

The Counseling Psychologist

<http://tcp.sagepub.com>

Race and Ethnicity in Empirical Counseling and Counseling Psychology Research: A 10-Year Review

Edward A. Delgado-Romero, Nallely Galván, Peggy Maschino and Marcy Rowland

The Counseling Psychologist 2005; 33; 419

DOI: 10.1177/0011000004268637

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://tcp.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/33/4/419>

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[Division of Counseling Psychology of the American Psychological Association](#)

Additional services and information for *The Counseling Psychologist* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://tcp.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://tcp.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations (this article cites 38 articles hosted on the SAGE Journals Online and HighWire Press platforms):
<http://tcp.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/33/4/419>

Race and Ethnicity in Empirical Counseling and Counseling Psychology Research: A 10-Year Review

Edward A. Delgado-Romero
Nallely Galván
Peggy Maschino
Marcy Rowland
Indiana University

This article examined 796 empirical studies published in the Journal of Counseling Psychology, the Journal of Counseling and Development, and The Counseling Psychologist from 1990 to 1999 and found that only 457 (57%) reported racial and ethnic characteristics of research participants. From this data, an overall picture was generated of the racial and ethnic composition of counseling and counseling psychology research participants: 78.2% White, 5.8% Asian American, 6.7% African American, 6.6% Hispanic, 0.9% Native American, and 0.1% multiracial. Compared to the overall U.S. population, Whites and Asian Americans were overrepresented, and African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans were underrepresented. There was limited information about how researchers gathered participants' race and ethnicity information and on factors that might inform participants' experience as racial and ethnic beings (e.g., racial and ethnic identity, generation status, acculturation). Findings are compared and contrasted with previous reviews related to issues of race and ethnicity in counseling research.

Issues of race and ethnicity have often been controversial topics in psychology (e.g., Beutler, Brown, Crothers, Booker, & Seabrook, 1996; C. I. Hall, 1997; Helms, 1994, 1996; Helms & Richardson, 1997; Spickard & Burroughs, 2000; Yee, Fairchild, Weizmann, & Wyatt, 1993). For example, Fish (1995) stated that "the field of 'race' [is] one in which our discipline generates more heat than light" (p. 44), thus referring to the ongoing contentious and controversial issues regarding the definition and examination of race and ethnicity in the psychology research literature. Although issues related to race and ethnicity can be controversial, psychologists are ethically and

The authors wish to thank Chalmer Thompson, Susan Whiston, Beverly Vandiver, Lisa Flores, and the anonymous reviewers of *The Counseling Psychologist* for their comments on earlier versions of this manuscript. Edward Delgado-Romero is now in the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services at the University of Georgia. Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to Edward Delgado-Romero, Department of Counseling and Human Development Services, 402 Aderhold Hall, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602; phone: 706-542-1812; e-mail: edward_delgado_romero@hotmail.com.

THE COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGIST, Vol. 33 No. 4, July 2005 419-448
DOI: 10.1177/0011000004268637
© 2005 by the Society of Counseling Psychology

professionally recommended (e.g., American Psychological Association [APA], 2003; Parham, 2001; D. W. Sue & Sue, 1999) to attend to and appropriately engage in matters that pertain to inequitable treatment based on race and/or ethnicity and that promote social justice. How counselors and counseling psychologists report and use race or ethnicity in research is important information that can be used to understand the relevance that psychological variables have to participants' race or ethnicity and vice versa. Indeed, knowledge about the relationship of race and ethnicity to psychological functioning and development can have a positive effect on interventions that promote growth and change.

In this article, we provide an overview of issues related to race and ethnicity in psychology and review counseling and counseling psychology research relative to the reporting of race and ethnicity and related methodological concerns. We then present the results of an analysis of racial and ethnic reporting over a 10-year period (1990-1999) in counseling psychology research as reflected in the contents of the *Journal of Counseling and Development (JCD)*, the *Journal of Counseling Psychology (JCP)*, and *The Counseling Psychologist (TCP)*. From the data set, we generate a racial and ethnic profile of the counseling and counseling psychology research participants during the study period. We then compare the profile to relevant external (e.g., the racial and ethnic composition of the United States) and internal professional (e.g., previous literature reviews) profiles of race and ethnicity within counseling and counseling psychology research.

Definitions of Race and Ethnicity

Race. Definitions of race range from biological and genetic explanations (e.g., Lehrman, 2003; Rushton, 1995) to reflections of sociopolitically constructed hierarchies (e.g., Haney López, 2000; Spickard, 1992). The concept of race in biology has origins in Linnaeus's classification of living things. Although there are differences in classification systems, human beings were often classified by skin pigmentation as red, yellow, black, and white, representing Indians, Asians, Africans, and Europeans, respectively (Spickard, 1992). Because of the variability of individuals within racial groups (which may exceed between-group variability) and given that in the United States, these classifications were often used in a broad and mutually exclusive manner that resulted in racial and ethnic inequities, many authors (e.g., APA, 2003; Fish, 1995; Helms, 1992, 2002; Haney López, 2000; Neville, Worthington, & Spanierman, 2001; Spickard, 1992) have argued that notwithstanding the biological component to race, it is primarily a social construct. As such, race is embedded in sociopolitical contexts that reflect a

social and economic hierarchy based on the relative superiority and inferiority of different races. Although many scholars now define race as a social construction, Jones (2003) pointed out that socially constructed race is not fundamentally different than biologically derived race, given that social hierarchies based on race have always been supported by instruments of society and culture, regardless of the underlying assumptions about race. He simply states that "*race matters*" (p. 277; italics in original).

In the United States, Whites (i.e., European-descended Caucasians) are the dominant racial group in terms of both population numbers and social, political, and economic influence. As a consequence, Whites have the ability to perpetuate racial power by denying race both as relevant to the lives of Whites and as an essential quality of those who are not White (Thompson, Shin, & Stephens, 2005). Guthrie (1976) and Holliday and Holmes (2003) argue that the professional dominance of White researchers has led to a history of racism and oppression in psychology (e.g., Guthrie, 1976; Holliday & Holmes, 2003) and to the imposition of limiting and dehumanizing racial categories on visibly racial (non-White) groups (Thompson et al., 2005; Trimble, Helms, & Root, 2003).

Ethnicity. Phinney (1996) defined ethnicity by examining three constitutive aspects: culture, identity, and minority status. Phinney (2000) stated that ethnicity is a dynamic, multidimensional construct that refers to one's identity in terms of a subgroup that claims a common ancestry within a larger context and that shares culture, race, religion, language, kinship, or place of origin. These aspects are dimensions along which individuals vary rather than discrete categories. Ethnicity denotes a common tradition composed of shared values and customs (McGoldrick & Giordano, 1996), allegiance to particular group, national or regional traditions, and the manner in which individuals include or exclude themselves from a group that shares a historical or familial relationships (Coleman, Norton, Miranda, & McCubbin, 2003). For example, Giordano and McGoldrick (1996) delineated European-descended ethnic groups on the basis of country of origin (e.g., German, Greek, French Canadians, Dutch, Irish, or Anglo Americans) and religion (e.g., Amish).

