Hardiman's in social identity theory, Helms's in racial relations, and Ponterotto's in majority-group counselor training), there is basic agreement across the models that White individuals begin at a stage of naivete and unawareness of racial identity and racism, progress through stages of increasing awareness and questioning accompanied by negative affect (guilt, anger, depression), may withdraw from these issues and/or attempt to become prominority in stance, and begin work on developing a positive White identity, together with acceptance of racial and/or cultural differences.

In reviewing the three models of White racial identity development, Sabnani et al., referring to the work of Helms and her colleagues with Helms's (1984) racial relations
model, state that the "single most significant advancement in cross-cultural practice and research in the last decade centers on the salience of both the client's and counselor's racial-identity development" (Sabnani et al., 1991, p. 77). In fact, although Ponterotto's (1988) model of White racial identity development is concerned with racial consciousness in White counseling trainees, only Helms's (1984) model attempts to explain the effects of racial identity developmental stages in terms of counselors' perceptions, affect, and behavior, as well as interaction with clients' stages of racial identity development. In addition, only Helms (1990a, 1990d) theorizes about racial identity effects in White-White dyads. Finally, at this time only Helms's model has been investigated and supported by research.

Helms's (1984) original model of White racial identity development was based on interviews with Whites and drew on theories of culture shock. Since then, Helms and colleagues (Carter & Helms, 1990; Helms, 1990f) have examined psychological correlates of White racial identity, and Helms has expanded her description of the characteristics of the stages and the critical incidents and psychological processes likely to be involved in the process of development (Helms, 1990a). In addition, Helms and Carter (1990) have developed an instrument for measurement of the
stages of development in Helms's model (see discussion of the WRIAS below and in Chapter Three).

**Theoretical Development: Helm's Model of White Racial Identity Development**

Helms (1990a) identifies White racism in the United States as an historical outgrowth of slavery and notes that in this country Blacks are the main reference group for Whites, the object of Whites' beliefs and attitudes that shape their racial identity development. Others (e.g., Comer, 1980) agree with this view. Like Helms, a number of other writers have also seen racism as interfering with the development of a positive White identity, as well as involving negative affect and distortions in thinking (Dennis, 1981; Karp, 1981; Katz & Ivey, 1977). In addition, all three models of White racial identity development reviewed by Sabnani et al. (1991) agree in describing racism as an obstacle in early stages that must be overcome to permit later stages of development. In this respect, Helms's model differs from the other two in that she specifies anti-Black racism rather than racism in general. Helms's specificity may reduce the relevance of her model in geographic areas of the country where the primary minority is not Black; on the other hand, the specificity of the model may be one of the characteristics that has permitted and encouraged research based on her model.
In the later, more comprehensive explication of her model, Helms (1990a) integrates findings of other researchers and theorists. The tendency of Whites to not think about their own race, as in Helms's first stage of White racial identity development (Contact) has also been discussed by Katz and Ivey (1977) and Terry (1981). Negative feelings and inner processes associated with racism and negative White identity, which Helms classifies primarily with the second and third stages of development (Disintegration and Reintegration) were also described by Karp (1981) and Dennis (1981).

In addition, Helms explains the emotional conflicts experienced by an individual in the Disintegration stage as consistent with effects predicted by other, more general theory. That is, White persons beginning to question and reject former racial beliefs and stereotypes must deal with conflict with other Whites or disguise their thoughts and feelings from other Whites. Those who choose disguise to keep the acceptance of others, according to Rogers (1951), will experience the emotional discomfort of incongruence. Helms suggests that incongruence at the Disintegration stage is the origin of such negative feelings as guilt, depression, helplessness, and anxiety reported by other authors as characteristics of Whiteness (e.g., Karp, 1981).
Helms suggests that Whites at the Disintegration stage experience conflicting feelings and beliefs, an unpleasant psychological state labeled "dissonance" by Festinger (1957). According to Festinger, persons experiencing dissonance may resolve this uncomfortable state by changing their behavior, changing an environmental belief, or developing new beliefs. The resolution of this dissonance, Helms believes, leads the White person into the next stage of development (Reintegration) and usually involves the choice of changing beliefs to gain acceptance among other Whites; that is, returning to beliefs in White superiority and Black inferiority.

The gradual development of positive White identity, which Helms classifies as the Pseudo-Independent, Immersion-Emersion, and Autonomy stages of White racial identity development, has also been described by Dennis (1981) and Karp (1981), and has been similarly included in the other two models of White racial identity development reviewed by Sabnani et al.

According to Helms’s model, racial identity development is driven by experience and critical incidents. She presents explanations of how individuals may transition from one stage of racial identity development to the next but does not directly discuss whether all White individuals cycle through the stages and whether the order is always
progressive and unidirectional. Sabnani et al. present somewhat different views in the discussion of their modified model restricted to majority-group counseling trainees. They suggest that trainees may become stuck at a stage or may cycle back through earlier stages. A related comment by Helms (1990a) on her model is that the stages each have their own effect on attitudes, behaviors, and emotions and that these may not all develop at the same rate (p. 66). These qualifying statements raise the question that the stagewise progression of the model may exist in pure form in conceptualization only, with individual instances in reality presenting mixed arrays of attitudes, behaviors, and emotions associated with the different stages, and especially adjacent stages. Neither Helms nor Sabnani et al. cite research investigating the progressive development posited by the racial identity models.

Helms (1990f) also reviews the examination of other variables, such as socioeconomic class or interracial contact, which could be alternative explanations of racial variability, and noted that research has not established a decisive link between these variables and the racial attitudes of Whites toward Blacks. Although Helms notes that research in this area is not exhaustive, the inconsistent findings of research that has been carried out imply again that racial identity is complex and permit
speculation that a developmental psychological process rather than a simple cause-effect phenomenon accounts for the inconsistencies. The involvement of thought processes is supported by another study cited by Helms (Carlson and Iovini, 1985), in which the researchers investigated the relationship between adolescents' racial attitudes and their fathers' racial attitudes and found the strongest correlation to occur between the boys' racial attitudes and their perceptions of their fathers' attitudes, rather than their fathers' actual attitudes.

Reviewing earlier research, Helms (1990f) cites findings of three studies that correlate Whites' self-esteem negatively with anti-Black attitudes but was unable to locate research on positive White identity. These findings are consistent with Helms's contention that at earlier stages of White racial identity development, characterized by White racism, Whites tend to lack a positive White identity.

**Summary**

Helms's model of White racial identity development is consistent with other proposed models and is consistent with the discussions and findings of other theorists and researchers, as well as consistent with the theories of Rogers and Festinger. Although evidence supports the existence of different stages of racial identity
development, the progression of the stages has not been investigated empirically. Nevertheless, the model appears to provide an appropriate basis for research into variability in White racial identity development.

**Supplemental Research: Measurement of White Racial Identity Development**

Research based on Helms's model of White racial identity development has focused on creating instrumentation to measure identity development and on seeking empirical support for the model. The White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale developed by Helms and Carter (1990) has been used by researchers in studies of Helms's model. The psychometric properties of the WRIAS will be presented in Chapter Three.

As noted above, both Sabnani et al. and Helms suggest that racial identity develops differentially in its various aspects. Helms notes that the behaviors, emotions, and cognitions distinguishing the stages evolve at different rates; Sabnani et al. even believe individuals may cycle back through earlier stages. These qualifications imply that measuring where an individual is stagewise at any particular time presents complex dimensions, although stage assessment would not appear nearly so complicated and difficult as attempting to evaluate individuals' past development or predict their future.
In constructing the WRIAS, Helms and Carter (1990) assumed that each stage of racial identity development, as in Helms's model, is distinguished by the individual’s attitudes about self as a White and about Whites in general, as well as attitudes about Blacks and the individual’s relationship to Blacks. Also as in the model, the stages progress from least awareness and acceptance of race to most awareness and acceptance of race, and from least awareness of racism to most awareness of racism.

Factor analysis of the five WRIAS subscales (Helms & Carter, 1990) reflects the complexities of the stages of development. Many items loaded on more than one of the eleven factors identified, with items from adjacent scales tending to load in the same direction. The factors include: (1) White superiority and avoidance of Blacks; (2) anxiety or insecurity in the presence of Blacks; (3) naivete about race; (4) anger and frustration related to race; (5) perceived injustice to Whites; (6) knowledge about Black culture; (7) willingness to learn about Black culture; (8) belief in racial equality in interpersonal relationships; (9) lack of awareness of race; (10) comfort with biracial interpersonal situations; (11) familial influences on racial obliviousness.

A series of studies have compared findings on the WRIAS and other instruments. With the same sample used for their
factor analysis of the WRIAS (n = 506), Carter and Helms (1990) compared results from the WRIAS and the Intercultural Values Inventory (Kohls, Carter & Helms, cited in Carter & Helms, 1990) and found racial identity attitudes to be differentially related to cultural values, supporting Helms’s description of White racial identity as more complex than simple race membership and also different from ethnicity. In a study of Midwestern students (n = 100), Carter (1990b) found racism to be differentially related to White racial identity attitudes, with different effects by gender. This study supports the conclusion that White racial identity is complex and includes a racism dimension but is not synonymous with racism.

A preliminary study by Claney and Parker (1989) examined interracial comfort in 339 White southeastern undergraduates and found that the highest perceived comfort in the presence of Blacks was associated with Contact and Autonomy attitudes. This finding is consistent with Helms’s description of Contact attitudes of unawareness of race and Autonomy attitudes of acceptance of race. The limitation of this study is its use of a short ad hoc measure (3 items per subscale) rather than the WRIAS.

A basic premise of Helms’s model, that the progression of the stages of racial identity development is associated with greater mental health, has been tested by Tokar and
Swanson (1991). They found that scores on three scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory (Shostrom, 1963) indicated that higher degrees of self-actualization were associated with more advanced racial identity development, as measured by the WRIAS (n = 308). As noted earlier, lower self-esteem has been found associated with earlier stages of racial identity development; the addition of evidence of increased positive identity in later stages of development thus contributes to support Helms's full spectrum of predicted development. These findings do not, however, address the chronological progression of the stages.

The most basic question posed by Helms's theory of racial identity development is whether simple race membership or racial identity development is more significant for individuals. Gathering data from simulated counseling dyads, Carter (1990a) compared the salience of simple race membership to the salience of racial identity attitudes and found a preponderance of evidence in favor of racial identity attitudes. The racial makeup of these dyads was primarily White-White, suggesting that same-race differences in racial identity attitudes comprise a significant variable. The study is limited by the small n (19 White-White dyads), which did not permit the more desirable analysis of results by multiple regression. Another limitation on the generalizability of the study is
that, although the sample were all counselors or graduate students in counseling, they were also all volunteers obtained from among the participants in multicultural counseling workshops.

Helms’s (1990c) description of White counselors at different stages of racial identity development, as well as her predictions about various White dyadic combinations (1990c, 1990d) has been examined in one major exploratory study by Carter (1987, 1990a). As described above, Carter’s primary question was to examine the salience of racial identity attitudes versus simple race membership in simulated counseling dyads. Using the WRIAS, a measure of therapist’s intentions (Hill & O’Grady, 1985), a measure of client reactions (Hill, Helms, Spiegel, & Tichenor, 1988), and affective measures, Carter attempted also to test Helms’s interaction model (Helms, 1984, 1990c). Correlations for race alone did not exceed the number expected by chance, but Carter found a number of significant relationships between racial attitudes, counselor intentions, and client reactions.

For his 1990 report on this study, Carter (1990a) used Pearson correlations to analyze the relationships between client and counselor racial identity attitudes and each of 19 possible counselor intentions and 19 possible client reactions, noting that for the 19 White–White dyads, 10 of
these correlations could be expected to be significant by chance; he found 37 significant correlations. With nearly a third of these results possibly significant by chance alone, his specific findings must then be regarded as very tentative.

Another difficulty lies in interpreting the findings in terms of Helms's interactive model and her predictions about the tendencies of clients and counselors at various stages of racial identity. Clients and counselors in the study reviewed tapes of themselves after the 15-minute simulations and recorded their reactions and intentions, respectively, to each taped response of the other, selecting from the 19 categories of the therapist intention and client reaction measures. However, the specific responses and the specific content of discussion between dyadic members were not a topic of study. In particular, the chain of thought content between counselors' racial attitudes, as measured by the WRIAS, and their choices of micro-intentions, as measured by Hill and O'Grady's therapist intention instrument, was not intended for elucidation in this study, which focused on examining whether relationships do exist between racial identity attitudes and therapist intentions. Since Carter did establish correlations between these variables, understanding the nature of these relationships further requires attempting to examine the thought processes
by which they are connected. Much of Carter's (1987) discussion of his findings focus on estimating how the significant relationships can be interpreted in terms of Helms's model, which involves speculating about the yet-unexamined processes of thought engaged in by the counselors. The present study focused on elucidating intermediary thought products that may connect racial identity attitudes to counselors' choices of behaviors.

