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Abstract

Career practitioners are increasingly called to engage in social justice action with or on behalf of their clients. However, there is a dearth of well-researched information on the kinds of competencies required of career practitioners to support a social justice agenda. The multicultural counselling competencies commonly referenced in the literature are limited in their application to career practice, social justice actions, and the complex interface of gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, age, ability, socioeconomic status, and religion. The measures that have been developed to assess multicultural competency, therefore, share these limitations as well as other conceptual challenges. This study focuses specifically on the creation of a tool for assessing the multicultural counselling and social justice competencies of career practitioners, based on current theoretical, research, and applied practice knowledge and a deliberate emphasis on social justice. Development and testing of the Multicultural Counselling and Social Justice Competencies scale are detailed.

There has been a specific call within the field of career development to return to its early focus on social justice issues (Blustein, 2006; Fouad, Gerstein, & Toporek, 2006; Sampson, Dozier, & Colvin, 2011). Social justice has been conceptualized in many ways (Watson, 2010). Career practitioners themselves attach multiple meanings to the concept of social justice as it relates to career development (Author2, Author1, Author3, & Marshall, 2009). In their review of the literature, Author2 and colleagues (2009) synthesized three core components of social justice: “(a) fair and equitable distribution of resources and opportunities, (b) direct action to ameliorate oppression and marginalization within society, and (c) full inclusion and participation of all members of society in a way that enables them to reach their potential” (p. 23). In the context of career development, specific examples include: inequities in access to education or career development resources; discriminant barriers to job entry, success, or advancement; and differential experience of employed, unemployed, or underemployed status in society.

It has become increasingly clear in the literature, as well as in our observations of professional practice, that various forms of cultural oppression have a direct impact on the lived experiences of our clients, as individuals and as non-dominant communities, and that the experience of social injustice is often tied to cultural group affiliation (Author2, 2008; Author2 & Author1, 2011; Leong, 2010). What is also increasingly acknowledged is the importance of broadening the focus of attention from factors within the individual to the broader organizational, social, economic, and/or political systems that impact people’s career development (Author2, 2008; Author2 et al., 2009). Applying a social justice lens to career development practice has implications for how people’s career-related issues are viewed and the direction of relevant interventions. It is insufficient to simply increase awareness of the cultural, contextual, and societal influences on people’s career development; career practitioners are being called to actively engage in challenging the organizational, institutional, community, and broader social, economic, and political systems that lead to marginalization and social injustices.
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tices (Fouad et al., 2006; Horne & Matthews, 2006). As a result, career practitioners are increasingly expected to design and implement interventions and to engage in advocacy and other social justice activities within these broader systems. This raises a question about how to prepare career practitioners with competencies that support social justice action and advocacy (Author2, 2005, 2008; Author3, Author2, & Author1, 2008a).

This study is unique in its focus specifically on the creation of a tool for assessing the multicultural counselling and social justice competencies of career practitioners, based on current theoretical, research, and applied practice knowledge and a deliberate emphasis on social justice. The development of the Multicultural and Social Justice Competencies (MCSJC) instrument, described below, was intended to provide a foundation for identifying multicultural and social justice competencies of particular importance to career development practices. We begin by providing an overview of the conceptual framework used as a foundation for the development of the MCSJC. The next section provides a detailed description of the instrument development process. Then we describe the implementation of the MCSJC with a group of Canadian career practitioners and the process of further refining the instrument, based on analysis of this data. We conclude with a discussion of limitations of the current study, potential practical applications of the MCSJC scale, and implications for strengthening the commitment to social justice in career development practices.

**Culture-Infused Counselling Model**

This current study is based on the Culture-infused counselling (CIC) model that Author1 and Author2 (2010a, 2010b, 2010c) proposed as conceptual enhancement of the Sue et al. (1982) and Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis (1992) multicultural counselling competencies framework. This CIC model has more recently been adapted for application in career development practice (Author2 & Author1, 2011). The CIC model emphasized three domains of practice. The first domain is counsellor self-awareness, which includes understanding of one’s personal cultural identity(ies), one’s position of relative privilege within society, and any potential biases towards individual or groups with particularly cultural backgrounds. Second, the awareness of others’ cultures domain includes sensitivity to a broad range of cultural factors (age, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, ability, religion, and socioeconomic status) and the common experience of cultural oppression based on group affiliation. The third domain focuses attention to the influences of culture on the working alliance, centralizing the relationship between counsellor and client in the bridging of worldviews and the collaborative negotiation of counselling goals and processes.