The relationship between race and ethnicity is often debated. In defining ethnicity, Phinney (1996) stated that "the term ethnicity is also used here to encompass *race*" (p. 918; italics in original), a notion that Helms and colleagues (Helms, 1996; Helms & Richardson, 1997; Helms & Talleyrand, 1997) found methodologically inappropriate. Helms argued that race was the more distinctive concept when compared with ethnicity and that race has a clear meaning as an ascribed racial category or phenotype, even when crudely assessed. Helms argued that ethnicity had no meaning apart from a

proxy for race or immigrant status. Often, it is difficult to clearly separate race and ethnicity; for example, ethnicity seems to have different connotations and consequences for Whites than for members of other racial groups. Waters (1990) observed that for Whites in the United States, ethnicity seems to be an optional part of identity, which they could choose to claim or not to claim. However, other racial groups often experienced ethnicity as an imposed identity equated with subordination, inferiority, minority status, and marginalization (Trimble et al., 2003).

A notable example of the contemporary issues in defining race and ethnicity is the U.S. Census, which provides the racial and ethnic classification system of the United States. Census 2000 specifies four races (White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaska Native) and one ethnicity (Hispanic). Haney López (2000) and Oboler (1995) argue that census terminology regarding race and ethnicity has changed over time and tends to reflect social and political context. The census categories represent a social-political construct designed for collecting data on the race and ethnicity of broad population groups in the United States and are not anthropologically or scientifically based (Office of Management and Budget, 1997). Traditionally, researchers have treated Hispanics as a (sociopolitical) racial category, and it remains to be seen if researchers, or Hispanic people themselves, will adopt the census practice of specifying both race and ethnicity for Hispanics (Diaz McConnell & Delgado-Romero, 2004).

Race, Ethnicity, and Psychology

Race and ethnicity are complex and multifaceted constructs that are often controversial and can evoke strong reactions that can support and protect systems of inequality. Consequently, it is not surprising that psychologists have concerns about racial and ethnic categorization and that many psychologists have questioned exactly what is meant by the terms *race* and *ethnicity* and the basis for these systems of classification. At the same time, psychologists are required to accurately report racial and ethnic demographic data according to the *Publication Manual for American Psychological Association* (APA, 1994, 2001) and to consider the psychological (rather than solely demographic) contextual factors of race and ethnicity according to the *Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training, Research, Practice and Organizational Change for Psychologists* (APA, 2003). Regarding the reporting of race and ethnicity in psychological research, the APA publication manual states, "Appropriate identification of research subjects and clientele is critical to the science and practice of psychology," and advises psychologists to "report major demographic characteristics such as sex, age, and race/ethnicity" (p. 18). In addition, it provides guidelines to reduce bias in lan-

guage, offering a section (2.5) on racial and ethnic identity (although in this context, identity seems to refer exclusively to a self-designation rather than to a psychological variable), which states, "Authors are reminded of the two basic guidelines of specificity and sensitivity. In keeping with Guideline 2, authors are encouraged to ask their participants about preferred designations, and are expected to avoid terms perceived as negative" (p. 68).

The categorization and use of race and ethnicity in psychological research is further complicated by the valuation of quantitative research designs by psychological scientists and the accompanying statistical requirement to obtain large samples of participants. Therefore, it is often difficult to explore within-group differences because of the expense and time involved in using large racial or ethnic minority samples (Fish, 1995; S. Sue & Sue, 2003). Often, the resolution of this problem has been to ignore heterogeneity within racial or ethnic minority populations (Padilla & Lindhoyt, 1995) through the use of overly broad categories, which may result in significant misrepresentations of groups of people, ignore within-group differences (Trimble, 1991, 1995), and lead to research based on samples of convenience (i.e., nonrandom samples) that compromise generalizability and replication of results. Without adequate specification of the populations being studied, issues arise regarding the ability to replicate a study as well as to generalize the results (S. Sue, 1999; S. Sue & Sue, 2003). Recently, there has been some research addressing the methodological implications of grouping racial and ethnic groups under general terms. For example, Umaña-Taylor and colleagues (Umaña-Taylor, Diversi, & Fine, 2002; Umaña-Taylor & Fine, 2001) have reported significant differences in ethnic identity, self-esteem, emotional autonomy, and familial ethnic socialization among Latino groups (e.g., Colombian, Guatemalan, Honduran, Mexican, Nicaraguan, Puerto Rican, and Salvadoran adolescents) that would have otherwise been categorized as a homogeneous population.

Thus, psychologists face the dilemma of having to report demographic data with minimal guidance and needing large numbers of participants to examine within-group differences. On one hand, there is a body of work critically questioning the basis, utility, and consequences of using racial and ethnic categorical systems, and on the other hand, there is the scientific requirement of adequate subject specification needed to establish the limits of generalizability and to aid in replication. Psychologists have attempted to work around this dilemma by using only participants' self-reported race and/or ethnicity to then infer an understanding about the constructs in psychological research (Helms, 1994) or by simply not addressing or reporting race and ethnicity at all. Consequently, we suggest that it is important to explore how counselors and counseling psychologists report and operationalize race and ethnicity in research. In the next section, we review

what other scholars in counseling and counseling psychology have concluded when they have systemically analyzed the reporting of race and ethnicity.

Race and Ethnicity and Research in Counseling and Counseling Psychology

Given the self-reflective focus of counseling and the leadership role that the counseling profession has taken in addressing multicultural competency, it is not surprising that counseling psychologists have taken the time to critically reflect on the research literature relative to issues of race and ethnicity (e.g., Gelso et al., 1988; Division 17's cosponsorship, along with Divisions 35, 44, and 45, of the National Multicultural Conference and Summit, [D. W. Sue, Bingham, Porche-Burke, & Vasquez, 1999]; the American Counseling Association, initially through the Association for Multicultural Counseling and Development, and Division 17's members, in collaboration with Division 45, in the development of the multicultural counseling competencies [e.g., D. W. Sue, Arredondo, & McDavis, 1992; D. W. Sue et al., 1998]; and the subsequent adoption of the multicultural counseling guidelines by APA [2003]). Most often, this reflection has focused on issues of definition and reporting, the number of racial and ethnic minority participants in counseling research, the types of research designs used that involve racial and ethnic minority participants, and the individuals or institutions that tend to publish racial- and ethnic-minority research (e.g., G. C. N. Hall & Maramba, 2001; Perez, Constantine, & Gerard, 2000).

Counseling psychologists have been addressing issues related to the reporting of race and ethnicity in some form for the past three decades. For example, Ponterotto and Casas (1991), in the *Handbook of Racial/Ethnic Minority Counseling Research*, advised researchers to accurately and comprehensively describe their samples beyond the simple reporting of ethnicity and mean age and to include information regarding education level and country of education, socioeconomic status, gender, preferred language, level of acculturation, level of racial identity development, geographic region, and other relevant characteristics. They stressed that the accuracy of participant information was directly tied to the generalizability of the results. Similarly, during the Third National Conference for Counseling Psychology held in Georgia in 1987 (Gelso et al., 1988), the research group addressed multicultural and cross-cultural issues as part of its agenda. Specifically, it focused on how best to increase the quality of multiculturally and cross-culturally focused research, to increase the multicultural sensitivity of researchers in all facets of the research process, and to take into account relevant methodological issues (methodology used, sample size requirements). The members of

the research group noted that the terms *race*, *ethnicity*, and *minority group membership* were frequently used synonymously and without an explicit rationale. The research group did not recommend that counseling psychologists should reach consensus on the definitions of terms but rather that “researchers need to be thoughtful in how they use these terms, explicit in how they use them, and clear in their rationale for whatever usage is made” (Gelso et al., 1988, p. 397).