Carter's subjects in his study, as reported in 1987, were participants in multicultural training workshops and as such represent a special population. The sample was particularized even more because only volunteers participated in the simulations and only volunteers among the volunteers contributed their recordings to the study. Unfortunately, Carter does not mention in either report how many were unwilling to be included in the study. Another risk is that findings are artifacts of the relatively small n of 19 dyads, or 38 individuals. Carter does not report the racial identity profiles of the sample.

Analyzing the data from this somewhat special sample, Carter found seven different counselor intentions and seven client reactions correlated with White counselor racial identity attitudes in the White-White dyads; and White client racial identity attitudes in the dyads correlated significantly with six client reactions and eleven counselor
intentions. Overall, Carter (1990a) concludes that counselor intentions in White-White dyads may be more influenced by racial attitudes than are client reactions.

Carter's findings can be interpreted as generally consistent with Helms's (1984, 1990a) predictions about the characteristic tendencies of White counselors at different stages of racial identity. Helms suggests that Contact-stage counselors are likely to overlook or minimize racial issues, and Carter found negative correlations between high levels of Contact attitudes in counselors and the reported counselor intentions of Set Limits, Hope, and Clarify. Since the clients were instructed to discuss a racial issue in the counseling simulation, it appears that Contact counselors did not wish to encourage hope, to offer structure, or to clarify the issue. High levels of Contact attitudes in counselors also related negatively to reported client reactions of Relief and No Reaction (see Figure 2-2), suggesting that clients did not feel benefited. However, counselors' Contact attitudes also correlated positively with Better Understanding, a result that appears to contradict the other findings, as well as Helms's predictions.

Disintegration attitudes in counselors were positively related to the counselor intentions of Hope and Behaviors and to client reactions of Relief, Got Unstuck, and
Ineffective. These results do not seem consistent with Helms's description of Disintegration counselors as being unsure of what will work interracially and covertly communicating that Blacks and Whites cannot interact effectively. Possibly these findings are an artifact of the multicultural workshop context.

Helms predicted that Reintegration counselors would communicate their negative attitudes nonverbally, and this prediction could be considered supported by the finding that while high levels of Reintegration attitudes in counselors correlated positively with the overt intentions of Set Limits, Hope, and Behaviors, they also correlated with the client reaction of Lack Direction. Counselors' Reintegration attitudes also correlated negatively with the intention of Feelings, which seems consistent with Helms's contention that Reintegration counselors would be unlikely to express racially related feelings.

High levels of Pseudo-Independent attitudes in the counselors correlated with the intentions of Get Information and Self-control, both consistent with the described cognitive focus of this stage and Helms's prediction that Pseudo-Independent counselors would be able to provide information and guidance for understanding racial issues but would have difficulty working with the client's feelings.
There were no significant correlations of counselors’ Pseudo-Independent attitudes with client reactions. Similarly, Autonomy attitudes in counselors did not correlate significantly with any client reactions but did correlate negatively with the intentions of Hope and Behaviors. This finding would appear to be the reverse of Helms’s expectation that Autonomy counselors would actively seek to take on a client’s racial issues, would be capable of empathizing with the client, and would be able to support the client’s attempts to deal with racial issues. It may be, however, that the Autonomy counselor is not so tolerant and empathic with Whites who are at less fully developed stages of racial identity; or perhaps the Autonomy counselor lacks knowledge or skills for helping other Whites with their racial issues.

High levels of Contact attitudes in clients were found to be related to the counselor intentions of Support, Feelings, and Reinforce Change, and to the client reactions of Support and Understood. These findings could be considered consistent with Helms’s description of Contact clients as approaching matters more simply, being less in conflict than those at other stages, and being relatively unaware of deeper conflict.

By contrast, clients’ high levels of Disintegration attitudes correlated negatively with the counselor intention
of Set Limits and positively to the client reaction of Ineffective. These findings do not seem inconsistent with Helms's predictions, but they also do not seem particularly to support it, although "ineffective" may reflect the client's frustration and feelings of inner conflict, as predicted by Helms.

Reintegration attitudes in clients were found to be negatively correlated with the counselor intention of Cathart but had no significant relationships with client reactions. This finding could raise the question of whether or not the overt or covert anger postulated by Helms in the Reintegration stage could have elicited reluctance in counselors to invite the client to express feelings.

Clients' Pseudo-Independent attitudes were found to be negatively related to the counselor intentions of Give Information and Cognitions and positively related to the client reaction of New Perspective. Helms sees this stage as primarily a cognitive one, with which the client reaction of New Perspective is consistent. Since a client in this stage would presumably be interested in information and cognitions, it is curious that this relationship is negative. However, Helms comments that Pseudo-Independent individuals often believe they know more about racial issues than they do, and this might elicit an opposite reaction in the counselor.
Autonomy attitudes in clients were negatively related to the counselor intentions of Get Information, Change, Relationship, and Therapist Needs and negatively related to client reactions of Responsibility and Lack Direction. These findings may make better sense in terms of Helms’s predictions about relationship types, since an Autonomy client, unless teamed with an Autonomy counselor, is in a regressive dyad.

In exploring the interactive effects between counselors’ and clients’ stages of racial identity development, Carter’s study of White dyads focuses on the immediate intentions of counselors and their clients’ immediate reactions. Although counselor effectiveness in dealing with racial issues is not directly a focus of his investigation, it is notable that Carter’s exploratory findings noticeably do not suggest that White counselors dealing with White clients’ racial issues obtain more positive client reactions if the counselors are at later stages of racial identity development. This trend appears to be inconsistent with Helms’s interactive model and suggests a need for further investigation.

Carter also analyzed the dyads as progressive, parallel, or regressive relationships and found no significant differences on a battery of measures between the dyadic types. Within each type, he identified significant
relationships with counselor intentions and client reactions, but the pattern of these relationships does not seem clear. Part of the difficulty in this analysis is that it requires assigning individuals to discrete developmental stages, a step Helms herself cautions researchers against (Helms, 1986), noting that a single scale score is an inadequate measure of a person's stage of racial identity.

Carter's study indicates some possible trends in counselor thinking that appear partly supportive of Helms's model, but, as exploratory research, it does not clearly describe the relationships between counselors' racial identity attitudes and their choice of responses to clients' racial issues. Since the "clients" in Carter's simulated dyads chose their own racial topics, the findings might have been impacted by the varying salience of particular racial issues. The choice of issue may be a variable that needs to be controlled in this research.

Summary

Research based on Helms's model supports the conclusions that racial identity attitudes are more salient than simple race membership in counseling simulations and that positive mental health increases with later stages of development of racial identity. White racial identity attitudes have been shown to be differentially related to cultural values, racism, and perceived comfort with Blacks.
Exploratory study suggests that in White-White dyads, counselor intentions and client reactions are related to White racial identity attitudes as predicted by Helms's model of racial identity development. Some of Helms's predictions about dyadic interactions appear supported, but differences between dyadic types, predicted by Helms's interaction model, were not found. This research did not control for the salience of the racial issues used in the counseling simulations.

Further understanding of the relationships between White racial identity attitudes and counselor intentions would seem to require attempting to examine the thought processes linking these variables. Such research may also elucidate dyadic interactions. The present study focused on examining the relationship between White counselors' racial identity attitudes and thought products predicted to intercede between such attitudes and counselors' choice of intentions in a case presented by a White client with a racial issue. Presentation of a single case was intended to control for the salience of the racial issue, which was not controlled in the earlier research.

White Racial Identity: The Sample Population

Nearly all the subjects in the White racial identity development research completed before this study were students, primarily from undergraduate psychology courses,
and were drawn from eastern or midwestern universities
(Helms & Carter, 1990, 506 eastern university students;
Carter, 1990b, 100 midwestern university students; Claney &
Parker, 1989, 339 southeastern university students; Tokar &
Swanson, 1991, 308 midwestern university students). Both
men and women are well represented, but socioeconomic class
is generally middle to upper-middle class, and median ages
are young (e.g., both Claney and Parker and Tokar and
Swanson reported median ages between 19 and 20).

The present study investigated a different population,
a sample of experienced counselors in the field. The
developmental nature of Helms' model implies that data
based on young, relatively inexperienced individuals is
likely to be different from data drawn from older,
experienced individuals. Thus the preliminary norms
published by Helms and Carter (1990) might not be
appropriate comparisons for older groups. In fact, a
comparison of WRIAS means published for undergraduate groups
(Helms & Carter, 1990; Tokar & Swanson, 1991) with the WRIAS
means of an older group of advanced graduate students, all
of whom were experienced in the field (Evans & Ochs, 1991),
reflects differences in the directions postulated by Helms:
earlier stages would be expected to become less salient as
later stages become more developed. Accordingly, the WRIAS
means for the older students were lower than the younger
students' means for the first four stages of development but higher for the Autonomy stage. It was anticipated that these apparent differences might be supported by statistically significant differences in larger samples of older individuals, reflecting similar profiles to this small group (n = 14) of older students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Helms</th>
<th>T &amp; S</th>
<th>E &amp; O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>32.4 (+1.5)</td>
<td>29.4 (-1.5,-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>25.09</td>
<td>25.61 (+.52)</td>
<td>22.6 (-2.49, -3.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>25.56 (+.49)</td>
<td>18.4 (-6.67, -7.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>36.08</td>
<td>37.24 (+1.16)</td>
<td>34.36 (-1.72, -2.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>33.71</td>
<td>35.06 (+1.35)</td>
<td>38.7 (+4.99, +3.64)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other than Evans and Ochs (1991), who were exploring effects of multicultural training of advanced graduate students, Carter's (1987) study is apparently the only one to include individuals with a wide age range (21-60; m = 33.97), as well as a number of experienced counselors. However, Carter did not report the descriptive statistics for the WRIAS in his study, nor did he analyze his data for age effects.

Several alternative explanations, other than a developmental effect, may account for a shift in older individuals' WRIAS means. The experiences of age cohorts may differ in ways affecting their WRIAS scores. This explanation would not be inconsistent with Helms's model,
which postulates that racial identity development is experience-driven; but if differing history rather than accumulated history is the primary influence, it would be inappropriate to generalize findings from one age cohort to the next.

A second possible explanation of differences between a group like Evans and Ochs's sample and the student samples studied by other investigators may be related to both their training and their experience. That is, as mental health professionals, the older group has been trained to believe that they should not be racist (cf. Helms, 1990a). In addition, they have been trained in the use and interpretation of tests and are more likely than general populations or students to be aware of response sets, particularly of socially desirable response sets. Thus, Helms's (1990a) precaution in making certain that none of the WRIAS items correlate significantly with the Crowne and Marlowe (1964) Social Desirability scale may be an insufficient guarantee against socially desirable response sets with a more test-sophisticated population. In addition, no research has yet investigated whether older, more sophisticated individuals may subscribe to more sophisticated socially desirable response sets, particularly in the area of racial attitudes. The consideration of age, experience, and sophistication variables appears highly
relevant in sampling a population of experienced counselors in the field.

Since both men and women have been well represented in the samples studied, researchers have investigated and found some gender effects. For example, Carter (1990b) found in his midwestern study that among the male students \( (n = 50) \), racism was predicted by all stages of racial identity; there was also a gender difference in the prevalence of racial identity attitudes, with males having higher levels of Disintegration attitudes and females having higher levels of Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy attitudes. Carter and Helms (1990) also found gender differences in their study of White cultural values, and Carter (1987) found differences between men and women in client reactions and counselor intentions. Gender appears to be a significant variable for this research.

Rates of return on surveys examining racial identity attitudes are another concern. The studies so far discussed all relied on captive samples—enrollees in college courses or multicultural workshops. Only two studies (Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1992; Yang, 1992) were located that surveyed noncaptive samples, and in both cases, the researchers surveyed samples from their own institutions. Borg and Gall (1989) consider 75 percent a minimal rate of return for justifying conclusions from a survey; however, Pope-Davis
and Ottavi reported a 61-percent return on surveys sent to 250 of their faculty; and Yang reported a 38-percent return on a survey sent to 965 faculty, administrators, staff, and student leaders at her institution. In both these cases, the survey was simpler and shorter than in the present study: Pope-Davis and Ottavi used the WRIAS and a racism scale, and Yang used only the WRIAS and a brief personal data sheet. Neither study reported procedures or steps to evaluate the representativeness of the returns they received; nor did either discuss the limitations the rate of return implied for their findings. Yang's results are not discussed here because her rate of return was under 50 percent; however, the findings of Pope-Davis and Ottavi are included since they do characterize more than half of the subjects surveyed.