The definition of culture was expanded in the CIC model to be inclusive of additional cultural identity factors (gender, sexual orientation, age, ability, socioeconomic status, religion), arguing that ethnicity is one of many factors that form a complex interface to define an individual cultural self-identification. Each of these elements and the interplay among them form important considerations in coming to a full understanding of the individual and her/his social location (Author1, 2010). The CIC model also assumes that all counselling is multicultural to some degree; both counsellor and client bring their unique combination of cultural identities to the relationship. Author1 and Author2 (2010a, 2010b) argue that the construct of the working alliance provides a more transtheoretical and conceptually inclusive category than appropriate skills/techniques (Arredondo et al., 1996; Sue et al., 1992) as the third competency domain. It is in the context of this working alliance between counsellor and client that cultural inquiry takes place and that the appropriate locus of change is identified, which may include social justice interventions such as client empowerment, consciousness raising, advocacy, or other systems change processes. Another strength of the CIC model is the centrality of social justice in case conceptualization and intervention planning. It emphasizes the importance of developing relevant and effective interventions directly with clients, while inviting career practitioners to design interventions that go beyond simply helping clients cope with or adapt to oppressive social and systemic conditions to targeting change in...
these contextual career barriers. The emergent framework of CIC competencies (Author1 & Author2, 2010a, 2010b) forms the foundation for the instrument development in this study.

Context of the Study

The development of the MCSJC scale was part of a larger cross-national study of career practitioners’ competencies related to cultural diversity and social justice in Canada and Australia. Ethics approval was obtained from the three universities where the researchers are affiliated. Several components of the study have been published, focusing on the qualitative data from the Canadian sample (Author2 et al., 2009; Author2, Author1, Marshall, & Author3, in press) and the Australian sample (Author3, Author2, & Author1, 2008a, 2008b). This paper focuses exclusively on the development and validation of the competency assessment instrument that was embedded in the broader study. One of the purposes of this sub-study was to expand the CIC model to reinforce a stronger focus on social justice. There were two distinct phases to the sub-study described in this paper: (a) instrument development and (b) data collection and empirical validation of the instrument.

Instrument Development

Conceptual Framework

The conceptualization and identification of multicultural and social justice competencies was rooted in the CIC model, itself based on a comprehensive review of the literature prior to 2005 (Author1 & Author2, 2005). A review of more recent research was then conducted, with a particular focus on emergent social justice competencies, as well as multicultural and social justice competencies specific to career counselling. Career development theories were reviewed to determine cultural influences on career development and critique models of career counselling practice with non-dominant populations. We reviewed the multicultural counselling literature to identify competency frameworks and standardized instruments on multicultural counselling competencies. The national standards and guidelines for career practitioners in both Canada and Australia were also reviewed for item content. Based on these comprehensive reviews, we retained the three-fold structure of the CIC model and created a revised taxonomy of multicultural and social justice competencies. The model was sufficiently robust to accommodate the new competency additions.

Taxonomy of multicultural and social justice competencies. The taxonomy remained organized according to the three core domains of the original CIC model, resulting in a revision to that model (Author1 & Author2, 2010a):

1. Cultural Self-Awareness: Active awareness of personal assumptions, values, and biases
2. Awareness of Client Cultural Identities: Understanding the worldview of the client
3. Culturally-Sensitive Working Alliance

Based on the critique of both the traditional multicultural counselling competencies frameworks (Author1 & Author2, 2010a, 2010b) and the critical analysis of previous assessment tools, several key operating assumptions emerged to undergird this taxonomy. First, some earlier instruments included more general counselling skills (based on the assumption of overlap between counselling and multicultural counselling) (Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin, & Wise, 1994). However, we did not include what we considered general counselling competencies, in an attempt to be more discriminating and precise about the additional competencies required for multicultural and social justice practice.

