

## Introduction

The terms *cultural*, *cross-cultural* and *multicultural* have sometimes been used interchangeably in the field of psychology. In order to understand the constructs, it is first useful to consider the definition of culture. Following the lead of cultural anthropology, we prefer to distinguish our working definition of culture as “a learned, socially transmitted, symbolically based mechanism for survival, which, like other phenomena of our universe, has order or pattern. . . . a system of learned and socially transmitted ideas, sentiments, social arrangements, and objects” (Gamst & Norbeck, 1976, p. 6). Whereas the term *cultural* has been used to refer to specific racial groups, the use of *cross-cultural* in mental health and psychology research typically refer to the study of similarities and differences across different cultural groups in the world. The term *multicultural*, in psychology, counseling, and other health-related fields, has been used more broadly to describe the diversity of social identities within a given population. Although some scholars may take a more narrow perspective on the term, including discussions relevant only to racial minority groups (i.e., racism, racial identity), we define *multicultural* as inclusive of issues and topics that address the socio-cultural-political experiences of people from different ethnic groups, genders, sexual identities, social classes, and disability backgrounds.

*Multicultural psychology* and *multicultural counseling* are fields of study and practice with considerable

overlap. Both recognize the importance of the social, cultural, and political influences on an individual’s beliefs, attitudes, thoughts, and psychosocial functioning. *Multicultural health* is a related field that addresses disparities in the treatment of or prevalence of behavioral or physical health problems experienced by underserved and underrepresented populations. Multicultural-oriented psychologists, counselors, and health practitioners come from many disciplines (e.g., clinical psychology, college student personnel, community psychology, counseling psychology, marriage and family therapy, nursing, psychiatry, social psychology, and social work). This book is oriented to provide enough breadth to satisfy scholars and practitioners in each of these disciplines. Given our training as psychologists, however, it is inevitable that our discussions focus more on the history and development of psychology.

With our more inclusive definition of *multicultural*, we include in this handbook issues and topics of concern for sexual minorities and persons with disabilities, as well as gender (including men’s issues), with the more commonly addressed groups (e.g., racial minorities) covered in the fields of multicultural psychology, counseling, and health. We also move beyond issues more commonly addressed in the multicultural counseling literature (e.g., acculturation, multicultural competence) to address measures of prejudice, gender role conflict, sexual prejudice, attitudes toward persons with

disabilities, etc. Hence, we define *multicultural measures* as survey instruments that facilitate the study of multicultural issues and that result in the promotion of the study of the sociopolitical and cultural experiences of individuals from a wide array of social identity groups as well as the contexts in which they may occur.

### 1.1 HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The history of the psychological study of people from marginalized backgrounds (e.g., women, sexual minorities, racial minorities) is, for a majority of the early 20th century, replete with examples of how research was used to further oppression and to maintain the status quo. Several landmark studies (e.g., Clark & Clark, 1939; Hooker, 1957) notwithstanding, most research painted ethnic minorities, women, and persons with disabilities as inferior beings and sexual

minorities as deviant and psychologically sick. At this same time, heterosexual White American men's behaviors, emotions, and cognitions were established as normative. However, the study of the role of gender in the lives of men was absent until the late 1970s.

Influenced by the civil rights movement and feminists of the 1950s and 1960s, psychology has become a more inclusive field of study. Research now addresses a multitude of social and cultural issues. In fact, since the 1970s, the amount of research and theoretical papers published in peer-reviewed journals has increased substantially (see Table 1.0). In order to demonstrate the increase, we conducted a cursory search on PsycInfo, an electronic database of peer-reviewed journal, articles published between 1975 and 2009 using the following keywords: *acculturation, culture, disability, ethnic identity, gay, gender, homophobia, lesbian, masculinity, multicultural, prejudice, racial identity,*

**Table 1.0** Frequency of Keyword Matches in Research Database Between 1975–2009

Keyword	1975–1979	1980–1984	1985–1989	1990–1994	1995–1999	2000–2004	2005–2009
gender	147	336	715	702	2468	8377	9872
women	773	369	272	297	1959	6408	9409
disability	330	539	1173	1934	3855	5388	6926
culture	191	227	427	587	1143	2617	3623
gay	17	33	107	402	552	1136	1302
lesbian	30	72	142	295	457	912	991
masculinity	89	94	104	126	161	449	781
acculturation	31	32	27	181	266	448	772
racism	19	28	43	103	140	401	644
prejudice	74	44	79	94	170	374	608
multicultural	11	28	35	142	268	493	534
ethnic identity	12	15	27	53	123	279	386
racial identity	4	2	27	51	85	164	181
homophobia	2	9	27	50	65	148	161
sexism	32	20	27	38	43	110	159