Pope-Davis and Ottavi described their study as exploratory and considered the rate of return high for this kind of research. The faculty in their sample ranged from age 29 to 70, with a mean of 45. More men than women returned the survey, but they did not evaluate this difference statistically. They reported that the WRIAS scores did not differ across age or by faculty standing. Men were higher than women on the Disintegration scale of the WRIAS; men's trend to be higher than women on the Reintegration scale of the WRIAS fell short of statistical
significance (p = .07). Multiple regression analysis showed that men’s Reintegration scores correlated positively with their racism scores (p = .001); while for women the correlation between Reintegration scores and racism scores fell short of statistical significance (p = .07). Pope-Davis and Ottavi concluded by stating that their study would need to be replicated elsewhere before conclusions could be drawn. There is no indication of whether or not their findings would hold with a larger percentage of returns.

**Summary**

Most research in the area of White racial identity development has been completed with samples of university students, who are different from the sample in the present study in age, training, and experience. In addition, the concept of socially desirable responses might be different for an older, more sophisticated population. Besides these variables, researchers have also found some trend toward gender differences. Thus variables that were chosen for particular consideration in the present study include age, training, experience, gender, and possibly socially desirable response sets.

Following Helms’s model of White racial identity development and her interactive model predicting likely counselor attitudes and behaviors, the present study focused on clarifying the nature of the relationships between White
racial identity attitudes of counselors, as measured by the WRIAS, and their more specific attitudes toward a case in which a White client presents a racial issue. Since the sample was drawn from a population of experienced counselors in the field, it was expected to be more similar to Carter's (1987, 1990a) and to Pope-Davis and Ottavi's (1992) samples than to the student samples studied by other researchers, with the caution that Carter's samples were all multicultural workshop participants while Pope-Davis and Ottavi surveyed only faculty at their university. Pope-Davis and Ottavi found gender differences on the WRIAS, no differences related to age, and a positive association between men's Reintegration scores on the WRIAS and their scores on a racism measure; however, their rate of return was only 61 percent and they did not evaluate the representativeness of their returns. A concern of the present study was therefore to attempt to evaluate the representativeness of the surveys returned. Carter found significant relationships between the White racial identity attitudes of his counselor sample and their choice of counselor intentions in White-White dyads; however, since his sample was too small for multiple regression analysis, a portion of these findings may have been significant by chance. Thus the present study, by drawing a larger, somewhat similar sample to Carter's, was intended to clarify
the role of White counselors' racial identity attitudes, which his research established as relevant to counselors' choice of behaviors in White-White dyads.
Population and Selection of the Sample

The target population of this study was White counselors in Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. An accessible population of counselors in the three states was the group of 1,635 White counselors certified by the National Board of Certified Counselors. Eligibility for certification includes professional references, a graduate degree with the major study in counseling or a related field; graduation from a CACREP-accredited program or a minimum of two years of half-time experience in the field; and a passing score on the National Board Examination.

A computer-selected random sample of 25 percent of White certified counselors provided a list of 400 counselors. It was thus intended that if the return rate on the questionnaire were as low as 40 to 50 percent, the $n$ would still be large enough to permit simultaneous correlation of multiple variables. It was anticipated that the subject matter of the questionnaire presented material that a considerable proportion of the sample might prefer avoiding, and that a major problem might be a low rate of response.
Demographic data on the accessible population was therefore obtained from NBCC to provide a basis for determining the representativeness of the returns received.

**Data Gathering**

The sample were mailed a questionnaire package consisting of a cover letter, the counselor data sheet, the case description, the case questionnaire, the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale, and a stamped return envelope. The covering letter indicated that NBCC was being petitioned to grant one hour of CEU credit for returning the completed questionnaire. The package was numbered, so that followup requests could be sent to nonrespondents. Subjects were asked to return the package as soon as possible. The followup questionnaire package, less the return envelope, was mailed to nonrespondents three weeks after the initial mailing. A second followup, three weeks later, consisted of a covering letter and the counselor data sheet only. The purpose of this final followup was to obtain data from nonrespondents in order to help determine the representativeness of the responses to the first and second mailings.
Instrumentation

The counselor data sheet, consisting of information about the subjects' age, sex, race, experience, etc., was created by the researcher and consisted of a single sheet that was tested for clarity on counseling students at the College of William & Mary. In particular, the respondents were asked to indicate their years of experience, their exposure to multicultural training, their highest degree in counseling, their work setting, the multicultural makeup of their current clientele, the incidence of racial issues presented by White clients in the past year, the respondents' self-assessed effectiveness with White clients' racial issues, and the categories of racial issues raised by their White clients.

The case description and the case questionnaire were also created by the researcher. The case description presented a single scenario in which a White client is personally encountering issues of racial relations. The case questionnaire presented an assortment of possible counselor cognitions about the case scenario, to be rated by respondents on a five-point Likert scale of agreement. The cognitions were intended to represent views likely to occur at different stages of racial identity development, according to Helms's (1984, 1990) model. The case description and questionnaire were evaluated by a panel of
five individuals, consisting of three expert researchers who were familiar with Helms's work and two doctoral candidates who received a briefing on Helms's stage model. All five individuals were provided with the same directions and with copies of Helms's descriptions of the stages and her predictions about counselors at the various stages. Questions without inter-rater agreement (at least three out of five) were dropped from the instrument. The panel was also asked to assign a stage of racial identity development to the client in the case description, based on a shortened description of the stages from Helms (1990b, p. 68). Finally, the panel was asked to judge each item on the questionnaire as likely or not to produce (a) conflict or tension and (b) client change.

Two questionnaire items were slightly revised to increase their correspondence to their respective subscales, and a third item was created to fill out the Disintegration subscale. With one new item and one revised item, the Disintegration subscale became the weakest of the five subscales on the case questionnaire.

The panel was in strong agreement about the likelihood of change to be associated with the counselor's agreement with the items on the case questionnaire. In accordance with Helms's interaction model, the likelihood of change was associated only with responses rated as characteristic of
stages more advanced than the client's stage, which was evaluated by three panelists as Reintegration (the other two panelists did not indicate a stage for the client).

The panel disagreed most about the amount of conflict or tension likely to be associated with the counselor's agreement with an item on the case questionnaire. According to Helms's interaction model, conflict and tension would be least with a same-stage dyad and will be higher when the stages are different between the members of the dyad. The panel's ratings appear to follow this pattern somewhat.

The White Racial Identity Attitude Scale (WRIAS) (Helms & Carter, 1990) is a rationally derived instrument consisting of five 10-item subscales designed to measure attitudes related to the original five stages of racial identity development in Helms's (1984) model of White racial identity development. Three studies of the reliability of the WRIAS found subscale reliabilities ranging from .55 and .67 for Contact to .75, .80, and .82 for Reintegration (Helms & Carter, 1990). As Helms (1990c) observed, these reliabilities consistently exceed the median reliability coefficient of .54 found for personality tests in general by Anastasi (1982). The largest sample for these studies consisted of students at Eastern colleges (n = 506); the subjects in the other two samples (n = 350 and n = 176) are not identified.
Construct validity of the WRIAS has been supported by correlations between the subscales that are consistent with the theoretical descriptions of the stages measured by the scales; that is, subscales measuring stages sharing some characteristics correlate positively while subscales measuring stages theorized to be very different correlate negatively (Helms, 1990). Studies by McCaine (cited by Helms & Carter, 1990), Carter (1987), and Westbrook (cited by Helms & Carter, 1990) identify relationships between attitudes as predicted by Helms's stage model and the subscales intended to assess the stages. In addition, Tokar and Swanson (1991) found that higher WRIAS scores on the more advanced stages of racial identity development were associated with measures of positive mental health.

Factor analysis of the items yielded eleven factors. Helms notes that this analysis suggests that both the items and the subscales are factorially complex, with subscale items tending to load in the same direction, although likely on more than one factor. The Contact items were found to constitute a complex but distinct scale. Reintegration and Disintegration items had positive loadings on four factors together, but as adjacent stages, Helms finds this reasonable. Pseudo-Independent items had more negative loadings on Disintegration/Reintegration factors than positive loadings on a distinctive factor of their own but
did load positively on some factors with Autonomy and Contact items, both related stages. Given further study of the instrument, Helms indicates that some items might better be reassigned.

Overall, Helms and Carter conclude that the reliability and validity data have sufficient consistency and strength to warrant the use of the WRIAS in research, with a cautionary recommendation that users calculate reliability estimates on their own samples.

Research Design and Method

The research design was a descriptive investigation of the relationship between White counselors' racial identity attitudes and thought processes likely to precede their choices of behaviors in responding to White clients with racial issues.

The sample was asked to respond to a set of questions about a single case description of a White client presenting a racial issue. This design thus controlled both for the client's racial identity attitudes and for the salience of the racial issue presented.

The sample was also asked to complete the White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale as the measure of their racial identity development and to answer a brief questionnaire providing basic demographic information and professional background and experience data. These latter variables
present possible influences on the subjects' responses to the case questionnaire. Collecting this additional information was also intended to help in determining whether the respondents represent a group with special bias of some kind. Age and years of experience were also considered important variables in testing a developmental model, since the presumption of such a model is that the stages occur progressively, with more characteristics of later stages occurring at later ages and with more years of experience. Collection of this information was also needed to help assess whether the returns were representative of the sample.

In order to test Helms's model of client-counselor interactions, the case description was intended to present a client more or less at Helms's Reintegration stage of racial identity development. Thus some counselors could reasonably be expected to be in the same stage as the client or one or more stages ahead of or behind the client, and their responses to the client could be examined for whether or not they reflect the patterns predicted by Helms for progressive, regressive, parallel, and crossed dyads.

**Statistical Analysis**

The representativeness of the returns was evaluated in the following two ways: (a) by comparison of the demographics reported on the returns with the demographics
of the accessible population, obtained from NBCC; and (b) by comparison of the other data collected on the returns, as classified by the three mailings.

The following hypotheses were to be tested by the data:

(1) White counselors' racial identity attitudes, as measured by the WRIAS, will predict their responses to the case questionnaire.

This hypothesis consists of five independent variables, the racial identity stages, and five dependent variables, the corresponding response sets on the case questionnaire. Since the analysis examines whether a combination of predictor variables correlate with a number of criterion variables, canonical correlation was used to analyze the data. Principal components analysis was used to examine the complex relationships between these variables.

(2) The choice of counselor responses rated by degree of likely conflict and tension and client change will vary significantly by counselors' racial identity attitudes.

(2a) White counselors at the same stage as the client's stage of racial identity development in the case description (Parallel dyad: counselor Reintegration scores with Reintegration client) will choose responses on the questionnaire that produce (a) little or no tension or conflict and (b) unlikelihood of change.
(2b) White counselors at a stage of racial identity development that is more advanced than the client's (Progressive dyad: counselor Pseudo-Independent and Autonomy scores with Reintegration client) will choose responses on the questionnaire that reflect (a) some tension and conflict and (b) also likelihood of change.

(2c) White counselors at a less advanced stage of racial identity development than the client (Regressive dyad: counselor Contact and Disintegration scores with Reintegration client) will choose responses on the questionnaire that reflect (a) considerable tension and conflict, plus (b) no likelihood of change.

(2d) White counselors with racial views opposite to the client's (Crossed dyad: counselor Contact and Autonomy scores with Reintegration client) will choose responses on the questionnaire that reflect (a) considerable tension and conflict and (b) no likelihood of change.

Hypotheses 2a-2d were examined with bivariate correlations between the appropriate WRIAS subscale scores and the corresponding set of questions selected by the expert panel as (a) leading to high, some, or little or no conflict and tension, and (b) likely or unlikely to lead to change.

(3a) Counselors' levels of attitudes at the later stages of racial identity development will tend to increase
with the age and experience of the counselor, while earlier stages will decrease.

(3b) Counselors' levels of attitudes related to racial identity development as well as responses to a client presenting a racial issue may vary with gender.

(3c) Counselors' responses to WRIAS as well as to the case questionnaire may vary by degree of exposure to multicultural training.