Second, we operated from a broad definition of culture. In the case of earlier instruments, the focus was on primarily ethnic/racial diversity. Constantine, Gloria, and Ladany (2002) noted the narrow definition of cultural as a limitation of earlier instruments and called for future research to assess self-perceived competence in working with clients from multiple non-dominant populations. Hays (2008) made the same observation in her review and noted this as a major limitation of these tools.

Third, we attempted to address the conceptual ambiguity in early instruments. Constantine
et al. (2002) noted ambiguity in wording and unclear relationships between the items in various scales and the constructs they represented. We placed primacy on the three core constructs of the CIC model and then broke each of them down into specific attitudes, knowledge, and skills (AKS) statements. Similar to Sue et al. (1992), this created a 3 x 3 matrix of competencies. Each specific competency was clearly worded as a learning objective, beginning with an active verb that reflected the intended category of learning – attitudes, knowledge, or skills – drawing on Bloom’s (1956) taxonomy of learning objectives. See the below examples of items from the final instrument:

- **Attitudes Q1**: Believe in the equal worth of all people.
- **Knowledge Q2**: Explain how belonging to particular groups can lead to certain privileges in society.
- **Skills Q5**: Empower clients to influence external factors affecting career development.

**First draft of the MCSJC instrument.** The taxonomy of multicultural and social justice competencies was a separate product designed for educational rather than assessment purposes. For the purpose of the instrument development, the number of items was then substantively reduced through detailed item analysis to identify higher order constructs and to eliminate redundancies. The items were also re-organized under the categories of attitudes, knowledge, and skills (AKS) to create the first draft of the MCSJC instrument. The rationale for re-organizing the items into an AKS listing was simply for ease of conceptual clarity for respondents.

One of the unique features of this instrument was that it contained two 5-point Likert scales for each item: The first was designed to assess the importance of the item to the profession, and the second was a self-assessment of personal competency level. We made this choice as a means of also including respondents in the process of determining direction for the profession, rather than simply lining them up against assumed professional standards.

**Expert Review**

International experts in the multicultural counselling and career development fields (N=10) were then invited to critique the selected items and offer opinion about the face/content validity of the items (Constantine et al., 2002) and user-friendliness of the questionnaire. The experts were recognized leaders in research, applied practice, or policy development, who were not directly connected to the authors’ research. A modified Delphi approach (Author1, 1998) was used with two rounds of feedback, providing opportunity for the experts to respond to changes suggested by their peers. This step guarded against researcher bias while providing expert opinion at the development stage of questionnaire construction. The expert reviewers were asked to first complete the draft MCSJC as if they were a respondent in the study and then to critically analyze the questionnaire to: (a) add any additional items that were important to the comprehensiveness of the survey; (b) indicate any current items that should be eliminated from the survey, because they are not central to the assessment of social justice competence; and (c) provide feedback on the wording of items that may enhance the effectiveness of the survey.

**Round 1.** The first draft of the instrument presented to reviewers contained 57 items, organized according to attitudes and beliefs (17 items), knowledge (15 items), and skills (25 items). Reviewers provided feedback on the overall survey; however, the focus here is exclusively on the items contained in the MCSJC scale. The feedback from reviewers clustered into several themes:

**Invitational language.** There was a caution from reviewers about the use of terminology or lingo related to social justice for two separate reasons: (a) Social justice may be outside the scope of practice and the current professional understanding of many counsellors, and (b) any subtle overlay of expectation to engage in social justice may result in defensiveness or a sense of being assessed. A definition of what the researchers meant by the concept of social justice was added to the MCSJC scale to address these concerns.

**Empowerment language.** The choice of verbs, in particular, was critically analyzed in terms
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of two potential inferences: (a) The degree of implied counsellor power was softened (e.g., *effect change* versus *facilitate or mobilize* versus *utilize opportunities*), and (b) the degree of client control or expertise was strengthened (e.g., more client-centred language).