These same concerns have been echoed and amplified in the research literature (e.g., APA, 2003; Bentancourt & López, 1993; Beutler et al., 1996; Fouad & Brown, 2000; C. I. Hall, 1997; Helms, 1994, 1996; Helms & Cook, 1999; Helms & Richardson, 1997; Yee et al., 1993) regarding the interchangeability of key terms such as *race*, *ethnicity*, *minority*, *culture*, and *multicultural*. Concerns were also identified in the literature concerning the following: the lack of adequate definition and operationalization of these terms, the tendency to ignore heterogeneity of racial groups, the failure to account for the race and ethnicity of researchers, the assumptions of race-casual relationships, and the confusion of race with other variables such as ethnicity and social class. Fish (1995, 2000) contended that U.S. psychologists inappropriately generalize psychological findings on the basis of limited samples (e.g., monolingual and monocultural research participants from the United States), fail to understand the role of culture, and use overly general racial categorical systems. Fish alleged that psychologists study rather than question the racial and ethnic categories that are used and tend to ignore within-group diversity by using self-perpetuating broad categories. Similarly, S. Sue (1999) commented on the selective enforcement of scientific principles, in particular, the tendency in psychological research for internal validity to take precedence over external validity. Consequently, results from research based on limited samples (college students, Whites, U.S. citizens) are often inappropriately presented as universal.

In addition to operational concerns, counseling psychologists have been concerned with issues of the inclusion and exclusion of racial- or ethnic-minority samples in counseling research and the types of research designs used when racial or ethnic minorities are the focus of research. Several authors (e.g., Bernal, Trimble, Burlew, & Leong, 2003; Castro & Ramirez, 1997; Graham, 1992; Ponterotto, 1988) have documented the lack of published research focused on racial or ethnic minorities over the past three decades in counseling psychology. For example, Ponterotto (1988) found that over an 11-year span (1976-1986), only 6% of the articles were focused on ethnic and racial minorities in *JCP*. Ponterotto raised a concern that when racial and ethnic minorities were the focus of research, racial-comparative designs comparing racial and ethnic minorities to Whites were overused. Graham (1992) raised a similar concern in her analysis of psychological

research involving African Americans. A concern about racial-comparative research is that it often positions Whites as the default or "normal" population against which racial and ethnic minorities are compared. Heppner, Casas, Carter, and Stone (2000) recently indicated that there has been only marginal improvement in the number of articles that focus on racial or ethnic research since Ponterotto's (1988) initial study. It should be noted that both Graham (1992) and Castro and Ramirez (1997) included only one counseling journal, *JCP*, whereas Bernal et al. (2003) searched the entire PsychINFO online database from 1961 to 2000. As such, the focus of these studies was the broader field of psychology rather than exclusively counseling or counseling psychology.

In contrast to research focused on the inclusion of racial and ethnic minorities, Buboltz, Miller, and Williams (1999) asked a more fundamental question: Were racial and ethnic data (among other demographic variables) reported at all in published research, regardless of the focus of the research? In a content analysis of *JCP* over a 26-year period (from 1973 to 1998), they found that the race and ethnicity of participants were reported in only 62% of the articles. The percentage, however, had increased from 11% in 1973 to 92% in 1998.

Thus, counseling psychologists have raised concerns regarding the amount of racial- or ethnic-minority-focused research extant in the counseling and counseling psychology research literature. Although these issues may be raised in the literature, there has been limited exploration of models or theories regarding the demographic variables being reported. Munley et al. (2002) used the Personal Dimensions of Identity model (Arredondo et al., 1996) to investigate the characteristics of research participants in empirical studies published in eight APA journals during 1999. The model classifies individual characteristics into three dimensions. Dimension A consists of stable characteristics across a lifespan, including age, culture, ethnicity, gender, language, race, social class, and sexual orientation. Dimension B characteristics are more malleable and include education, geographic location, marital status, income, religion, work and military experiences, and hobbies. Finally, Dimension C consists of the historical backdrop and key political and economic events occurring during a person's lifetime. Munley et al. found that gender (89.30%) and age (88.56%) were the most reported Dimension A characteristics, whereas race or ethnicity was reported at a moderate level (60.7%), and language, disabilities, sexual orientation, and social class were reported at much lower levels. This research is important because it connects the reporting of personal characteristics to dimensions of identity and may be a reflection of the worldview of the researchers (e.g., categories reported may indicate what the researchers consider important aspects of identity).

Taking a step beyond examining the issue of reporting demographic characteristics, Beutler et al. (1996) questioned the quality, utility, and basis of demographic data. Their results indicated that over three periods from 1970 to 1993, demographic information in three prominent psychology journals (including *JCP*) was reported at low rates across all journals and that many demographic terms were used interchangeably with no operational definitions. Specific to race and ethnicity, they noted that the use of *ethnicity* increased and *race* remained constant over time and that psychological measures were rarely used to define these terms. Consequently, it was difficult to determine the characteristics of samples being used in research from study to study, thus severely limiting the ability of researchers to replicate studies or to generalize findings. It seems that reporting race and ethnicity was almost always solely based on participant self-report (e.g., Helms, 1994) and most likely through a (nonstandardized) forced-choice format. Beutler et al. (1996) strongly questioned the utility of such data.

Carter and colleagues (Carter, 1991; Carter, Akinsulure-Smith, Smailes, & Clauss, 1998) critically examined the role that research played in extending an understanding of racial- or ethnic-minority issues. Carter (1991) examined empirical research published in *TCP*, *JCD*, and the *Journal of Vocational Behavior (JVB)* to examine what the reader learned about racial or ethnic research participants (defined as visible racial or ethnic groups in the United States, exclusive of international populations). He determined whether counseling psychology research exhibited a commitment (added new knowledge) or complacency (failed to add new knowledge) toward racial or ethnic concerns. Only 2% of the studies in this investigation were rated as committed (i.e., avoided using White norms, used culture-specific measures and within-group variation, and offered knowledge about the groups being studied). The majority of articles were rated complacent (i.e., making assumptions about visible racial or ethnic people and adding no new knowledge). Carter et al. (1998) extended this analysis by examining *JCP*, *JCD*, and *JVB* over a 10-year period (from 1982 to 1991). In this study, the authors gathered information regarding the extent to which race or ethnicity was mentioned, and they critically analyzed the literature review, methodology, data analysis, and discussion sections of published research.