The relationship of the variables in hypotheses 3a-3c to counselors' responses on the WRIAS and the case questionnaire were analyzed by multiple regression. The variable of experience was considered as (a) years of experience in the field and (b) reported experience with racial issues.

**Ethical Considerations and Safeguards**

This research was descriptive and did not involve interventions or any kind of manipulation that created risk of harm to the participants. However, the subject matter of racial identity attitudes and racial issues touches on very private thoughts and potentially involved strong sensitivities and negative feelings. Subjects asked to participate in this research were assured that their participation was voluntary and could be withdrawn at any time and that their responses would be held in confidence. Furthermore, all records and published reports of the data
are and will be reported as coded material. In addition, the study was reviewed and approved by the student's dissertation committee as well as by the Human Subjects Review Committee of the School of Education at the College of William and Mary.
Survey Returns

The original survey n of 400 dropped to 370, due to the following reasons. Thirteen surveys were returned by the post office. Another 13 persons returned their surveys without completing them, indicating that they were no longer active in the field, by reason of retirement, illness, or change of occupation (individuals returning blank surveys because of objections to the subject matter are not included in this count). Four others returned their completed surveys from geographic locations not covered by this research (different states or countries).

Of the remaining 370, a total of 202 respondents (55%) returned the full survey. The background data sheet, including the needs assessment, was returned by an additional 42 respondents, providing basic data on 66% of the sample. The three states surveyed differed in their rates of return, with Virginia (63%) providing the highest rate and Pennsylvania (49%) the lowest (see Table 4.1). Possible biases in the responses due to the sample percentage that did not participate were examined by
Table 4.1 rates of return by state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maryland</th>
<th>Pennsylvania</th>
<th>Virginia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample n</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Surveys Returned</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of sample n</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Sheets Only Returned</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of sample n</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Returns</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of sample n</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
comparison of the groups responding to the first mailing (n = 129), the followup reminder (n = 59), and a final request (full survey, n = 14; background data, n = 56). The three groups' WRIAS responses, Case Questionnaire responses, and background data were analyzed by analysis of variance, and statistically significant group differences were found in the numbers reporting concerns about their handling of White clients' racial issues, in the hours of multicultural workshop training reported, and on two scales (Reintegration and Autonomy) of the Case Questionnaire (see Table 4.2). Other differences approached significance; these included the number of racial issues raised by White clients and the scores on two scales (Disintegration and Pseudo-Independence) of the WRIAS. In Group 1, those who responded to the first mailing, 43% reported concerns about handling their White clients' racial issues; these percentages dropped to 35% in Group 2 and 19% in Group 3. In a similar trend, Group 1 reported more experience of White clients' racial issues, with Group 2 and Group 3 each reporting less. On the Case Questionnaire, Group 1 tended to score higher on the Autonomy scale while Group 3 scored highest of the groups on the Reintegration scale, as it tended also to do on the Disintegration scale of the WRIAS. In two instances Group 2 reported the highest levels: in hours of multicultural workshop training and in Pseudo-Independence
### Table 4.2 Differences Between Response Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>F</em></th>
<th>_p</th>
<th>Order of Means by Group (high to low)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WRIAS Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>3, 1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>2, 1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.1254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>3**, 2, 1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>1**, 2, 3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns on handling White clients’ racial issues</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>1**, 2, 3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources for handling White clients’ racial issues</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of multicultural workshop training</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>2, 1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural course credits</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White clients’ racial issues, number raised</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White clients’ racial concerns, as % of cases</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Group 1 is the first response group and Group 3 the last. **Groups identified as significantly different from each other, using Scheffe’s followup test, _p_ = .05.*
scores on the WRIAS. A limitation on the WRIAS and Case comparisons is the small number of complete surveys in the third group. Another limitation is the higher representation of men and doctoral degrees in the third group, particularly among those who returned the complete survey. Two of the three significant group differences were also found for gender differences, as is reported below, and in the analysis for Hypothesis 3.

Comparison With the Population

Comparison of the sample of 244 to the NCC population of White counselors in the three-state area shows both a gender bias and an education bias; that is, the sample contained a higher proportion of male respondents and a higher proportion of degrees above the master’s than the population as a whole contained (see Table 4.3). These biases are strongest in the Pennsylvania sample. The Virginia sample most closely approximates its NCC population, as could be anticipated from its higher rate of return.

Because of these biases, the background data, the WRIAS responses, and the Case Questionnaire scores were analyzed by multiple regression to determine whether differences were associated with educational degree. No differences were significant or even approached significance in comparisons of degree groups on background data (which includes the
Table 4.3 Comparison of Sample With White NCC Population in Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ratio of Men to Women</th>
<th>Ratio of Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctor’s:Master’s:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.S. or CAGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC: n=1547,1635*</td>
<td>26:74</td>
<td>13:84:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: n=244</td>
<td>31:69</td>
<td>22:73:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC: n=548,541*</td>
<td>25:75</td>
<td>8:91:.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: n=78</td>
<td>27:73</td>
<td>13:82:5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC: n=528,622*</td>
<td>24:76</td>
<td>16:83:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: n=82</td>
<td>35:65</td>
<td>33:64:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC: n=471,472*</td>
<td>29:71</td>
<td>16:78:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample: n=84</td>
<td>30:70</td>
<td>19:72:9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The first n is the number reporting gender; the second n, degrees.

**More respondents reported an Ed.S. or CAGS degree in the sample than reported to NBCC. These could be newly earned degrees.
needs assessment) and responses on the Case Questionnaire. However, on the WRIAS, a higher Disintegration score was significantly associated with master’s degrees ($F = 3.76, p = .025$), and the association of higher Contact attitudes with master’s degrees approached significance ($F = 2.83, p = .062$) (see Table 4.4).

Gender differences on the Case Questionnaire and the WRIAS were analyzed to test Hypothesis 3b and will therefore be reported later in this chapter. Analysis of variance of background data and gender showed only one significant association with gender, and no others even approaching significance. Women were significantly more likely to report having concerns about their handling of White clients’ racial issues than were men ($F = 5.13; p = .025; ns$ unequal, $n = 144$ women, 72 men).

**Other Characteristics of the Sample**

The respondents in the survey ranged from age 26 to 69 ($m = 44; sd = 8$). They reported their years of experience as ranging from 1 to 40 years ($m = 13; sd = 7$). Their work settings included schools (23%), private settings (36%), public agencies (13%), a combination of these settings (14%), and other settings (14%). In classifying their client populations by percentage of White, Black and other, most respondents reported working with primarily White populations, with only about 20% ($n = 226$) reporting Black
Table 4.4 WRIAS Scale Differences by Educational Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Sample Mean</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Mean Differences by Degree Group: M,E,D*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>M +1.48 over D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M +2.28 over E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>19.59</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>M +1.03 over E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M +2.07 over D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>D +.73 over E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D +1.72 over M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Master’s degree (M) ns on these scales vary from 139 to 146; doctoral degree (D) ns are either 37 or 38; and the Ed.S.-CAGS degree (E) n is 10.
clientele over 10% and 22% of the respondents reporting over 5% clientele classified as other.

Thirty-six percent of the respondents indicated that they had taken a multicultural course, and 42.6% said they had attended multicultural workshops. Only 10% reported formal training to help White clients with racial issues.

Needs Assessment

Respondents were asked to estimate the incidence of racial issues raised by their White clients in the past year, classifying these issues as incidental, relevant or main issues in the counseling. About 24% of the respondents (n = 213) reported racial concerns occurring as main issues with some of their White clients; as a percentage of their caseloads, their estimates of the incidence of racial concerns as main issues ranged from 0% to over 30% of their cases. About 45% of the respondents (n=205) estimated that their White clients were presenting racial concerns relevant to their counseling issues at incidence rates of less than 1% to over 30% of their cases. More detail about these responses is shown in Table 4.5.

Respondents were also asked to check areas in which racial issues were being encountered by their White clients. The most common issues involving race brought up by White clients to the respondents were related to school, work and dating (31% to 34%; n = 233), with about a fifth of the
Table 4.5 Incidence of Racial Issues Raised by White Clients in Past Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Cases</th>
<th>Incidental (n = 200)</th>
<th>Relevant to Counseling (n = 205)</th>
<th>Main Issue (n = 213)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% or less</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%-5%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%-10%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%-30%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
respondents reporting client racial concerns in the areas of neighborhood, socializing, and affirmative action (Table 4.6).

Most of the respondents (64%; n = 216) said they were mostly satisfied with their handling of White clients' racial issues, while 35% indicated that they had some or many concerns about this area. Only 17% (n = 225) reported having special resources (case studies, strategies or interventions) related to racial concerns of White clients.

Missing Values

Many respondents did not answer their surveys completely. For the data drawn from the background and needs assessment section of the survey, the number of respondents reporting for an item is indicated with reported results, as in Table 4.6.

The WRIAS contained missing values in 42 of the 202 complete surveys that were returned. Helms and Carter (1990) indicate that missing answers on the WRIAS should be scored as zeroes. This procedure was followed in comparing the WRIAS means of the sample with the published norms on the WRIAS, except that six questionnaires missing values on three or more scores were left with missing values. For other analyses using the WRIAS scores, missing values were replaced by the average value of the other 9 items of the subscale, with the limitation that no more than two missing
Table 4.6 Areas of Racial Concern Encountered by White Clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents Checking (n = 233)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socializing</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Identity</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
values could be replaced on a questionnaire and that these two values could not occur on the same subscale. Through this procedure, all 5 subscales on 29 questionnaires and 4 of the 5 subscales on 3 other questionnaires were made available for analysis.

For the Case Questionnaire, missing values eliminated at least 3 and as many as 6 from the scale ns, and therefore from the analysis. It was not judged appropriate or necessary to compute and include average values for the incomplete scales.

Comparison of WRIAS Means With Norms

Table 4.7 compares the WRIAS means of the sample with the WRIAS norms published by Helms and Carter (1990). T-tests showed that the groups differed significantly. Carter and Helms's norm group of 339 women and 167 men were drawn from Eastern college populations. Other data about the group are not given, but it is reasonable to assume that the sample is different from the norm group in that it is older, has a higher level of education, and has specialized training in human relations. The significant differences between the norm group and the sample group are all in the direction predicted by racial identity development theory; that is, with age and experience, levels of attitudes at earlier stages are predicted to be lower and levels of
4.7 Comparison of Sample and Norm WRIAS MEANS**

Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Women (df = 474-475)</th>
<th>Men (df = 225-226)</th>
<th>Total (df = 698-703)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>30.77, 4.33</td>
<td>31.16, 4.17</td>
<td>30.90, 4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>30.31, 4.41</td>
<td>30.35, 4.29</td>
<td>30.32, 4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disintegration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>25.18*, 5.48</td>
<td>24.91*, 5.31</td>
<td>25.09*, 5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>19.36*, 3.67</td>
<td>19.79*, 5.12</td>
<td>19.47*, 4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reintegration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>25.10*, 5.88</td>
<td>25.02*, 5.94</td>
<td>25.07*, 5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>18.87*, 3.91</td>
<td>19.62*, 5.30</td>
<td>19.10*, 3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pseudo-Independence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>35.82*, 4.88</td>
<td>36.63, 5.31</td>
<td>36.08*, 5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>37.86*, 3.83</td>
<td>37.47, 5.30</td>
<td>37.74*, 4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autonomy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>33.43*, 4.93</td>
<td>34.29*, 4.46</td>
<td>33.71*, 4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>38.62*, 3.57</td>
<td>38.25*, 4.83</td>
<td>38.51*, 3.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant differences shown by T-tests, p < .01.

**Preliminary WRIAS norms from Helms and Carter (1990), p. 70.
attitudes associated with more advanced stages are predicted to be higher.

**Reliability of Instruments**

Helms and Carter (1990) recommended that reliability of the WRIAS scales be calculated for each sample tested. Internal reliability coefficients were generally consistent with those reported by Helms and Carter (1990, p. 71):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Helms and Carter (n=506,176)</th>
<th>Current Study (n = 183)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>.55, .67</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>.77, .76</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>.80, .75</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>.71, .65</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.67, .65</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Case questionnaire, internal reliability coefficients for the scales were: Contact, .26; Disintegration, .55; Reintegration, .59; Pseudo-Independence, .12; Autonomy, .76. Three of the scales were thus moderately acceptable but two were unsatisfactorily low. Changed items apparently were consistent with their scales (Autonomy and Disintegration).