**Inclusive language.** There was also some concern about limiting the focus to non-dominant populations, so a broader group terminology was adopted in some questions. However, it was also clear that the relationship of social justice to cultural oppression of particular non-dominant groups was essential. In addition, the implication of a right *answer* in certain phrasing was noted (e.g., describe *the* theory… versus describe *potential* dilemmas…)

**Shared meaning/understanding.** There was tension related to the breadth/depth of items – e.g., breaking competencies down into specific attitudes, knowledge, and skills, which are then isolated from contextual considerations that may affect how the competency is interpreted and assessed. In addition, there were concerns that some items assumed a conceptual understanding that not all career practitioners would possess.

**Comprehensiveness versus specificity.** Some items potentially contained multiple constructs or applied a construct to more than one population or context. A number of items were reworded to contain a stem with a number of sub-points to address this concern. There was also a concern that one survey could not provide a comprehensive overview of multicultural and social justice competence, so trade-offs would need to be made. The length of the overall survey in which the MCSJC was embedded was a concern in terms of potential response and completion rates.

**Importance and competence scales.** Apart from concerns about length of the instrument, the reviewers supported the dual-scale approach, noting their own reactions to reflection on expectations related to the profession versus their own personal competency levels. They suggested minor modifications to the layout of the instrument, such as making it easier to separate professional expectations and personal competence, noting: “It was interesting to me that, though I held a strong belief in most of the items, it was in the personal degree of competency and skill that greater variances appeared in my answers.” “I found myself answering the same for both the profession as for myself, even unconsciously… I think in part because I hold the belief that if I believe it is important for the profession than I ought to also hold that belief…” These changes addressed reviewer concerns for the second round of review.

**Round 2.** The same experts were asked to review the second draft of the instrument, which now contained 80 items: 21 attitudes, 26 knowledge, and 33 skills competencies. Although the number of items increased, most items were shorter, more concise, and contained less potential for overlapping constructs or misinterpretation. The feedback from the second round included the following key points.

**Refining the Likert scales.** All reviews were comfortable with the wording of the Importance scale as “designed to assess your personal perspective on the importance of social justice to career development practice generally.” Concern was expressed that the description of Competence scale might still encourage responses impacted by *social desirability*: The scale “…provides an indication of your self-assessment of *professional competence* on each item” so the wording was changed to “…indicates the degree to which you personally feel competent…” The scales were then labeled simply “Importance to Career Practice” and “Current Competency Level” with 5-point Likert Scales (1 = *very low*, 2 = *moderately low*, 3 = *average*, 4 = *moderately high*, and 5 = *very high*).

**Revision of wording.** Some fine-tuning of wording was required to ensure clarity of item stems and sub-points, to ensure all of the earlier critiques were fully addressed, to ensure clarity and reduce any remaining redundancy in the constructs, and to again simplify the language for practitioners responding to the survey. The word *beliefs* was also removed from the heading of the first section, *Attitudes and beliefs related to social justice*, to clearly communicate the AKS
structure and level of learning targeted and to avoid confusion with what we consider a sub-construct of attitudes (e.g. attitudes are reflected in and through particular beliefs, values, biases, etc.).

**Empirical Validation of the MCSJC Scale**

The final version of the MCSJC instrument used in this study consisted of 82 self-report statements, organized according to attitudes (20 items), knowledge (25 items), and skills (37 items). These items were rated in terms of *Importance and Competence*, using the scales described above. For the purposes of the data analysis, in items with stems and sub-points, each sub-point was treated as a distinct item. For example, the following Attitudes Q12 contained three items.

Believe that career development practitioners have a role to play in influencing:
1. Community development
2. Organizational development
3. Broader social, economic, and political systems

The survey was conducted online with invitations extended through professional organizations and networks. Participants completed a consent form and were offered a chance to win a $100 gift certificate to a bookstore for completing the survey. Only participants from Canada were included in this portion of the study.