*racism*, *sexism*, and *women*. The keywords are listed by order of most published articles to least published articles for the most recent 5-year period (i.e., 2005–2009). Over the course of these 35 years, we noted an increase in nearly every multicultural-related topic of study, particularly between the 1990s and the first decade of the 2000s. Dramatic increases were observed for gender-, women-, disability-, and culture-related articles published. There are several limitations of this analysis, however. First, since it was not our intent to analyze the contents or methodology of the articles, we cannot make any claims regarding specific topics of interest within a field of study. Individuals interested in the contents of these articles for specific groups should see Cokley, Caldwell, Miller, and Muhammad (2001); Edwards and Pedrotti (2008); Huang, Brewster, Moradi, Goodman, Wiseman, and Martin (2010); Liang, Salcedo, Rivera, and Lopez (2009); or Phillips, Ingram, Smith, and Mindes (2003). The multicultural contents of specific journals also have been studied, and interested readers may wish to review Arredondo, Rosen, Rice, Perez, and Tovar-Gamero (2005) or Pope-Davis, Ligiero, Liang, and Codrington (2001). In recent years, the methods and contents of specific topics (e.g., coping with racism) within an area of study also have been presented. Some examples of these review articles are Brondolo, ver Halen, Pencille, Beatty, and Contrada (2009); Miller and Kerlow-Myers (2009); and Worthington, Soth-McNett, and Moreno (2007). Second, a number of articles may have multiple keywords and, as such, been counted twice. However, the fact that there has been an increase in the number of articles published in these areas still is clear. Third, we performed our search on only one database. Hence, the number of articles published in journals not cataloged in PsycInfo was not counted in our search. Finally, because of the wide diversity of ethnic groups in the United States (e.g., more than 40 Asian ethnic groups alone), the frequency of published articles addressing specific groups is not presented in this analysis. It is important to note that some authors have found that the proportion of articles published for ethnic groups relative to the total number of articles

published does not reflect the general ethnic makeup of our culture (e.g., Delgado-Romero, Galván, Maschino, & Rowland, 2005). Hence, research on some marginalized groups remains underrepresented relative to the proportion of individuals that make up the group. We argue that greater attention to the development of psychometrically sound instrumentation will not only allow for more culturally sensitive treatment (see Chapter 2) but also encourage more research.

## 1.2 PURPOSE AND STRUCTURE

As researchers and trainers of doctoral- and master's-level clinicians, we saw the need to organize the growing body of multicultural-related measures for our own projects as well as to facilitate the research and clinical endeavors of our students. With that said, we are aware of other books (e.g., Fisher, Davis, Yarber, & Davis, 2010; Nelson, 2009), book chapters (e.g., Smiler & Epstein, 2010), and manuscripts (e.g., Bastos, Celeste, Faerstein, & Barros, 2010) produced to meet some of those needs. Authors of previous works, however, have tended to offer reviews or critiques of measures on a narrow range of multicultural topics (e.g., prejudice) or based on a specific population (e.g., lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered individuals). While these reviews and books are informative and help to shape that specific field of inquiry, their focus on one issue makes it more challenging for clinicians and researchers to identify measures addressing multiple social identities or experiences (e.g., prejudice and perceived racism; gender role conflict and disabilities). As such, the purpose of this book is to summarize and promote the use of multicultural-oriented measures across a wider range of populations and issues in (1) the training of students and staff, (2) culturally responsive service delivery of agencies, (3) clinical practice, as well as (4) research.

To meet our objectives for this handbook, readers will be presented with a review of important terms and concepts related to the process of developing a reliable and valid instrument in Chapter 2. This psychometric discussion is coupled with a multicultural augmentation that provides a multicultural measurement context.