**Testing of the Research Hypotheses**

**Prediction of Case Questionnaire Responses by the WRIAS**

The first research hypothesis stated that the participants' responses on the WRIAS would predict their
responses to the Case Questionnaire. The relationship of the WRIAS to the Case Questionnaire was examined both by principal components analysis and canonical correlation. Relationships between the scales of the two instruments as shown by Pearson correlations are listed in Table 4.8.

The principal components analysis for the two instruments produced four principal factors, with the fourth falling just under an eigenvalue of 1. Together these four factors account for 70% of the variance. The loadings are shown in Table 4.9.

The first factor alone accounted for 30% of the variance, with six of the ten scales having loadings over .30. This factor appeared to be a positive-negative dimension of attitudes toward Blacks and race relations, similar to Factor One in the Carter-Helms (1990) factor analysis of the WRIAS. The Disintegration and Reintegration scales of both instruments loaded positively on the first principal component, while the WRIAS Pseudo-Independent and Autonomy scales loaded negatively. According to the loadings on this first factor, counselors who on the WRIAS endorsed Disintegration and Reintegration items but disagreed with Pseudo-Independent and Autonomy items were more likely than other respondents to endorse statements on the Disintegration and Reintegration scales of the Case Questionnaire.
Table 4.8 Pearson Correlations Between WRIAS and Case Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
<td>-0.38*</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
<td>0.39*</td>
<td>-0.31*</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = .05 or less
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WRIAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case Questionnaire</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two Case scales, Contact and Autonomy, loaded significantly on the third principal component (.82 and -.38, respectively), while the WRIAS Contact scale had a nearly significant loading of .28. This factor, which accounts for 12% of the variance, appears to contrast emphasis on the individual and minimizing of race (Contact) with positive acceptance of race (Autonomy). The third factor could be similar to Helms and Carter's Factor 9, on which three of the WRIAS Contact items loaded positively. Factor 9 is considered to measure racial obliviousness.

The second and fourth principal components appear to be complexly interrelated, with three of the ten scales loading on both factors. Together these two factors account for 28% of the variance (18% and 10%, respectively). The second factor may best be described as primarily a dimension of definiteness about race relations, whether at the naive level of the WRIAS Contact scale or the more mature considerations of attitudes at the Pseudo-Independent and Autonomy levels. However, another interpretation of this pattern of association could be that the second factor represents a "counseling desirability" response set on racial matters, in which positive or at least neutral and nondetrimental statements about race and race relations are endorsed. According to the loadings on this factor, counselors tending to endorse statements on the WRIAS
Contact and Autonomy scales without a pattern of disagreement with contrasting scales would also tend to endorse statements on the Case Pseudo-Independent and Autonomy scales but not have a pattern of disagreement with contrasting scales.

Two scales, the WRIAS Contact scale and the Case Reintegration scale, loaded negatively on the fourth factor, while two other Case scales, Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy, loaded positively. In addition, the Case Contact scale had a nearly significant positive loading (.28). The fourth factor appears to be a cognitive dimension that contrasts the use of thinking to engage a racial situation, as in the Case Contact, Pseudo-Independent and Autonomy scales, with superficial reactions (the WRIAS Contact scale) or avoidance (the Case Reintegration scale). According to the loadings on this factor, counselors tending to disagree with WRIAS Contact items would be more likely than other respondents to disagree with statements on the Case Reintegration scale and endorse items on the Case Pseudo-Independent and Autonomy scales.

To summarize these results, responses on four of the five Case Questionnaire scales were predicted by participants' responses on one or more of the WRIAS scales. The failure of the WRIAS to predict the remaining scale may be due to the explanation given above, that it tapped a
factor assessed by only three of the ten WRIAS Contact items, or it may be due to the possibility that the Case Contact scale assesses a dimension of race-minimizing that is salient for counselors but not measured or predicted by the WRIAS. Another explanation may simply be the low internal reliability of the Case scale (.26).

The canonical correlation analysis of the WRIAS and Case Questionnaire showed two significant sets of canonical correlations, which account for 70% and 25% of the variance, respectively (95% cumulatively). The canonical coefficients for the two instruments are shown in Table 4.10. The first set of coefficients, with a correlation of .55, seems to describe relationships similar to those of the first factor in the principal components analysis. That is, negative attitudes toward Blacks and race relationships are characteristic of both Reintegration scales as well as the Case Disintegration scale. The WRIAS Pseudo-Independent scale is characterized by opposite views. It appears that respondents endorsing WRIAS Reintegration items and disagreeing with WRIAS Pseudo-Independent statements tended also to endorse the Case Disintegration and Reintegration items. They did not, however, show a pattern of agreeing or disagreeing with the Autonomy or Contact items on either instrument, nor was a pattern of response to the WRIAS
Table 4.10 Canonical Coefficients on the WRIAS and Case Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WRIAS Scales</th>
<th>V1 (r = .55)</th>
<th>V2 (r = .36)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Scales</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disintegration</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disintegration scale associated with this set of relationships.

In the second set of canonical relationships, which had a correlation of .36, an extremely high loading on the WRIAS Autonomy scale is associated with a positive loading of nearly .5 on the WRIAS Reintegration scale. This pattern is associated with a very high tendency to respond positively to the Case Autonomy items and a weaker tendency to respond positively to Case Contact and Reintegration items, accompanied by a tendency to respond negatively on the Case Disintegration scale. The common factor in this response pattern might be the definiteness of attitudes, either positive or negative, contrasted with doubt and ambiguity; however, such a pattern would be expected to include both Contact and Pseudo-Independent scales. Or, as with the second factor in the principal components analysis, the pattern may represent a "counseling desirability" response set, in which Autonomy items are highly endorsed even though antithetic attitudes are also held.

To summarize, in the canonical correlation, responses on WRIAS scales predicted responses on four of the five Case scales. The Case Pseudo-Independent responses were not predicted by either set of relationships.
Prediction of Counselors' Responses According to the Interaction Model

To test Helms's interaction model, the panel rating the case questionnaire items judged whether each item would produce change and tension or conflict. Their ratings were averaged for each item, and the items were then sorted into three combinations:

Set A: Low conflict-tension and change unlikely (3 items)
Set B: Some or high conflict-tension and change likely (8 items)
Set C: Some tension and change unlikely (13 items)

One item (question 16) fit none of these categories, since it was rated low for tension-conflict but also rated as likely to lead to change. No items were rated both high for tension-conflict and as unlikely to lead to change. Pearson correlations between the three sets and WRIAS subscales are reported in Table 4.11.

Parallel Dyads. In accordance with the interaction model, Hypothesis 2a predicts low tension-conflict and therefore little likelihood of change if both counselor and client are in the same racial identity stage. Since the panel had judged the client in the case scenario as being in the Reintegration stage, Hypothesis 2a was tested by comparing respondents' Reintegration scores with their
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dyad Type</th>
<th>WRIAS Scale By Case Set</th>
<th>Pearson r</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Supports Prediction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parallel</td>
<td>Reint./A</td>
<td>+.314</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/B</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/C</td>
<td>+.395</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Ps-In./B</td>
<td>+.063</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/A</td>
<td>-.254</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/C</td>
<td>-.251</td>
<td>.0005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auton./B</td>
<td>+.221</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/A</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/C</td>
<td>-.171</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regressive</td>
<td>Cont. /C</td>
<td>+.147</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/B</td>
<td>+.184</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>No*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/A</td>
<td>+.223</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disin./C</td>
<td>+.303</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/B</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/A</td>
<td>+.256</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossed</td>
<td>Cont. /C</td>
<td>+.147</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/B</td>
<td>+.184</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>No*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/A</td>
<td>+.223</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>No*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auton./C</td>
<td>-.171</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>No*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/B</td>
<td>+.221</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>No*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/A</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These items correlated significantly in the opposite direction from the prediction.
responses to the case questionnaire. These scores would be expected to correlate positively with Set A and negatively with Set B. Set C might correlate positively as items unlikely to lead to change or negatively as items producing some tension; the avoidance of tension and change in parallel dyads appears to be equally salient in the theory. Pearson correlations showed that Set A correlated positively as predicted ($r = .314; p = .0001$), but Set B was nonsignificant ($r = -.006; p = .94$). The strongest correlation occurred between WRIAS Reintegration scores and Set C ($r = .395; p = .0001$). Hypothesis 2a is thus partially supported.

Progressive Dyads. Hypothesis 2b predicts some tension-conflict and likelihood of change when the counselor is at a more advanced stage of racial identity development than the client. According to this hypothesis, the respondents' Pseudo-Independent and Autonomy scores on the WRIAS are predicted to correlate positively with Set B and negatively with Set A. Set C would be expected to correlate negatively as items unlikely to lead to change, since the counselor theoretically in progressive dyads seeks change and does not avoid tension and conflict. Pearson correlations showed a weak but positive correlation between Set B and Autonomy scores ($r = .22; p = .002$) but no correlation with Pseudo-Independent scores. Set A
correlated weakly and negatively, as predicted, with Pseudo-Independent scores \( r = -0.25; p = 0.0004 \), but not with Autonomy scores. Set C correlated weakly and negatively with both Pseudo-Independent and Autonomy scores (respectively: \( r = -0.25, p = 0.0005 \); \( r = -0.17, p = 0.019 \)). Hypothesis 2b is thus also partially but weakly supported.

Regressive Dyads. Hypothesis 2b predicts a combination of tension-conflict and little likelihood of change when the client is at a more advanced stage of racial identity development than the counselor. According to this hypothesis, Pearson correlations should show positive associations between Set C and WRIAS Contact and Disintegration scores, while Set B would be expected to correlate negatively with these scores. Set A could be expected to be negatively associated because of the low tension-conflict or positively associated because of the unlikelihood of change; theory does not clearly indicate either dimension as more salient than the other. Set C correlated positively as predicted, very weakly with Contact scores \( r = 0.15, p = 0.048 \) and more strongly with Disintegration scores \( r = 0.30, p = 0.0001 \). Set B correlated positively instead of negatively with Contact scores \( r = 0.18; p = 0.013 \) but not at all with Disintegration scores. Set A correlated positively with both Contact scores \( r = 0.22; p = 0.002 \) and Disintegration
scores \( r = .26, p = .0004 \). Although Hypothesis 2c is thus partially and weakly supported, at least part of the results are opposite the predictions.

Crossed Dyads. Hypothesis 2d predicts a combination of tension-conflict and little likelihood of change when client and counselor hold opposing views about race. According to this hypothesis, WRIAS Contact and Autonomy scores should be positively associated with Set C and negatively with Set B. Because crossed dyads are predicted to produce high tension and conflict, Set A would also be expected to correlate negatively. Set C correlated weakly with both the Contact and Autonomy scores, but in opposite directions. Set B correlated weakly and positively instead of negatively with both scales. Set A correlated significantly only with the Contact scale, and this relationship also was positive instead of negative. Thus Hypothesis 2d was not supported.

Overall, this analysis examined responses in 7 dyad types: one parallel, two progressive, two regressive, and two crossed. The interaction predictions for the crossed dyads were not supported. With the other three types, four of the five predicted positive associations were found; but of the five predicted negative correlations, only one was significant, three were nonsignificant but in the direction predicted, and one was significant and in the opposite
direction of the prediction. As shown in Table 4.11, the significant correlations that were identified were all weak.

Factors Affecting WRIAS and Case Responses

Hypothesis 3a predicted that counselors' levels of attitudes at later stages of racial identity development will increase with age and experience, while levels of attitudes at earlier stages of development will decrease. Two multiple regressions for the WRIAS were used, with one including experience of racial issues reported as the total percentage of cases with racial issues and the other including this experience as the total number of times racial concerns were brought up. Both analyses showed a significant effect for Pseudo-Independent attitudes, with age as the significant factor ($F = 6.19, p = .014; F = 5.47, p = .02$) that correlated positively with Pseudo-Independent scores. In addition, with experience with racial concerns reported as number of times rather than percent of caseload, an effect approaching significance ($F = 2.14, p = .079$) appeared for Autonomy levels, with experience of racial concerns the salient factor ($F = 6.74, p = .01$). Experience reported as years of counseling was not a significant factor. These results provide some support for the hypothesis that age and relevant experience are associated with higher levels of attitudes at later stages of racial identity development.
Hypothesis 3b examined whether counselors' racial identity attitudes and responses to the Case Questionnaire vary by gender. Analysis of variance showed no significant differences between men (n = 61) and women (n = 135) on any WRIAS scales; however, they differed in their responses to the Case Questionnaire both on the Disintegration scale (F = 4.14, p = .043) and on the Autonomy scale (F = 4.30, p = .039). Men (m = 11.0) were significantly more likely to agree with Disintegration-scale items than were women (m = 10.25); while women (m = 18.3) were significantly more likely than men (m = 17.3) to agree with Autonomy items on the questionnaire. These findings support the existence of some gender effects in this research.