Of the studies reviewed, 77.5% made no mention of racial or ethnic issues, 13.4% mentioned only race or ethnicity in the subject section, and 8.6% of the empirical articles discussed racial-cultural issues in depth. *JCP* was rated the most likely of the three journals to discuss racial or ethnic issues in depth. The majority of the articles discussing racial-cultural issues in depth were rated complacent, although there was evidence of improvement over time in *JCP* and, to a lesser degree, in *JCD*. Carter et al. (1998) noted with disappointment that only 9% of the articles over a 10-year period added to the

knowledge about racial or ethnic groups in the United States. Furthermore, many researchers overlooked race or ethnic issues as a research topic, or they confined the topics of race and ethnicity to the description of participants only. They concluded that counseling psychologists had not demonstrated a commitment to advancing the understanding of race and ethnicity in the research published in the premier counseling journals. The research of Carter and colleagues (Carter, 1991; Carter et al., 1998) marks an important shift in reflective views of racial- or ethnic-minority-focused research because they moved the discussion past static issues of inclusion or adequate reporting and into dynamic issues regarding the implications and aspirations of racial- or ethnic-minority-focused research and challenged counseling researchers to demonstrate commitment in published empirical research.

Similarly, Thompson et al. (in press) challenged the way in which race is addressed in counseling research by examining the degree to which race as a psychological construct has been researched over a 35-year period (January 1967-March 2000). Using PsychINFO (an abstract database of psychological literature), they found that a majority of research studies addressing race used a categorical definition of race. They pointed out that categorical approaches prevented the examination of nuances of racial self-identification and contributed to the assumption that race is a fixed quality of human beings. Very few studies extended the view of race beyond nominal categories. Perhaps most troubling, the authors found that in general, the study of race as a psychological construct was largely absent of theory development.

Thompson et al.'s (2005) concerns are echoed among counseling scholars who focus on race and ethnicity and who contend that psychology should move away from simplistic and categorical classification systems to focus on the contextual meaning and salience of race and ethnicity to individuals (e.g., Fouad & Brown, 2000). In addition, counseling psychology research should add to the knowledge of race and ethnicity rather than complacently accept categorical and limiting uses of race and ethnicity that fail to add knowledge and may contribute to racist and dehumanizing systems of oppression (e.g., Carter 1991; Carter et al., 1998).

Although we agree with the need to move away from the exclusive use of categorical systems of racial and ethnic classification in research, we are not sure that it is practical or realistic for counseling psychology to abandon the practice altogether. Heppner, Kivlighan, and Wampold (1999) explain that typically, the purpose of research studies is to be able to make inferences and to generalize these to a given population. As such, they argued for the need to attend to internal and external validity issues, particularly documenting participants' characteristics (e.g., race and ethnicity) so that the generalizability of the results can be determined. In addition, research funded by federal funding agencies is required to document the race and ethnicity of research

participants in accordance with government guidelines (Office of Management and Budget, 1997). For example, Heppner et al. (1999) refer to the inclusion guidelines of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), which stressed that gender and race or ethnicity information are crucial factors in research. They stated that all NIH-supported biomedical and behavioral research must include women and members of minority groups, and the exclusion of women and minorities must be justified.

Current Study

Over the past 30 years in counseling and counseling psychology, there has been consistent concern regarding issues of race and ethnicity, especially with regard to professional leadership and advocacy on multicultural issues. At the same time, there has been a notable lack of commitment and considerable complacency reflected in the research literature (Carter, 1991; Carter et al., 1998). Our review of the research indicated a somewhat fragmented picture with regard to time frame and focus of inquiry; that is, most research regarding race and ethnicity seemed to limit itself to a specific subset of research (e.g., ethnic- or racial-focused research only), was limited in years studied (e.g., reviewed research prior to the 1990s), or did not focus solely on counseling psychology (e.g., Castro & Ramirez, 1997; Graham, 1992; Munley et al., 2002). Consequently, we were interested in comprehensively addressing the issue of race and ethnicity in counseling and counseling psychology research published in leading journals during a recent 10-year period (from 1990 to 1999). Thus, the current study is grounded in the recent (1980s to the present) leadership and advocacy by counseling psychologists in addressing multicultural issues, it examines the entire research population in counseling psychology over a decade rather than examining only the results at the level of individual studies or selecting a subgroup of studies, and it provides both an external (e.g., the population estimates of racial and ethnic groups in the United States during the same period) and an internal (e.g., previous reviews of research) comparison for counseling and counseling psychology research. We felt it was vitally important to examine all the data relative to the reporting of race and ethnicity (and the consequences of this reporting) for all research participants during this period for two reasons. First, an unintended side effect of examining racial- and ethnic-focused subsets of studies might be that this approach relegates the relevance of racial- and ethnic-minority research participants to a marginal or second-class status (Gelso et al., 1988) and reinforces the idea of race or ethnic essentialism (i.e., race or ethnicity is an essential part of the lives of racial or ethnic minorities and an optional or unimportant part of the lives of Whites). Second, by conducting a census of counseling-research participants, we are able to look at

the issue of inclusion broadly. That is, we can examine the extent to which racial and ethnic minorities are included in research (both with and without a focus on race and ethnicity).

Based on our review of the literature, it was hypothesized that our sample of the counseling psychology research literature would indicate an increased reporting of race and ethnicity of research populations but that this practice would not be universal. Based on previous research, we hypothesized that (a) when race and ethnicity were reported, it would be predominantly at a very broad level with little elaboration or contextual information (e.g., generational status). Given the relative lack of attention given to racial and ethnic issues in previous analyses that examined the prevalence of racial- and ethnic-minority research, we expected (b) to find that the racial and ethnic composition of the counseling-research population would differ from the population of the United States during the study period and that Whites would be overrepresented and racial and ethnic minorities underrepresented. We expected (c) to find that the number of racial- and ethnic-minority-focused studies would marginally increase in line with previously published analyses. Finally, because of the increased attention given to multicultural issues by counseling psychologists, we expected (d) to find that racial- and ethnic-minority-focused research would not be predominantly race comparative, would not be primarily descriptive (S. Sue, 1999), and would be focused on normal developmental issues (a tenet of counseling) rather than pathology.

METHOD

Journals

This study focused on three leading counseling journals: *JCD*, *JCP*, and *TCP*. Collectively, they serve as the premier outlets for general peer-reviewed counseling and counseling psychology research and theory. They are extremely competitive, have large circulations, and are well recognized in the counseling psychology field. The Institute of Science and Information (ISI) annually calculates impact factors (frequency with which an average article is cited in a given year) for each journal to determine its importance compared with other journals in the same field and to examine the regularity with which its articles are cited. In 1998, *JCP*, *TCP*, and *JCD* were rated 3rd, 9th, and 16th, respectively, out of 50 counseling-related journals (other journals rated included *JVB*, 1st place; the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2nd place; and the *Journal of Multicultural and Counseling and Development*, 41st place). The impact factor of *JCP*, *TCP*, and *JCD* has changed over the years,

but over a 10-year period (1990-1999), these journals have been able to maintain their ratings in general. In the most recent citation report (2002) of 50 journals, *TCP*, *JCP*, and *JCD* were rated 2nd, 10th, and 37th, respectively. In addition, they have published self-reflective content analyses and content-review articles and have been components of content analyses of the broader field of psychology.