**Participants**

All 180 participants were Canadian and were at least 18 years of age. Participants came from nearly every territory and province, with the majority from Alberta (31%), British Columbia (19%) and Ontario (19%). Over 75% were between the ages of 30 – 59, and 75% were female. 47% of participants had between 3-10 years of work experience, and 47% had 11-20+ years. The majority of participants identified as Caucasian Canadian (97%). The majority worked for career and employment centres (19%), non-profit organizations (16%), and public universities (13%), although numerous other career counselling settings were represented.

**Results and Discussion**

Although the original survey items were organized according to the AKS framework, for the purposes of the factor analysis, the items were re-organized according to the CIC conceptual model, based on the following rationale. First, the subjects-to-variables (STV) ratio was too small to conduct a factor analysis on the entire data set, but the STV ratios were acceptable for the three sub-scales. Second, as noted above, the empirical studies on other instruments have not supported the traditional AKS factor structure. Third, building on the conceptual/theoretical arguments presented here and elsewhere, the intent of the study was to explore the components of the three a priori sub-scales of the CIC model. Fourth, we were interested in the core constructs that contribute to each of these superordinate conceptual categories. Two separate exploratory factor analyses were conducted on the data from each of the rating scales: *Importance to Career Counselling* and *Current Competency Level* of participants.

**Exploratory Factor Analysis I: Importance Ratings**

A principal components factor analysis was conducted on the items on each of the subscales, with no factor solution specified. There is some debate about statistical approaches to factor analysis; however, “principal components with varimax rotation and the Kaiser criterion” remain most widely used (Costello & Osborne, 2005, p.8). The factor solution for each of the sub-scales was selected based on both meaningfulness/interpretability of the factors and scree plot of eigenvalues (Kim, Cartwright, Asay, & D’Andrea, 2003; Sodowsky et al., 1994). The selected factor solution was then submitted to oblique rotation process. Varimax with Kaiser Normalization was used to calculate the item loadings on each factor. Items with factors loadings greater than .50 were included. Items scoring below this cut off or loading on multiple factors were removed (Kim et al., 2003; Sodowsky et al., 1994). The test of internal reliability on the Importance ratings for the complete instrument was .91.
Cultural self-awareness: Active awareness of personal assumptions, values, and biases. This sub-scale contained 10 items. Two factors were identified with eigenvalues greater than 1.00. Together, these factors accounted for 62.08% of the variance. The rotation converged in 3 iterations.

Awareness of client cultural identities: Understanding the worldview of the client (28 items). The combination of the 6 emergent factors explained 78.34% of the variance. The rotation converged in 6 iterations. Factor solutions of 2, 3, 4, and 5 factors were also examined; however, they yielded less interpretable solutions, had items with lower factor loadings, and accounted for less of the overall variance.

Culturally-sensitive working alliance (44 items).

The combination of the 6 factors explained 72.13% of the variance. The rotation converged in 22 iterations. In this case, factor solutions of 7 and 8 were also examined, because these yielded eigenvalues greater than 1.00, along with those based on fewer factors. However, the strongest and most consistent item factor loadings and best conceptual fit emerged with the six-factor solution.

As a result of these three exploratory factor analyses, the overall conceptual framework for the instrument in Table 1 emerged. The eigenvalues and percent variance for each of the factors is provided, along with the total variance from the selected factor solution.

Three members of the research team collaborated in assigning construct names to the factors within each sub-scale. Sodowsky et al. (1994) presented a conceptual model that hypothesized the possibility of a higher order general multicultural counselling factor, with four first order factors accounting for the item clusters. The theoretical/conceptual argument in this paper, as well as the results of this study, suggest the possibility of a more complex conceptual model, one that potentially identifies second order factors, within the a priori three-fold conceptualization of multicultural counselling competencies. See Figure 1. These second order factors offer meaningful and applicable constructs for both training and assessment purposes.

Exploratory Factor Analysis II: Competence Ratings

A principal components factor analysis was also conducted on the items on each of the sub-scales based on the competence ratings. Again, no factor solution was specified.

Cultural self-awareness.

For the self-awareness sub-scale, the number of factors and item loadings matched those of the exploratory factor analysis on the Importance ratings exactly. The combination of the two factors explained 62.93% of the variance.