Hypothesis 3c examined whether counselors' responses to the WRIAS and the Case Questionnaire vary by their exposure to multicultural training. Multiple regression was used first to analyze the effects of participants' yes-no answers to questions of whether or not they had taken a multicultural course, attended multicultural workshops, or received training to work with White clients' racial issues. No significant effects were present for either the WRIAS or the Case Questionnaire.

The relationship of multicultural training to the WRIAS and Case scales was also examined using respondents' indications of the number of workshop hours, course credits,
or both together that they had acquired. These multiple regressions showed significant effects for the Pseudo-Independent scale of the WRIAS ($F = 2.75, p = .044$) and the Disintegration scale of the Case Questionnaire ($F = 3.17, p = .03$). The number of workshop hours was significantly ($F = 4.72, p = .03$) and positively related to the WRIAS Pseudo-Independent scores. Both workshop hours and course credits were significant for the Case Disintegration scale ($F = 4.90, p = .03; F = 3.78, p = .05$; respectively) and were negatively related to Disintegration levels. The regression analysis approached significance on the WRIAS Reintegration scale ($F = 2.14, p = .097$), with workshop hours the salient factor ($F = 4.67, p = .03$).

With both positive and negative relationships identified in the expected directions, these findings are relatively strong support for the hypothesis that multicultural training, at least in workshop form, is associated with lower levels of some earlier-stage racial identity attitudes and higher levels of some later-stage racial identity attitudes.
Bias of Returns

The sample data may misestimate White NCC counselors in the states of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia in a number of ways.

Underrepresentation of counselors with master’s degrees may mean that the population mean on the WRIAS Disintegration scale is underestimated by the sample mean. Another effect of this underrepresentation may be that the population mean on the WRIAS Contact scale is underestimated by the sample mean.

Underrepresentation of women in the sample may mean that the population mean for the Case Disintegration scale is overestimated, while the Case Autonomy mean is underestimated. In addition, the underrepresentation of women may mean that the population’s concerns about handling of White clients’ racial issues may be underestimated.

If differences between Group 3 and Group 1 means indicate a trend, then the population mean on the Case Reintegration scale and possibly on the WRIAS Disintegration scale may be underestimated. The population mean on the
Case Autonomy scale, counselors’ concerns about their handling of White clients’ racial issues, and the number of racial issues occurring in counseling may all be overestimated.

Sorting out the countertrends in the above effects is complicated by the too-small size of Group 3 (n = 14) for conclusions about WRIAS and Case scales. The size problem is confounded further by the disproportionate number of males (6) and doctoral degrees (4) among the last 14 to complete the full survey. The trends are in the direction anticipated, however, by racial identity development theory: individuals at earlier stages of development would be less comfortable with race as a topic and less likely to respond, while those at later stages would be more comfortable and more likely to respond. In other words, theory predicts a sample bias in favor of later stages of development.

The primary weight against this interpretation is the underrepresentation of women, who tended to score lower on early stages and higher on later stages, at least on the Case Questionnaire. The difficulty is estimating how nonresponding women would score, and the responses of 8 women are not sufficient to do this. However, the larger
Group 3 n (56) for background data does permit sorting out the salience of group vs gender on the question of concern about handling White clients' racial issues. The trend of later respondents being less likely to report such concern is not only statistically significant but also meaningful, with the percent of counselors reporting concerns dropping from 43% in Group 1 to 35% in Group 2 and 19% in Group 3. The lessening of concern may be related to another possible group effect, a descending trend for the incidence of racial issues raised by White clients. The consistent and coherent picture suggested by these trends is that the nonrespondents are probably less aware of racial issues among White clientele, are less likely to have or report concern about handling White clients' racial issues, and probably have more attitudes corresponding to earlier stages of racial identity development than attitudes relating to later stages. Furthermore, the 45% who did not complete the WRIAS and Case Questionnaire might represent patterns of response that did not appear among those who did respond fully.

Based on the limitations in the participation rate, conclusions of this study may not be generalized to the NCC population of the three states, although it is likely that the findings characterize corresponding proportions of the
NCC population and have stronger application in Virginia, with its significantly higher rate of return.

**Needs Assessment**

As an exploratory survey of a group of White counselors' experience, training, and concerns in working with White clients' racial issues, the research establishes that a considerable number of White NCC counselors in the three states are indeed encountering racial issues, of varying degrees of salience, with their White clients. It seems likely that White NCC counselors in the three states, like those in the survey, have generally not received training in this area. Some, but not many, of the participants have resources (case studies, strategies, interventions) which they find useful in this area. A considerable number—but more women than men—are experiencing concern about handling White clients' racial issues.

**Relationship of the WRIAS and the Case Questionnaire**

Both analyses of the WRIAS-Case Questionnaire relationship show significant patterns in counselors' responses. Together they seem to be describing three basic patterns. The first pattern appears to involve endorsing negative and rejecting positive views and reactions about race and race relations. In this pattern counselors who tended to agree with WRIAS items having to do with White
superiority, avoidance of Blacks, anxiety, insecurity, anger and frustration in relation to Blacks and who also tended to disagree with WRIAS items endorsing racial equality, acceptance of, interest in, and comfort with Blacks tended also to agree more highly than others with items conceptualizing the case situation as confusing and more or less hopeless and to agree with items implicating school personnel and recommending that the client move.

The second pattern seems to be somewhat the reverse of the one just described. Counselors who tended to disagree with WRIAS items expressing naive curiosity about Blacks and minimizing race tended more than others to disagree with reactions to the case that cast blame on the school or recommended moving; in addition, counselors in this pattern tended to endorse cognitive approaches to the situation and agree with items calling for directly and openly working with the racial issue.

The third pattern seems to involve endorsing positive views about race and race relations without rejecting negative ones, or while endorsing negative ones also. In the principal components analysis, this pattern included agreeing with WRIAS items that express naive curiosity about Blacks, that minimize race, that endorse racial equality, and that express acceptance and valuing of Blacks. These WRIAS responses were matched with responses on the Case
Questionnaire that endorsed cognitive approaches to the case and called for directly and openly working with the racial issue. As this pattern appeared in the principal components analysis, there was no tendency to reject negative attitudes on either instrument, even though positive attitudes were endorsed.

The third pattern, as shown by the canonical correlation, was more obviously contradictory. On the WRIAS, counselors in this pattern tended more than others to agree with items expressing White superiority and negative feelings about Blacks while at the same time endorsing items about racial equality and acceptance and valuing of Blacks. Similarly, when they responded to the Case Questionnaire, they were more likely than the others to agree with items that minimized race, implicated school personnel or suggested moving as a solution, and at the same time to agree with items calling for directly and openly working with the racial issue and indicating that they did not see the case as hopeless or confusing.

The identification of these patterns indicates that the participants' attitudes toward, and thinking about, a White client presenting a racial issue did differ according to racial identity attitudes measured by the WRIAS. Furthermore, the differences may have serious impact on the ability of counselors to support the development of White
clients who are struggling with racial issues in their lives, since, of the three response patterns identified, only the second appears as if it might be conducive to client growth. The third pattern would seem to present contradictions to the client, and the first would seem only to endorse the client’s present position.

In other words, the patterns show that the counselors’ personal thoughts and reactions about race and race relations are reflected in their thoughts and reactions about a White client with racial concerns. Those with positive personal attitudes about race tended also to endorse more positive attitudes about the case scenario; those without such positive attitudes tended to endorse the more negative choices. The clear implication of this relationship is that White counselors in early stages of racial identity development will have difficulty in finding positive ways to support the development of White clients who are attempting to deal with racial issues.

The three response patterns could represent three developmental stances, with Pattern 1 characterizing early-stage counselors; Pattern 2, later-stage counselors; and Pattern 3, counselors somewhere between the other two patterns. Pattern 3, on the other hand, as already suggested, may represent a counseling desirability response set. For example, respondents might endorse the choice of
giving the client permission to ventilate anti-Black feelings because their training teaches that counseling is the appropriate place for the expression of feelings, not because the respondent would actually choose this step as therapeutic in a real situation. Likewise, counselors would be likely to endorse items expressing valuing of relationships, feeling comfortable talking to others, and seeing others as equals and would be unlikely to endorse items describing counseling as being of little help or suggesting that the counselor should ignore a client attitude. Sophistication in identifying counseling-appropriate responses to such items would not necessarily be helpful in answering less obvious questions. If such a desirability response set exists, it must be studied and understood before pencil-and-paper research on racial matters can be interpreted accurately. If such a response set exists as a function of a particular stage of racial identity development, understanding it would appear extremely useful in supporting the development of counselors at such a point of thinking.

The Interaction Model

The second research question asked whether White counselors' attitudes toward, and thinking about, a White client presenting a racial issue would differ in the specific manner predicted for parallel, progressive,
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regressive, and crossed dyads. Predictions for crossed dyads were clearly not supported by the findings in this research. However, since both Contact and Autonomy scores were also included in other, and contradictory, dyadic predictions, there was no way that the findings could support all the predictions.

For the other dyads, the clearest and strongest support is provided by the significant correlations of Set C (some conflict-tension, unlikely change). In both progressive and regressive dyads, this set correlated both positively and negatively as predicted. Three of these four correlations, however, are so weak that they would not appear to indicate very meaningful trends. The strongest correlation of Set C is Reintegration scores in parallel dyads, and this effect can be seen as strong and meaningful only if the more salient aspect of Set C is seen as the unlikelihood of change, rather than the amount of tension.

A similar question of salience—likelihood of change over conflict-tension, or vice versa—occurs with Set A (low tension-conflict, unlikely change). Out of three correlations clearly predicted by the model, two were significant in the correct direction; the third, nonsignificant. In regressive dyads, however, the predicted combination is tendency to high tension-conflict and unlikely change. The findings appear to be indicating that,
as with Set C, unlikelihood of change is more salient than the level of conflict and tension.

Set B (some conflict-tension and change likely) was nonsignificant in 3 of the 5 correlations predicted, and one of the two significant effects occurred in the opposite direction from the prediction. The remaining correlation is very weak. Thus the results on Set B do not fit the predictions of the interaction model. It may be that the model does not fit, but other explanations also could apply. Since three predicted negative correlations did not occur with Set B, it can be described as unexpectedly endorsed. Possibly this effect is similar to the pattern described in the second factor of the principal components analysis of the two questionnaires, and in the third pattern of counselor responses noted above. If a counseling desirability response set is involved, then respondents with relatively high levels of attitudes at earlier stages of racial identity development will tend to endorse some items because of the counseling desirability, not because of agreement with them. Another explanation is that, although the respondents as a sample are skewed (compared to published norms) toward later stages of racial identity, they still have many attitudes associated with earlier stages and will respond inconsistently. These explanations can be tested by further analysis of the data. Following
the procedure used by Carter (1987), the respondents can be categorized by their WRIAS percentile ranks. However, only respondents clearly differentiated by the ranks would be selected for analysis. If a confounding developmental factor is present, then both definitively regressive and definitively progressive dyads should produce stronger support of the model. If the confounding factor is a counseling desirability response set, the differences will appear primarily with the progressive dyads, who would more explicitly reject unlikely-change items as well as endorse more likely-change items.

Although the interaction model is somewhat supported by this investigation of dyads with a Reintegration client, questions remain and further analysis of the data may confirm and extend the support or weaken it. Besides this analysis, however, the identification of the first pattern described in the comparison of the WRIAS and Case Questionnaire above also seems somewhat supportive of the predictions made for regressive and parallel dyads, with its combination of endorsement of WRIAS Disintegration and Reintegration items, disagreement with WRIAS Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy items, and agreement with Disintegration and Reintegration items on the Case Questionnaire.
The strong relationship between the Disintegration and Reintegration scales of the WRIAS complicates separating the two as they must be in testing the dyadic predictions in this study, in which one of the scales forms a parallel dyad with the client and the other a regressive dyad.

Other Effects Related to Racial Identity Attitudes

The relationship primarily of age and possibly also of counseling experience to levels of racial identity development, as measured by the WRIAS, provides support for the developmental thesis in racial identity. Such support, however, does not constitute proof, since the effects could be related, for example, to the differing history in general of the age cohorts.