We chose the period from 1990 to 1999 because there seemed to be a great deal of professional attention directed toward issues of race and ethnicity by counseling psychologists through Division 17, including the adoption of the Multicultural Counseling Competencies in 1997 (N. Fouad, personal communication, October 22, 2003) and culminating in 1999 with the first National Multicultural Summit and Conference, cosponsored by Divisions 17, 35, 44, and 45 (D. W. Sue et al., 1999). Therefore, we could expect the multicultural focus in the division to be reflected in the research, although there may be a substantial lag before the research accurately reflects this professional attention. In addition, using this period serves as bridge from past reviews of the literature to the present.

Procedure

This study included 1,842 empirical articles published in *JCD*, *JCP*, and *TCP* from January 1990 through December 1999 (*JCD*, Volumes 68-77; *JCP*, Volumes 37-46; *TCP*, Volumes 18-27). The criterion for inclusion of an article in this study was straightforward. Articles were reviewed if the method sections reported at least one research participant. As such, theoretical articles, comments, editorials, introductions to special issues, and empirical research that used a population of research participants from a study that was previously published were excluded from this study. Out of the original 1,842 articles reviewed, 796 (42%) were found to have used research participants and were included in the study.

The research team consisted of four researchers. Three members of the team collected the data (described below), and the fourth ensured accuracy and agreement in data collection. The research team consisted of a Latino (Colombian) male, a Latina (Mexican) female, a European American (French-German) female, and a European American (German-Scandinavian) female. All of them lived in the Midwest and were members of a counseling psychology department at the time of the study.

The primary author developed a coding sheet for the study that was used to describe each empirical article in every journal. This coding sheet was used to gather the following information from the method sections of empirical articles: (a) total number of participants, (b) number of males, (c) number of females, (d) average age, (e) total number of participants by race and/or eth-

nicity, and (f) the cross-tabulation of gender by race and/or ethnicity. Because the objective was to identify specific numbers in each category, no information was estimated. That is, when a population was described in nonspecific terms such as *mostly*, a number was not estimated. Some articles included multiple studies with distinct sets of participants. In these articles, the selected data from each of the substudies were combined into a single value for the entire article where possible.

Given the focus on race and ethnicity and the conceptual problems in defining these terms, the sheet included specific guidelines for identifying race and ethnicity. We used (but were not limited to) the categorization system of the U.S. Census to aid in comparison to census data. For race, the categories White, Black, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaska Native, and multiracial were specified. Coders were also provided a blank space to write in any other term used that seemed to indicate a racial designation (classification based on observable differences such as skin color). For ethnicity, the category of Hispanic or Latino/Latina was specified. Coders were also provided a blank space to write in any other term that seemed to indicate ethnic-group membership, including references to a country of origin (e.g., Irish, Ireland), sociopolitical identities (e.g., Chicano), or other examples of ethnic-group identifiers (e.g., Amish).

In addition, the study sheet instructed coders to identify (a) whether the study stated a specific racial or ethnic focus (i.e., was race or ethnicity used as a variable in the analysis of the data?); (b) how the race or ethnicity of participants was determined; (c) whether the article provided information regarding generational status or acculturation regarding race or ethnicity; (d) if the study involved U.S. populations, international populations, or both; (e) where the research participants were recruited from (university or community populations); and (f) if the study employed a qualitative (analysis of experience through linguistic or narrative exploration) or quantitative (analysis of a variable through mathematical modeling) research design and, if race or ethnicity was specified, whether the study was descriptive (e.g., nonexperimental, defining the existence and delineating characteristics of a particular phenomenon or group of people; Heppner et al., 1999) or race comparative (racial and ethnic minorities compared with Whites).

Initial training of coders included each one's independently coding a volume of a selected journal. Following this exercise, the research team discussed their coding methods, modified the categories to be coded, and clarified the procedures to be used in gathering data. Research team meetings continued on a weekly basis during the data-collection phase of the research, whereby the coders would compare their results and identify any questions or issues regarding the coding. For example, initially, the category of "racial or ethnic focus" proved confusing to coders until they agreed on an operational

definition (race and/or ethnicity used as a variable in the analysis of data). Following the initial review and data coding of all of the articles, the fourth researcher audited the data collection to ensure accuracy in the calculations of totals. Given our objective to calculate total numbers in various categories from the data, the auditor first checked whether the complete population of a study had been accounted for in the selected variables (e.g., Males + Females + Unreported = Total Participants). When subcategories did not sum to the total and missing data did not account for the difference, the data from those articles were reviewed, and the article was recoded if errors were identified. Every study was checked in this manner, and approximately 3% of the studies were reviewed for errors. The auditor then compared the data collected between researchers over similar periods and journals to check for systemic differences in categories that might be due to coder error. For example, the auditor found that over a similar period, one of the coders had coded Category B—how the race or ethnicity of participants was determined—differently (at a much higher rate) than other reviewers. A review of the data indicated that the difference was due to coder misunderstanding rather than differences in the data. In this case, the research team met to discuss the category and to reach consensus on the category, and the data were recoded.

RESULTS

In the selected journals, 796 empirical studies over the 10-year period reported a total of 383,734 research participants. The participant pool was 42% male, 46% female, and 12% unidentified relative to gender, with an average overall age of 31.6 (only 483 [61%] studies provided information on age). Whereas we provide an overall score for age for all participants, Werth, Kopera-Frye, Blevins, and Bossick (2003) provide an example of different ways to present aggregate data relative to age, namely, to provide separate means in research designs where therapists are included as participants. Of the 796 studies that used at least one research participant, 339 (43%) did not provide specific information regarding the racial or ethnic composition of the participants (i.e., these studies either did not report racial or ethnic information at all or reported race and ethnicity in overly general terms such as *mostly White*). The percentage of studies reporting race and/or ethnicity by journal and year is presented in Table 1. As hypothesized, over the period from 1990 to 1999, it became increasingly commonplace to report ethnic and racial characteristics of the samples used. In 1990, only 26% of the empirical articles reported race or ethnicity, and this gradually increased to 40%, 40%, and 53% for 1991, 1992, and 1993, respectively. In later years, with the exception

TABLE 1: Percentage of Studies Providing Participant Racial and/or Ethnic Information by Journal and Year

<i>Year</i>	JCD	JCP	TCP	<i>Total</i>
1990	19	29	—	26
1991	46	36	33	40
1992	43	38	50	40
1993	41	65	17	53
1994	47	80	50	62
1995	61	57	75	60
1996	69	72	50	70
1997	82	82	60	80
1998	85	85	86	85
1999	67	95	33	85
Total	52	61	52	57

NOTE: JCD = *Journal of Counseling and Development*; JCP = *Journal of Counseling Psychology*; TCP = *The Counseling Psychologist*.

of 1995, the number of articles designating racial and ethnic characteristics continued to increase, peaking at 85% in 1999.