Awareness of client cultural identities. For the awareness of others sub-scale, four rather than six factors emerged as the best solution. The combination of the four factors explained 72.43% of the variance. In this case, the items consistently loaded on the same factors; however, Importance Factors 4 and 5 merged into Competence Factor 1 and Importance Factors 5 and 6 merged into Competence Factor 4. The test of internal reliability on the Competence ratings for the complete instrument was .94.

Working alliance. In the case of the working alliance sub-scale, for the most part, the loading of items on each factor was supported by the emergent 5-factor solution from the Competence
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Figure 1. Conceptual structure of the MCSJC scale. Higher and first order factors are derived from theoretical hypotheses and review of previous research in the designation and assessment of multicultural counselling competencies. Second order factors reflect the results of both exploratory factor analyses in this study. The number of items in each first order factor are listed according to A = Attitudes, K = Knowledge, and S = Skills nature of the competency.

data. Of the 82 AKS items on the self-report statements on the original question bank, 43 were placed under the Culturally-Sensitive Working Alliance domain. Four of these were removed from the Importance factor analysis, because they did not load clearly on one factor over another; 3 were removed from the Competence factor analysis. Thirty one of the remaining 36 items loaded on the same factors across both sets of data (86% consistency).

Forcing the Competence data into a 6-factor model created a less viable and interpretable solution. The extra Importance factor contained three items. Knowledge Q12 (List the advantages of working collaboratively with professionals in other fields) loaded on Factor 2, labeled Assessment, Design, and Evaluation of Social Justice Interventions, for competence. Skills 3a did not meet the criteria for factor loading in the competence data set. Skills 3b (Identify the impact of social injustices on client career development by assisting clients to explore how social inequalities have influenced their career development) loaded on Factor 4, Expanded Professional Roles. We were also left with uncer-
tainty in the placement of a certain sub-items from Skills Q10. Skills Q10 a, b, and d loaded on Factor 1, Implementation of systems interventions, for Importance and Factor 3, Raising social justice awareness, for Competence. Conceptually, this item could fit in either place (Implement interventions that target social, economic, and political systems by...)

Revision of the MCSJC Instrument

The second exploratory factor analysis supported the majority of the factors and item loadings identified in the first factor analysis. As noted above, further research may be required to finalize the factor and item structure, particularly for the working alliance sub-scale. It is also possible that the qualitative difference between an assessment of perceived importance to the profession and an individual’s self-assessment of personal competence account for the minor differences. At this point, the revised MCSJC instrument in Tables 1 through 3 reflects the first factor analysis structure, with questionable items in italics. It should also be noted that the response rate dropped between the attitudes, knowledge, and skills sub-scales, perhaps due to the length of the survey and the complexity of responding to both ratings for each item. As a result, the power of the statistical analyses was lower for the working alliance subscale, which had a higher weighting of skills items.

As noted earlier in the article, during the expert review phase, a number of items were separated into stems with sub-items. The main purpose of this separation was to enable us to assess whether the sub-items clustered onto the same or different factors. So, for example, we did not want to assume that respondents would rate each of the following in similar ways:

Believe that career development practitioners have a role to play in influencing:
1. Community development
2. Organizational development
3. Broader social, economic, and political systems

As a result, the number of items in each sub-scale, with the final number of items reflected in Figure 1 above. For example, for the Professional Responsibility factor in the Self-Awareness domain, items 3 a, b, c in Table 1 are reworded in the final instrument as one item: Believe that career development practitioners have a role to play in influencing:

Believe that career development practitioners could do more to help eliminate discrimination.
Believe that career development practitioners have a role to play in influencing:
Community development
Organizational development
Broader social, economic, and political systems

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Q7</td>
<td>.723 .287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Q8</td>
<td>.764 .211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Q12a</td>
<td>.853 .155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Q12b</td>
<td>.789 .181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Q12c</td>
<td>.845 .241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The loading of each item in the original MCSJC instrument onto the emergent factors from the Importance scale data is provided. The item # specifies the original organization of the items as A = Attitudes, K = Knowledge, and S = Skills, as well as the original question number. The items have been reorganized to align with the conceptual structure of the revised MCSJC instrument in Figure 1.