The Case Questionnaire proved to be more sensitive to gender effects than the WRIAS. A curious juxtaposition of gender effects is the men’s higher endorsement of Disintegration items and their lower expression of concern about their handling of White clients’ racial issues. The Case Disintegration scale consists of items expressing confusion and helplessness about the case and would seem to accompany higher rates of concern. The difference between men and women is small, but it is also accompanied by women’s higher endorsement of Autonomy items. Attention to gender differences clearly will continue to be important in this research.
Multicultural training, primarily in the form of number of workshop hours, was associated with lower levels of early-stage attitudes measured by the WRIAS as well as with lower scores on the Case Disintegration scale. Multicultural training was also positively associated with higher levels of Pseudo-Independent attitudes on the WRIAS. Multicultural course credits were significant only for the Case Disintegration scale. Since workshop participants are usually volunteers, and more interested volunteers could be expected to seek more workshop hours than others, the differences in scores could as easily reflect motivation for seeking the workshops as they could be a result of workshop attendance. Since multicultural course credits were generally not related to scores, future surveys should perhaps ask for more specific information about multicultural training, particularly whether it is voluntary or required, when it was taken, and what content was included.

Since multicultural training does not usually address working with White clients' racial issues, the lack of association between such training and responses to the Case Questionnaire Pseudo-Independent and Autonomy scales, which offer approaches to helping the White client, is not surprising.
Limitations

Limitations on the generalizability of the findings have already been discussed. Other limitations on the study derive from the use of a written case description, the content of the case scenario, and the choice of a single case, rather than multiple cases. It is possible that a written scenario lacks the power to evoke racial identity-related responses in the same way evoked by a live, personal presentation, in simulation or actual session. Consideration of conflict and tension might be particularly difficult without in vivo presentation, and the lowered salience of these characteristics might particularly impact on findings involving these dimensions in the predictions of the interaction model. Findings might be related to some aspect of the particular content of the single case scenario used. Findings are also limited by the single case scenario in the sense that all the patterns examined represent patterns of response to a client at one particular stage of racial identity development.

Finally, this survey has focused not on counselors' actions, but on their thinking about a case. Understanding the influence of racial identity attitudes on counselors' thinking will hopefully contribute to understanding counselors' actual behavior in real sessions, but
establishing the linkage between thoughts and actions calls for separate study.

Conclusions

This study has provided evidence that a sizable number of randomly selected well-qualified, experienced White counselors in three eastern states are distinguishable by their racial identity attitudes and that these attitudes are related in identifiable patterns to their thinking about a client's racial issue. While the participants probably do not represent the White NCC population as a whole in those states, they appear to represent a majority who see research in this area as an appropriate and needed focus of professional research and development.

This study has also provided evidence that White counselors are being presented with racial issues by White clients, although the incidence rate of racial issues that are relevant or primary in counseling seems at present fairly low. Nevertheless, many of the respondents are concerned about handling White clients' racial issues. Very few have received any relevant training in this area, and not many have any special resources they have acquired to help them work with White clients' racial issues.

In light of the concerns expressed by respondents, in light of their reported dearth of training and resources for working with White clients' racial issues, and in light of
the identification of response patterns both likely and unlikely to support White clients' development in racial areas, it seems that an important and perhaps urgent need is a climate of acceptance for open discussion, exchange, and furtherance of research on working with White clients' racial issues.

Further study is warranted for a number of issues. More rigorous surveys of needs, concerns, and resources in more states are needed to develop a more complete understanding of the professional development needed. Followup study with the current sample could accumulate information about strategies and resources that some respondents report having. Methods need to be found also to test these interventions. Further analysis of the data already collected can clarify findings about Helms's interaction model and will indicate the next steps needed in understanding dyadic interactions. Finally, further study of a possible counseling desirability response set is critical for conducting paper-and-pencil research in this area.
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Development of the Case Questionnaire

Appendix A
Inter-raters' Responses on the Case Items

1. This case is mainly a conflict between individuals, the teacher and the mother.

Stage: Contact-5  
Conflict/Tension: Little/none-1 Some-3 High-1  
Client Change: Unlikely-5

2 (5). The critical issue in this case is to develop a positive school-home rapport, which has little or nothing to do with race.

Stage: Contact-5  
Conflict/Tension: Little/none-1 Some-2 High-1 No answer-1  
Client Change: Likely-1 Unlikely-3 No answer-1

3 (7). The counselor should help Mrs. W realize that probably no one is trying to harm John, but it is difficult for the races to get along.

Stage: Reintegration-1 Pseudo-Ind.-3 No stage-1  
Conflict/Tension: Some-5  
Client Change: Likely-1 Maybe-2 Unlikely-2

4 (9). One way the counselor can help is to encourage Mrs. W to think about what it means to be White.

Stage: Pseudo-Ind.-1 Immersion - 1 Autonomy-3  
Conflict/Tension: Some-2 High-3  
Client Change: Likely-5

5. Mrs. W sounds quite racist, and she is not likely to respond if the counselor tries to help her change.

Stage: Disintegration-2 Reintegration-2 Pseudo-Ind.-1  
Conflict/Tension: Little/none-1 Some-2 High-1  
Client Change: Unlikely-5

Above item revised to suggest more clearly confusion of Disintegration stage:

5. Mrs. W sounds quite angry with Blacks, but trying to help her change may just make her angry with the counselor.
6 (11). Mrs. W needs to be confronted with her racist attitudes, although counseling may not be the place to do this.

**Stage:** Disintegration-1  Pseudo-Ind.-4
**Conflict/Tension:** Some-2  High-3
**Client Change:** Likely-1  Unlikely-4

7 (12). The best solution for Mrs. W is to move to a school district with a better racial ratio.

**Stage:** Contact-1  Reintegration-4
**Conflict/Tension:** Little/none-1  Some-4
**Client Change:** Unlikely-5

8 (13). It is high-handed of the school to refer Mrs. W and John to counseling when it is the teacher who needs treatment.

**Stage:** Disintegration-1  Reintegration-4
**Conflict/Tension:** Little/none-3  Some-1  High-1
**Client Change:** Likely-1  Unlikely-3  No answer-1

9 (14). The counselor should comment on the insight Mrs. W’s situation can give her on the feelings of Black mothers with children in predominantly White schools.

**Stage:** Contact-1  Pseudo-Ind.-3  Autonomy-1
**Conflict/Tension:** Little/none-1  Some-2  High-2
**Client Change:** Likely-2  Maybe-1  Unlikely-2

10 (15). This is a very confusing situation, and it is not clear what, if anything, will help.

**Stage:** Contact-1  Disintegration-3  Pseudo-Ind.-1
**Conflict/Tension:** Little/none-2  Some-2  High-1
**Client Change:** Maybe-1  Unlikely-4

11 (16). It is important to help Mrs. W acknowledge her racial fears.

**Stage:** Reintegration-Alternative maybe  Pseudo-Ind.-1  Autonomy-4
**Conflict/Tension:** Some-3  High-2
**Client Change:** Likely-4  Maybe-1
12 (17). Mrs. W needs to learn that Black professionals are just like White professionals and treat children the same regardless of race.

Stage: Contact-4  Pseudo-Ind.-1
Conflict/Tension: Some-2 High-3
Client Change: Unlikely-5

13 (18). This situation presents an opportunity for the counselor to help Mrs. W examine her thoughts and feelings about racism and about being White.

Stage: Immersion-1  Autonomy-4
Conflict/Tension: Some-3  High-2
Client Change: Likely-4  Unlikely-1

14 (20). The situation is primarily racial interaction, and counseling probably will be of little help.

Stage: Disintegration-5
Conflict/Tension: Little/none-2  Some-1  High-2
Client Change: Unlikely-5

15 (21). The counselor should encourage Mrs. W to think about race as a valuable and important part of herself as well as a valuable and important part of her son's teacher.

Stage: Pseudo-Ind.-1  Autonomy-4
Conflict/Tension: Some-2 High-3
Client Change: Likely-4  Maybe-1

16 (25). The best approach for this client is to help her deal with a racial situation through some cognitive problem-solving.

Stage: Contact-1  Pseudo-Ind.-4
Conflict/Tension: Little/none-3  Some-2
Client Change: Likely-3  Unlikely-2

17 (26). The teacher probably is getting back at Whites by picking on John.

Stage: Reintegration-5
Conflict/Tension: Little/none-1  Some-3  High-1
Client Change: Unlikely-5
18 (27). There is probably very little a counselor can do to facilitate an interracial situation like this.

Stage: Disintegration-5
Conflict/Tension: Little/none-1 Some-2 High-2
Client Change: Unlikely-5

19 (28). The best result in this case will come by minimizing race.

Stage: Contact-5
Conflict/Tension: Little/none-1 Some-3 High-1
Client Change: Unlikely-5

20 (29). Mrs. W may have some anti-Black attitudes which the counselor can best discourage by ignoring them.

Stage: Contact-4 Disintegration-1
Conflict/Tension: Little/none-1 Some-3 High-1
Client Change: Unlikely-5

21 (31). The best success the counselor can hope for in this case is to help the client understand the racial issues involved in the situation.

Stage: Pseudo-Ind.-3 Autonomy-2
Conflict/Tension: Some-4 High-1
Client Change: Likely-4 Maybe-1

22 (19). The school situation is unfortunate, and Mrs. W should not be discouraged from moving.

Stage: Contact-1 Reintegration-3 No answer-1
Conflict/Tension: Some-3 High-1 No answer-1
Client Change: Unlikely-4 No answer-1

New Item:

23. The problem in this case is that the counselor either has to side with Mrs. W, which is like siding against Blacks, or not side with Mrs. W, which is like turning against Whites.

24. Mrs. W appears to have some anti-Black attitudes and needs the counselor's permission to talk openly about them.
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Stage: Disintegration-1  Pseudo-Ind.-2  Autonomy-2
Conflict/Tension: Some-3  High-2
Client Change: Likely-4  Unlikely-1

Above item revised to shift from cognitions to affect for Autonomy scale:

24. Mrs. W appears to have some anti-Black feelings and needs the counselor’s permission to talk openly about them.

25 (30). Mrs. W is not being racist when she objects to her son’s being the only White child in a class taught by a Black teacher.

Stage: Disintegration-1  Reintegration-3  Reinteg.,
Pseudo-Ind & Autonomy-1
Conflict/Tension: Little/none-1  Some-3  High-1
Client Change: Unlikely-4  No answer-1
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Conflict/Tension</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>Some—3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>Some—2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>High—3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>Some—3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>Some—3/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disintegration Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Conflict/Tension</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5(Rev)*</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>Some—2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>None—2/5; Some—2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>None—2/5; High—2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>Some—2/5; High—2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23(New)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reintegration Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Conflict/Tension</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>Some—4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>None—3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>Some—3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>Some—3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>Some—3/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pseudo-Independent Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Conflict/Tension</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>Some—5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>High—3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>Some—2/5; High—2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely 2/5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>None—3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>Some—4/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autonomy Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Conflict/Tension</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>High—3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>Some—3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>Some—3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>High—3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24(Rev)*</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>Some—3/5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These two items were revised to make them more consistent with the intended scale.

** The Disintegration items include two which are extremely similar and one item that is completely new.
Classification of Case Items for Interaction Model

Conflicts-tension scale: Little/none = 1; some = 2; high = 3

Likelihood of change scale: unlikely to change = 0; likely to change = 1; maybe = .5

Low tension-conflict: less than 2
High tension-conflict: over 2.4
Likely to change: .4+

Set A: Low conflict-tension and change unlikely

Item 7 (Reintegration scale): conflict-tension 1.8; change 0
Item 8 (Reintegration scale): conflict-tension 1.6; change .25
Item 10 (Disintegration scale): conflict-tension 1.8; change .1

Set B: Some or high conflict-tension and change likely

Item 3 (Pseudo-Independent): conflict-tension 2; change .4
Item 4 (Autonomy): conflict-tension 2.6; change 1
Item 9 (Pseudo-Independent): conflict-tension 2.2; change .5
Item 11 (Autonomy): conflict-tension 2.4; change .9
Item 13 (Autonomy): conflict-tension 2.4; change .8
Item 15 (Autonomy): conflict-tension 2.6; change .9
Item 21 (Pseudo-Independent): conflict-tension 2.2; change .9
Item 24 (Autonomy): conflict-tension 2.4; change .8

Set C: Some or high tension-conflict and change unlikely

Item 1 (Contact): conflict-tension 2; change 0
Item 2 (Contact): conflict-tension 2; change .25
Item 5 (Disintegration): conflict-tension 2; change 0
Item 6 (Pseudo-Independent): conflict-tension 2.6; change .2
Item 12 (Contact): conflict-tension 2.6; change 0
Item 14 (Disintegration): conflict-tension 2; change 0
Item 17 (Reintegration): conflict-tension 2; change 0
Item 18 (Disintegration): conflict-tension 2.2; change 0
Item 19 (Contact): conflict-tension 2; change 0
Item 20 (Contact): conflict-tension 2; change 0
Item 22 (Reintegration): conflict-tension 2.5; change 0
Item 23 (New Disintegration): est. conflict-tension 2; change 0
Item 25 (Reintegration): conflict-tension 2; change 0
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Contents of the Mailings

Appendix B
Dear National Certified Counselor:

Issues of cultural diversity have become a significant factor in the counseling field. Recent research has suggested that White counselors may have some cognitive difficulties with other than White clients. The research being studied by Nancy Ochs examines the struggle that may occur when a White counselor attempts to help a White client with an issue that has racial overtones. While multicultural and cross-cultural counseling courses are more readily available than when some of us were trained, there is little, if any, information or training available for White counselors who wish to understand how to be helpful in this situation.