Racial and Ethnic Characteristics of the Sample

The general racial and ethnic composition of the sample of research participants over the 10-year span is presented in Table 2. The participants were 78.2% White, 5.8% Asian/Pacific Islander, 6.7% Black, 6.6% Hispanic, 0.9% American Indian/Alaskan Native, and 0.1% multiracial. In addition, 8.5% of the studies provided information on the country of origin of participants, 6.1% provided information regarding acculturation, and 3.1% provided information on the generational status (in the United States) of participants.

Of the 457 studies that provided racial or ethnic information about research participants, 45 (10%) provided more specific information regarding race and ethnicity beyond the use of the general census categories. For example, the general category of American Indian/Alaskan Native was further described in the following manner: Arikara, Choctaw, Lakota, Menominee, Native American, and Zuni. The category of Asian was further described in the following manner: Asian American, Chinese, East Indian, Hawaiian, Hmong, Japanese, Korean, multi-Asian, Laotian, Oriental, other Asian, Pacific Islander, Philippine, Taiwanese, Thai, and Vietnamese. The category of Black was further described in the following manner: African American, African, Jamaican, and Haitian. The category of Hispanic was further described in the following manner: Chicano/Chicana, Colombian,

TABLE 2: Racial and Ethnic Composition of Research Participants by Journal and in Total

<i>Racial/Ethnic Classification</i>	<i>JCD</i>		<i>JCP</i>		<i>TCP</i>		<i>Total</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	1,177	1.1	1,371	0.9	27	0.3	2,575	0.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	5,350	4.9	10,156	6.5	434	5.5	15,940	5.8
Black	6,878	6.3	11,082	7.1	272	3.5	18,232	6.7
Hispanic	5,969	5.5	11,906	7.6	158	2.0	18,033	6.6
White	86,777	79.8	120,303	76.8	6,795	86.6	213,875	78.2
Multiracial/biracial	179	0.2	104	0.1	28	0.4	311	0.1
Other	2,456	2.3	1,821	1.2	130	1.7	4,407	1.6

NOTE: *JCD* = *Journal of Counseling and Development*; *JCP* = *Journal of Counseling Psychology*; *TCP* = *The Counseling Psychologist*.

Cuban, Dominican, Hispanic American, Latino/Latina, Latin American, Mexican, South-Central, and Venezuelan. The category of White was further described in the following manner: Australian, Caucasian, Dutch, English, and European American. Other descriptions that were used but not tied to a general category of race or ethnicity were Israeli and Middle Eastern.

Other characteristics of sample included the finding that 419 of the 796 (53%) studies were university based, and minority-focused institutions (e.g., historically Black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving institutions, and tribal colleges) were almost absent (2%) from the population. One hundred and fourteen studies (14%) had a specific focus on race or ethnicity (i.e., race or ethnicity was used in the analysis or description of results). Finally, only 4% of studies indicated that there were international (non-U.S.) racial- or ethnic-minority participants.

Comparison to Census Data

As shown in Table 3, we compared our data with the population percentages from the U.S. Census (2002) for the same period to see how the racial and ethnic makeup of counseling psychology research participants compared to the racial and ethnic makeup of the U.S. population. This comparison is broad, given the different data sources and limitations to our data set (i.e., many studies did not report race or ethnicity). In comparing the percentages of research participants in each racial or ethnic category to average census percentages over the same period, we found that Whites (78.2% vs. 73.8%), Asian/Pacific Islanders (5.8% vs. 3.3%), and American Indians/

Table 3: Comparison of U.S. Census Data to Counseling Psychology Research Participants (1990-1999)

	<i>American Indian/ Alaskan Native (%)</i>	<i>Asian/ Pacific Islander (%)</i>	<i>Black (%)</i>	<i>Hispanic (%)</i>	<i>White (%)</i>
U.S. Census data	0.7	3.3	12.0	10.2	73.8
All studies classifying participants	0.9	5.8	6.7	6.6	78.2
Studies with racial/ethnic focus	1.3	7.9	6.6	9.0	73.2
Studies of the general population	0.4	2.9	6.5	3.3	82.7

Alaskan Natives (0.9% vs. 0.7%) were overrepresented and that Blacks (6.7% vs. 12%) and Hispanics (6.6% vs. 10.2%) were underrepresented.

In our analysis of research-participant representation compared with the U.S. Census, we separately considered only the studies with a specific racial or ethnic focus, which have traditionally been the focus of content analyses in counseling psychology research. Those studies may have focused entirely on one racial or ethnic group or may have focused on several groups in the interest of identifying between-group differences. Hispanics and Blacks were underrepresented in those studies as well. The representation of Whites was approximately equal to the census data, and American Indians and Asian/Pacific Islanders were overrepresented compared with the census data. In research studies that claimed no specific ethnic or racial focus, all groups were underrepresented except for Whites, who were overrepresented, comprising 82.7% of the study participants but only 73.8% of the population in general. However, given that 53% of the studies that generated the research population over this period used research participants drawn from universities, perhaps the overall U.S. population does not provide the most accurate comparison. We generated some average values for racial and ethnic groups in 4-year institutions of higher education from 1990 to 1999 (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). We then compared these with counseling and counseling psychology research participants from universities in our data. Results indicated that Asian/Pacific Islanders (8.4% of the university-based population in our study vs. 5.2% enrolled in universities) and Blacks (11.1% vs. 9.5%) were overrepresented, whereas Hispanics (4.5% vs. 5.4%), American Indians (0.3% vs. 0.7%), and Whites (73.3% vs. 75%) were underrepresented in university-based research relative to their numbers at 4-year universities.

Research Designs and Focus

In regard to our hypotheses about research designs, 321 studies used research participants where the research sample consisted of more than one race or ethnicity. Of these studies, 50 (16%) had a racial or ethnic focus (i.e., race or ethnicity was a variable in data analysis), 288 (90%) were quantitative, 90 (28%) were descriptive, 46 (14%) were race comparative, and 27 (8%) focused on pathology. Of the studies in which race or ethnicity was reported, 107 used research participants who were identified as all members of the same racial or ethnic group. In the majority of the studies that had only one racial or ethnic group, the participants were identified as White (71 studies or 66%). Of this subgroup of research studies involving White participants, 13% specified a focus on ethnicity, the majority (83%) used quantitative (vs. qualitative) analyses, 31 (44%) were descriptive studies in which no variables were manipulated, and 15 (21%) focused on pathology (i.e., disease and abnormality) as opposed to normal functioning. In the other 36 (34%) studies in which the research participants were identified as being members of a racial or ethnic group (other than White), all were focused on examining aspects of race or ethnicity, all the studies were quantitative, 11 (31%) were descriptive, and 5 (14%) focused on pathology. Consequently, research focused on racial or ethnic minorities was neither primarily descriptive nor pathology focused, as was the case in past research reviews.

DISCUSSION

We set out to explore issues related to the reporting and use of race and ethnicity in counseling and counseling psychology (as reflected by the empirical research published in *JCD*, *JCP*, and *TCP*). Grounded by research, theory, and professional advocacy regarding race and ethnicity, we generated several hypotheses that were supported by the data.