Based on the factor analyses, it was possible to identify which of these clusters of items loaded on the same factors and which ones loaded differently, in spite of their origins with the same item stem. The research team made the decision to simplify the instrument by collapsing stems and sub-items where appropriate. This reduced the number of items in each sub-scale, with the final number of items reflected in Figure 1 above. For example, for the Professional Responsibility factor in the Self-Awareness domain, items 3 a, b, c in Table 1 are reworded in the final instrument as one item: Believe that career development practitioners have a role to play in influencing:

Believe that career development practitioners could do more to help eliminate discrimination.
Believe that career development practitioners have a role to play in influencing:
Community development
Organizational development
Broader social, economic, and political systems

Further analyses of the data based on mean scores for each factor in the final MCSJC instrument are reported in Author1, Author2, Author4, and Author3 (2013).
Reliability and Validity

The Cronbach’s Alpha scores for both sets of data indicated strong internal reliability, higher than most of the instruments reviewed. The content validity of the MCSJC was strengthened by comparison of the items to other competency frameworks and instruments in the development of the original taxonomy and by the review of item appropriateness, goodness of fit, and clarity by the expert reviewers (Constantine et al., 2002). Construct validity was supported through the amount of variance accounted for in both exploratory factor analyses (Constantine et al., 2002; Hays, 2008).

Implications and Conclusions

The conceptual/theoretical arguments underlying the three core competency domains in the CIC model have been previously substantiated (Author1 & Author2, 2010a, 2010b). Although this study did not test the tri-partite factor structure of the instrument, the factor analysis of the three a priori sub-scales provided meaningful and empirically supported second order factors that potentially contribute to our understanding of multicultural and social justice competence, specifically for career development practitioners. A confirmatory factor analysis using either the importance or competence scale, or both, with larger samples would provide an opportunity for further validation of both the three-factor structure (first order factors) and specific competencies (second order factors).

There are a number of limitations to this study, which affect its generalizability and leave questions to be answered in future research. The MCSJC instrument was designed specifically for and tested with career development practitioners. This affected the inclusion/exclusion and the wording of some items. It will also be important to test...
### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 1: Implementation of systemic interventions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 2: Assessment, design, and evaluation of social systems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 3: Raising social justice awareness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 4: Committed to client empowerment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 5: Committed to social justice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 6: Committed to multicultural and social justice competencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The loading of each item in the original MCSJC instrument onto the emergent factors from the Importance scale data is provided. The item specifies the original organization of the items as A = Attitudes, K = Knowledge, and S = Skills, as well as the original question number. The items have been reorganized to align with the conceptual structure of the revised MCSJC instrument in Figure 1.*

---

**Development of the Multicultural and Social Justice Competencies Scale**
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three independent factor analyses. This made it impossible to assess the overall factor structure of the instrument or to fully support, apart from the theoretical arguments made in this paper, the self-awareness, awareness of others cultural identities, and culturally sensitive working alliance model.

The benefit of including the Importance measure in this study is that it provided career practitioners with a direct opportunity to identity the elements that they believed were essential to career development and to position multicultural and social justice principles and practices in the context of their own practice experiences. The resultant MCSJC instrument serves not only as a potential tool for practitioner self-assessment, but also as a potential guide for and assessment measure in the design and delivery of career counselling and career development pre-service and continuing education curricula. We have provided a detailed description of the instrument development process in hopes that it might be helpful for future researchers who wish to test and/or refine this instrument or develop a new one.

To conclude the discussion, we return to comments of the expert reviewers and a number of key statements about the significance of this study, particularly to the field of career development: This whole survey puts career development at a higher level... I think this is an important area and I know we do not deal with social justice issues in any comprehensive way in training career professionals... I believe this is valuable research and that the findings will greatly contribute to the field. However, I think the most important outcome will be to raise the awareness of career practitioners about their role in promoting and enacting social justice strategies. It is our hope that through engaging career development practitioners to consider the importance of the competencies for career practice and providing self-ratings of competence will have moved participants along this consciousness-raising path and positioned social justice a bit closer to the forefront of professional education and practice.
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