In our effort to promote multicultural-responsive practice, we provide an overview of several multicultural assessment models in Chapter 3. We offer the Multicultural Assessment-Intervention Process (MAIP) Model as a framework to guide practitioners', agency directors', and educators' efforts for including the use of multicultural-oriented measures in clinical practice, service delivery, and training. In the remaining chapters, the development and psychometric properties of 236 measures are summarized. In Chapter 4, we provide a summary of 26 measures that address some aspect of multicultural competence in clinical, education, and training settings. In Chapter 5, we offer readers a summary of 27 measures of racial identity and ethnic identity. Although the two constructs represent distinct concepts (see Helms, 2007), we present these measures of race- or ethnic-based identity together. Measures summarized in Chapter 5 are developed for specific ethnic groups as well as for multiple ethnic groups. In Chapter 6, we summarize 48 measures addressing the multidimensional and bidirectional aspects of acculturation. Measures of enculturation, culturally based family conflict, cultural values orientations, as well as behavioral measures of acculturation are reported and summarized in this chapter. In Chapter 7, a summary of measures addressing the diverse literature regarding race-based prejudice, perceived discrimination, and stress is presented. In total, 37 racism- and prejudice-related measures are summarized in this chapter. The psychometric properties of instruments developed to assess for prejudicial attitudes as well as perceptions of race-based discrimination are presented. Several measures addressing multiple forms of discrimination or prejudice are summarized in this chapter as well. In Chapter 8, we summarize the development and properties of 41 measures addressing gender roles, gender identity, and perceived discrimination or attitudes. In this chapter, measures of masculine ideology and feminine ideology as well as their accompanying strain, stress, and conflict are summarized. Furthermore, summaries of measures of perceived sexism, attitudes, identity development, and

gender invariance are provided. In Chapter 9, we offer the summaries of 21 measures addressing aspects of prejudice, sexual discrimination, identity development, and environmental stressors facing sexual minorities. We noted that most measures address lesbian and gay individuals with considerably less attention to issues and experiences of bisexual individuals. In Chapter 10, we provide a summary of 36 measures addressing the psychosocial experiences of persons with disabilities. The measures in this chapter do not address neurological assessments but will assist practitioners and researchers to in developing a greater understanding of stigma-related experiences of persons with disabilities.

Because our main focus is to provide readers with summaries of the development and properties of measures, the structure of each chapter will vary little from one to the next. In each chapter, we begin by providing a broad overview of the general terms used in the field of study. We follow that discussion with a summary of the historical development of the construct(s) of interest in each chapter, offer a general review of the theoretical or empirical literature guiding the development of instruments in the field, and provide some suggestions for continued research. We felt that a general overview was necessary to give readers the context and language through which to have a basic understanding of the nature of the field of study. Given the broad range of topics addressed, a specific research review of each area of study within a field (e.g., coping with racism in Chapter 7) was beyond the scope of each chapter. As such, we do not provide an in-depth review of research in both perceived discrimination and prejudice. Reviews of research on specific topics can be found elsewhere. As an example, individuals interested in the empirical coping with racism literature should read Brondolo, ver Halen, Pencille, Beatty, and Contrada's (2009) review. Finally, although the items of measures are not presented, readers are given the references to the primary journal sources and the contact information of the person for the instrument of interest.

### 1.3 METHOD FOR INCLUSION

In our review of the literature, we identified more than 300 measures addressing the topics and populations covered in this book. Measures summarized in this book were included if they met the following criteria: (1) was published in a peer-reviewed journal; (2) demonstrated evidence for factorial validity; (3) was developed for use or heavily used in the United States or Canada, and (4) had discernible scoring instructions. A preliminary list of measures was then sent to experts in their respective fields of study for review. These experts provided feedback to ensure that we did not erroneously exclude any measure of which they were aware.

### 1.4 MOVING FORWARD

To our knowledge, this handbook, which summarizes measures across many multicultural topics, represents the first of its kind. We are encouraged by the quantity of and rigor by which many of the measures have been developed. In engaging in this review, we observed that researchers are using increasingly more sophisticated methods by which to develop psychometrically sound instruments for use in addressing multicultural topics with diverse populations. Having said this, we also acknowledge that some measures summarized in this handbook do not evidence strong validity or

reliability. We leave it for you, the reader, with your knowledge of issues of validity and reliability (see Chapter 2), to discern which instruments may be useful for you in your practice or research endeavors. Finally, we wish to acknowledge that although we are confident that we identified many of the strongest measures developed to date, we are aware that some may not have been captured through our search methods. Further, we also recognize that there are some dimensions of multiculturalism not addressed in this text. From our vantage point, important issues related to classism and social class cultures are not addressed in this handbook. Lack of inclusion of this topic was a result of our inability to identify a critical mass of such measures that met our criteria. Limitations notwithstanding, we believe this handbook is a comprehensive text that may serve to guide researcher and practitioner alike. We hope this compendium inspires (1) further research using well-known as well as lesser-known psychometrically sound measures; (2) researchers to engage in further tests of validity of current measures; and (3) researchers to develop measures for areas in which there appear to be none. We also hope that this handbook facilitates greater use of these measures among practitioners in the delivery of mental health services. On a more idealistic note, we hope that this book can foster greater awareness and understanding of multicultural issues.