Our first hypothesis was that race and ethnicity would be reported in a broad manner with little elaboration or contextual information. However, this hypothesis presupposed that race and ethnicity would be reported. This turned out not to be the case, as race and/or ethnicity were often not reported in counseling psychology journals (especially during the early 1990s). Many studies simply did not report demographic characteristics. A typical statement regarding the lack of demographic data was, "No age or racial data were available for clients." We found this to be an interesting (and passive) way to explain the lack of information as "not available" rather than "not collected" or perhaps "not considered important." It is plausible to assume that there was some awareness of the need to report demographic characteristics in

general and awareness specifically of the need to attend to the issues in reporting racial and ethnic information from 1990 to 1999 (e.g., Gelso et al., 1988), so we were struck by the need to justify the exclusion of racial and ethnic information. These missing data (43% of empirical studies did not provide racial or ethnic data) make it difficult to understand the extent to which racial and ethnic minorities were included in research populations and create the impression of homogeneity in White research populations.

We did find that when race and ethnicity were reported, it was at very broad levels with little elaboration or contextual information (e.g., generational status). In the early years of the study, it was common for authors to relegate the race or ethnicity of participants (where not White) to an undifferentiated "other" status or to imply this by statements such as "the sample was mostly White." By relegating racial or ethnic minorities to an "other" status, White participants are assumed to be the default or universal ethnicity, and other ethnicities are deviations from White. This can contribute to a marginalizing, dehumanizing, racist, and stereotypical view of racial or ethnic minorities. The use of general terms made it difficult to understand who the participants were and made the task of replicating research a daunting one. For example, the use of generic terms (e.g., Asian, Hispanic, White) in the literature made it difficult to differentiate U.S. citizens or natives from recent immigrants or international populations. Although general terms were commonly used, we rarely found ethnic or racial terms used that could be considered blatantly offensive or outdated other than a reference to "Orientals" instead of Asians, and in one article, biracial or multiracial participants were referred to as "mixed." Perhaps the uses of such blatantly negative terms were largely avoided because of guidelines in the *APA Publication Manual* (2001) and editorial vigilance.

An interesting by-product of the use of general terms was that they were used in a mutually exclusive manner. That is, given that individuals who identify with more than one race or ethnicity exist and identify themselves as biracial- or multiracial/multiethnic in increasing numbers (Root, 1996), we were surprised by the lack of participants who identified across multiple categories. As researchers did not indicate if they had given research participants the option to identify across general racial or ethnic categories, we do not know if this issue is one of identity (i.e., individuals chose to identify with one race or ethnicity) or methodology (i.e., self-report demographic measures were structured in such a way that individuals were not allowed to choose more than one race or ethnicity). It could be the case that the use of discrete and mutually exclusive racial categories originate in racist systems of classification such as *hypodescent* (also known as the one-drop rule), where the race of an offspring of a mixed-race relationship was automatically assigned to the race of lower social status (Root, 1996; Trimble et al., 2003).

The studies that provided detailed demographic data relative to race and/or ethnicity were the exception not the rule. Although the percentage of studies that reported the race and ethnicity of research participants increased over the 10-year period (from 26% to 85%, see Table 1), by 1999, such reporting was still not a universal or standardized practice. Our finding that the reporting of race and ethnicity became increasingly commonplace from 1990 to 1999 is complementary to the findings of Buboltz et al. (1999), who reported that the rates of reporting ethnicity in *JCP* increased from 44% in 1990 to 92% in 1998. Our estimates were consistently lower than Buboltz et al. because of the fact that we were strictly guided by the data in generating total numbers of participants. For example, a study that reported the participants were “mostly White” would have received credit in the Buboltz study for having reported the race or ethnicity of participants (Buboltz, personal communication, May 8, 2003), whereas in our study, this generic description prevented us from calculating a total value as we chose not to estimate values for terms such as *mostly*. Similarly, our findings were also complementary to Munley et al. (2002) as we found that the percentage of studies reporting race or ethnicity was lower than the percentage of studies reporting gender or age.

Although we found a similar trend toward reporting race and ethnicity, we differ from the suggestion by Buboltz et al. (1999) that “perhaps this [increase] reflects a greater awareness of multicultural issues among individual authors, the editors, and the discipline of counseling psychology” (p. 501). We contend that simply reporting race or ethnicity does not reflect a greater awareness of multicultural issues per se (see Helms, 1994). For example, in our review of the studies that reported race or ethnicity and did not focus specifically on racial- or ethnic-minority issues, racial or ethnic minorities comprised only 13% (see Table 3) of the samples. This low percentage indicates that unless racial or ethnic minorities are the specific focus of interest, they are included in smaller numbers in the counseling and counseling psychology research population. Providing the data to document lack of inclusion of racial or ethnic minorities in counseling research might be a first step toward multicultural awareness, but much work remains to be done. We also submit that reporting race or ethnicity is not an issue limited to multicultural awareness; it is also a scientific issue (e.g., adequate subject specification to permit replication and to specify the limits of generalization). We contend that multicultural awareness and competence cannot be distinct and separate from scientific competence.

Our aim was to create a racial and ethnic profile of the research participants in these journals and over this period. As we mentioned above, the lack of this information and the overly general descriptors prevented us from creating a comprehensive profile of the research participants relative to race and ethnicity. However, there are several examples of research articles that

provided demographic characteristics of their research participants beyond generic labels and that aided us in understanding the racial and ethnic characteristics of the participants. For example, Leung, Ivey, and Suzuki (1994) explicitly described the ethnic origin of Asian American research participants while also cross-tabulating ethnicity and gender:

A total of 149 students (52 men and 97 women) participated, . . . 43 Chinese (16 men and 28 women), 12 Filipino (7 men and 5 women), 21 Japanese (3 men and 18 women). (p. 405)

They also specified the number of years the participants had resided in the United States. Consequently, it was a straightforward process to categorize participants by race, ethnicity, and gender.

Similarly, Abe and Zane (1990) provided information about the ethnicity and generational status of some of their participants:

61 were White Americans (23 men and 38 women), 29 U.S. born Asian Americans (9 men and 20 women), 46 foreign-born Asian Americans (26 men and 20 women). The composition of the Asian American sample included Chinese (7), Japanese (13), Korean (24). . . . Among the U.S.-born Asian Americans, 45% were second generation, and 14% were third generation. (p. 439)

However, while providing ethnic information about Asian or Asian American participants, Abe and Zane neglected to report the ethnicity and generational status of White participants.