Your views as an experienced working professional are especially valuable in remedying this problem. By tapping into your views on racial matters, Nancy will get the answers she needs to assist counselors in developing this expertise. You have been chosen in a randomly selected group to answer a few questions, which will take only about 20 minutes of your time. Since she needs a high rate of return (about 90 percent), I urge you to take the time to complete this questionnaire and return it in the enclosed postpaid envelope. I would personally appreciate it if you would complete it as soon after you have received it as possible and return it to her. No names will be used in the research and complete anonymity is assured to all who participate. The code number included is for her confidential records so followup requests are not sent to those who have completed the questionnaires.

Thank you very much for this assistance in valuable research.

Sincerely yours,

Fred L. Adair, Ph.D., NCC, LPC
Professor

P.S. We are petitioning the NBCC Board to grant one hour CEU credit toward your next renewal for completing and returning this questionnaire. If the Board agrees and you want the credit, please indicate your response at the bottom of the consent form (back of this letter).
Consent Form

This consent form is to request your voluntary participation in a study which will be conducted in the winter of 1992. Please read the following information. Then sign the last section marked "Informed and Voluntary Consent to Participate if you are willing to participate in the study.

Purpose of the Study

The study asks questions about counseling White clients who may be struggling with racial issues, and it asks about counselors' views on racial matters. Although courses are available in multicultural and cross-cultural counseling, there is little, if any, information or training available for White counselors who wish to understand how to be helpful to White clients with a racial concern.

Amount of Time Involved

You are asked to complete a background data sheet, read a case scenario, answer about 20 questions about the case, and then respond to a 50-item attitude survey. Others who have completed the survey report that it takes about 20 minutes.

Assurance of Confidentiality

All data collected in the study will be kept in confidence. Each respondent is assigned a number for research analysis, and only the investigator will have access to this number. For purposes of analysis only group data will be utilized.

Assurance of Voluntary Participation

Participation in this study is strictly voluntary. The right of the individual to decline to participate or to withdraw in part or whole at any time is guaranteed.

Questions and Availability of Results

Questions about this study may be telephoned to the investigator, Nancy Ochs (804 221-2363 or 898-8972) or to Dr. Kathy Evans, dissertation chair ((804 221-2328). Results of this study may be obtained by writing the investigator at the following address: Nancy G. Ochs, School of Education, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA 23185.
Informed and Voluntary Consent to Participate

I have been informed and agree to participate in the study outlined above. My right to decline to participate or to withdraw at any time has been guaranteed.

Volunteer ___________________________ Date ___

Possible CEU Credit

If the NBCC Board grants permission for CEU credit to be given for completing and returning this questionnaire, I would ____ would not ____ like to receive the credit.
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Background Questionnaire

1. Age ___ 2. Race ___ 3. Sex: Female ___ Male ___

4. Years of experience in counseling _________

5. Training:
   Highest degree in counseling ______
   State license or certification? ______
   Multicultural training:
     Workshop ___ If yes, how many hours? ______
     Course ___ If yes, how many credits? ______
   Any preparation for helping White clients with racial issues? ______
     If yes, please describe: __________________________

6. Work setting:
   School ___ Public Agency ___ Private ___
   Other (Describe) _____________________________

7. Client population:
   Percent White ___ Percent Black ___ Percent Other ___

8. How often in the past year have your White clients mentioned racial issues (please estimate) as--

8a. incidental to their counseling concerns:
   # of incidents _____ Percent of cases ______

8b. relevant to their counseling concerns:
   # of incidents _____ Percent of cases ______

8c. main issues:
   # of incidents _____ Percent of cases ______

9. Are you mostly satisfied with your handling of White clients’ racial issues?
   Yes ____ Have some concerns ____ Have many concerns ___

10. Do you have case studies, interventions, strategies, etc., that you have found helpful for White clients with racial issues or that exemplify difficulties you have encountered in this area?
   Yes ___ No ___

   If you are willing to share the above, please call or write Nancy Ochs, 804 221-2353, School of Education, College
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of William & Mary, Williamsburg, VA 23185. Anonymous contributions are also welcome.

11. In what areas are your White clients tending to encounter racial questions?

- Neighborhood
- School
- Dating
- White Identity
- Socializing
- Work
- Affirmative Action
- Other (Please describe)

Please be sure to read and/or complete the back of each of the following pages.
CASE SCENARIO

Please read the following scenario and respond to the questions on the following page.

* * * * *

Your agency contracts with several school districts to provide counseling for school-referred families.

Mrs. W has been referred by her school because of ongoing discipline problems with her son John, age 7. The school report says that John constantly talks out of turn, does not pay attention or stay on task, does not stay in lines with the other children, and generally requires constant monitoring to keep him from disturbing others.

Mrs. W tells you that her son is not a troublemaker and that she believes her son is being picked on by his teacher, who is Black, and the other children in his class, who are all Black. In fact, John’s school is 90 percent Black. Mrs. W is very upset and feels that her son is being harmed by his school situation. Mrs. W appears to be an articulate, active advocate for her son but she is very angry about the notes about John’s behavior, which she says the teacher is constantly sending home. Mrs. W finds the notes offensive and feels that the teacher is constantly picking on every petty thing John does.

* * * * *

Please be sure to complete the back of each of the following pages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. This case is mainly a conflict between individuals, the teacher and the mother.

2. The critical issue in this case is to develop a positive school-home rapport, which has little or nothing to do with race.

3. The counselor should help Mrs. W realize that probably no one is trying to harm John, but it is difficult for the races to get along.

4. One way the counselor can help is to encourage Mrs. W to think about what it means to be White.

5. The focus of this case should be John's school behavior.

6. Mrs. W needs to be confronted with her racist attitudes, although counseling may not be the place to do this.

7. The best solution for Mrs. W is to move to a school district with a better racial ratio.

8. It is high-handed of the school to refer Mrs. W and John to counseling when it is the teacher who needs treatment.

9. The counselor should comment on the insight Mrs. W's situation can give her on the feelings of Black mothers with children in predominantly White schools.

10. This is a very confusing situation, and it is not clear what, if anything, will help.

11. It is important to help Mrs. W acknowledge her racial fears.
1. Mrs. W needs to learn that Black professionals are just like White professionals and treat children the same regardless of race.

2. This situation presents an opportunity for the counselor to help Mrs. W examine her thoughts and feelings about racism and about being White.

3. The situation is primarily racial interaction, and counseling probably will be of little help.

4. The counselor should encourage Mrs. W to think about race as a valuable and important part of herself as well as a valuable and important part of her son's teacher.

5. The best approach for this client is to help her deal with a racial situation through some cognitive problem-solving.

6. The teacher probably is getting back at Whites by picking on John.

7. There is probably very little a counselor can do to facilitate an interracial situation like this.

8. The best result in this case will come by minimizing race.

9. Mrs. W may have some anti-Black attitudes which the counselor can best discourage by ignoring them.

10. The best success the counselor can hope for in this case is to help the client understand the racial issues involved in the situation.

11. The school situation is unfortunate, and Mrs. W should not be discouraged from moving.

12. The problem in this case is that the counselor either has to side with Mrs. W, which is like siding against Blacks, or
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not side with Mrs. W, which is like turning against Whites.

24. Mrs. W appears to have some anti-Black feelings and needs the counselor's permission to talk openly about them.

25. Mrs. W is not being racist when she objects to her son's being the only White child in a class taught by a Black teacher.

Please add any other considerations, approaches, or cautions you believe are important in this case:
PLEASE NOTE

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

Social Attitude Scales
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University Microfilms International
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SECOND REQUEST

Dear National Certified Counselor:

Issues of cultural diversity have become a significant factor in the counseling field. Recent research has suggested that White counselors may have some cognitive difficulties with other than White clients. The research being studied by Nancy Ochs, a White researcher, examines the struggle that may occur when a White counselor attempts to help a White client with an issue that has racial overtones. While multicultural and cross-cultural counseling courses are more readily available than when some of us were trained, there is little, if any, information or training available for White counselors who wish to understand how to be helpful in this situation.

Your views as an experienced working professional are especially valuable in remedying this problem. By tapping into your views on racial matters, Nancy will get the answers she needs to assist counselors in developing this expertise. You have been chosen in a randomly selected group to answer a few questions, which will take only about 20 minutes of your time. Since she needs a high rate of return (about 90 percent), I urge you to take the time to complete this questionnaire and return it (a postpaid envelope was enclosed in the first mailing to you). I would personally appreciate it if you would complete it as soon after you have received it as possible and return it to her. No names will be used in the research and complete anonymity is assured to all who participate. The code number included is for her confidential records so followup requests are not sent to those who have completed the questionnaires.

Thank you very much for this assistance in valuable research.

Sincerely yours,

Fred L. Adair, Ph.D., NCC, LPC
Professor

P.S. We are petitioning the NBCC Board to grant one hour CEU credit toward your next renewal for completing and returning this questionnaire. If the Board agrees and you want the credit, please indicate your response at the bottom of the consent form (back of this letter).
Dear National Certified Counselor:

Recently you were requested to contribute your views and experience in a study designed by Nancy Ochs, a White researcher, to support the development of expertise for White counselors wishing to understand how to be helpful to White clients with issues that have racial overtones.

This study has a risk of bias if Nancy does not receive the views of those who have not had time or who have not wished to respond. To help this research be fully representative, please return at least the enclosed basic data sheet. You may return your sheet anonymously, since it has no code number for follow-up mailings and can therefore be received "blind." A postpaid envelope is enclosed for your return.

You may also still send back the complete survey, sent to you earlier. To return the survey anonymously, remove the corner of the sheet that has the handwritten code number. That code number is confidential and has been needed by Nancy only to send out followup requests.

No names will be used in this research, and complete anonymity is assured to all who participate.

Thank you very much for this assistance in valuable research.

Sincerely yours,

Fred L. Adair, Ph.D., NCC, LPC
Professor
Consent Form

This consent form is to request your voluntary participation in a study which will be conducted in the winter of 1992. Please read the following information. Then sign the last section marked "Informed and Voluntary Consent to Participate" if you are willing to participate in the study.

Purpose of the Study

The study asks questions about counseling White clients who may be struggling with racial issues, and it asks about counselors' views on racial matters. Although courses are available in multicultural and cross-cultural counseling, there is little, if any, information or training available for White counselors who wish to understand how to be helpful to White clients with a racial concern.

Amount of Time Involved

You are being asked to complete only a background data sheet, which will take less than 5 minutes. Other participants have been asked to complete a background data sheet, read a case scenario, answer about 20 questions about the case, and then respond to a 50-item attitude survey.

Assurance of Confidentiality

All data collected in the study will be kept in confidence. Each respondent is assigned a number for research analysis, and only the investigator will have access to this number. For purposes of analysis only group data will be utilized.

Assurance of Voluntary Participation

Participation in this study is strictly voluntary. The right of the individual to decline to participate or to withdraw in part or whole at any time is guaranteed.

Questions and Availability of Results

Questions about this study may be telephoned to the investigator, Nancy Ochs (804 221-2363 or 898-8972) or to Dr. Kathy Evans, dissertation chair ((804 221-2328). Results of this study may be obtained by writing the investigator at the following address: Nancy G. Ochs, School of Education, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA 23185.
Informed and Voluntary Consent to Participate

I have been informed and agree to participate in the study outlined above. My right to decline to participate or to withdraw at any time has been guaranteed.

Volunteer ........................................... Date
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