Gomez and Fassinger (1994) provided the 23 countries of origin of their Latina subjects. Although the sample was not representative of the U.S. Latina population (e.g., Mexican Americans were underrepresented in the study), the study demonstrates the complexity and heterogeneity of the generic term *Latina*. The authors also offered information on acculturation, biculturalism, and race. Similarly, Sodowsky, Lai, and Plake (1991) identified the ethnic makeup of their Hispanic and Asian American participants and reported the generation status of their sample:

Among the Hispanics, two thirds were Mexican Americans ($N = 87$), South Americans and Central Americans ($N = 21$). . . . Among the Asian Americans, five groups had approximately equal numbers of respondents: Asians from the Indian subcontinent ($N = 26$), Chinese Americans ($N = 24$), Japanese Americans ($N = 24$), Vietnamese ($N = 24$), and Koreans ($N = 22$). . . . Almost half of the respondents ($N = 133$) were first-generation immigrants, [and] the number of respondents for the second, third, and fourth generation were 65, 50, and 34. (p. 197)

Our second hypothesis was that the counseling and counseling psychology research population would differ in racial and ethnic composition from that of the U.S. population from 1990 to 1999. From data in our study, we can see that African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans are underrepresented in counseling and counseling psychology research relative to their numbers in the U.S. population (all of whom are represented in studies without a racial or ethnic focus at less than half their numbers in the U.S. population). Asian Americans have fared better overall (although they are underrepresented in studies without a racial or ethnic focus), and Whites continue to be the group that has the largest representation, even in studies with a racial or ethnic focus. In the future, when the race and ethnicity of research participants is routinely reported, a more accurate comparison will be possible between counseling and counseling psychology and the external comparison in question (e.g., the general population, university-based populations).

In our third hypothesis, we predicted a marginal increase in the number of racial- and ethnic-minority-focused studies. Previously, Ponterotto (1988) reported that from 1976 to 1986, only 6% of the articles focused on ethnic and racial minorities in *JCP*, and Carter et al. (1998) found that from 1982 to 1991, 13.4% of empirical articles mentioned race or ethnicity in the subject section, and 8.6% discussed racial-cultural issues in depth in *JCP*, *JCD*, and *JVB*. Thus, our finding that 14% of the counseling and counseling psychology research was focused on issues of race and ethnicity can be viewed as a marginal increase relative to previous research. However, it is important to add that Bernal et al. (2003) noted that less than 1% of the overall psychological research during the 1990s (in PsychINFO) made reference to race or ethnicity at all. Thus, it seems that counseling and counseling psychology research attend to issues of race and ethnicity at a far greater rate than does psychology in general.

Finally, our last hypothesis was with respect to methodology, there would be less of a focus on race-comparative, race-descriptive, and pathology-based research designs when compared to previous reviews of racial- or ethnic-minority-focused research. In terms of methodology, the findings indicated continued progress relative to previous studies. As expected, we found that the race-comparative research was limited to 14% of studies with more than one racial or ethnic group represented. In research that stated a specific racial or ethnic focus (i.e., race or ethnicity used as a variable in the analysis of the data), the incidence of descriptive research was lower (31%) than that of studies that only had one racial or ethnic group (44%). Given that racial- and ethnic-focused research is often criticized for being mostly descriptive (e.g., S. Sue, 1999), this was an interesting finding. Consistent with counseling's espoused focus on normal development, the incidence of pathological focus was again lower for racial or ethnic minorities (14%) than

for Whites (21%). The dominance of quantitative analyses and the accompanying lack of qualitative research with racial or ethnic minorities were also of interest, although some authors (i.e., Ponterotto, 2002; Ponterotto & Grieger, 1999) have predicted that qualitative research approaches (particularly in the multicultural realm) will constitute the future or the fifth force of research in psychology.

Limitations

Some limitations to this study should be noted. Our research did not address those publications that did not use research participants yet may have been focused on issues relevant to race and ethnicity. In particular, *TCP* has a tradition of major contributions concerning issues of importance to the theory, research, and practice of counseling, and often, these major contributions address issues related to race and ethnicity (e.g., Thompson & Neville, 1999). Readers are referred to Flores, Rooney, Heppner, Browne, and Wei (1999) for an analysis of *TCP*'s major contributions.

Another limitation is the large amount of unreported race and ethnic data in the counseling and counseling psychology research literature during the 10-year period. We were able to generate a profile of the racial and ethnic characteristics for only 57% of the research participants. Consequently, our profile must be interpreted with caution. If it were possible to classify the unreported 43% of research participants, our racial and ethnic profile might be dramatically different. Related to this point, while the U.S. Census attempts to represent the entire population of the United States, individual studies in counseling and counseling psychology may draw their participants locally.

Finally, the construction of a racial and ethnic profile of the participants is also related to sample size. Studies with a large number of participants contribute more to a general profile than do single-case studies, and thus, a limitation of this study is that not all studies contribute equally to the profile. At the same time, large sample size is not necessarily related to a focus on race or ethnicity. For example, a single case or dyadic study might be focused on issues of race and ethnicity, whereas a large-scale study of several thousand participants may include a diverse sample relative to race and ethnicity but not focus on race and ethnicity at all. Consequently, studies such as those conducted by Carter et al. (Carter, 1991; Carter et al. 1998) and Thompson et al. (in press) are necessary to provide information on race and ethnicity beyond numbers and representation, as these studies directly address the theoretical foundations and commitment of researchers to understanding race and ethnicity in research.

CONCLUSION

When the empirical counseling and counseling psychology literature represented by *JCD*, *JCP*, and *TCP* from 1990 to 1999 is considered, some things stand out relative to race and ethnicity. On one hand, there seems to be a lack of standard definitions and operationalization for the assessment and categorization of race and ethnicity and a lack of inclusion of racial- or ethnic-minority research participants. The current use of self-report demographic questionnaires is limiting in terms of the options offered to participants and does not address the salience, centrality, or meaning (e.g., Sellers, Rowley, Chavous, Shelton, & Smith, 1997; Sellers, Smith, Shelton, Rowley, & Chavous, 1998) of race or ethnicity to research participants. It might be helpful for researchers to attempt to measure aspects of racial or ethnic identity or to investigate what these concepts mean to research participants. In light of the extensive literature available examining the many facets of race and ethnicity in the counseling literature (for examples of literature regarding racial-identity development, see Cross & Vandiver, 2001; Helms, 1984, 1990, 1995, 1996; Helms & Cook, 1999; Thompson & Carter, 1997; Trimble et al., 2003), it seems that empirical research in the three target journals from 1990 to 1999 did not fully reflect the conceptual and theoretical literature regarding race and ethnicity.

On the other hand, the reporting of race and ethnicity became increasingly more commonplace, and methodological concerns (e.g., the predominance of the race-comparative approach), which were raised in the past, seem to have been addressed. It is clear from an organizational standpoint that Division 17 took a leadership role during this period with regard to multicultural issues in general. We predict that the effects of this leadership will fully materialize in a future analysis of these journals.

In closing, we are reminded of the challenge implicit in Carter et al. (1998) of finding complacency instead of commitment to the study of racial- and ethnic-minority issues and the challenge made by Bernal et al. (2003) to move away from simplistic categories of race and ethnicity and “towards the development of constructs that reflect the true complexity of culture and ethnicity and its relationship to psychological phenomena” (p. 8). We look forward to a similar review of counseling psychology research from 2000 to 2009, which we imagine will reflect an active engagement with issues related to race and ethnicity; reflect more fully the demographic population of the United States, including increased inclusion of racial or ethnic minorities; and explicate aspects of White race and ethnicity.

REFERENCES

- Abe, J., & Zane, N. (1990). Psychological maladjustment among Asian and White American college students: Controlling for confounds. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 37*, 437-444.
- American Psychological Association. (1994). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychological Association. (2001). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychological Association. (2003). Guidelines on multicultural education, training, research, practice and organizational change for psychologists. *American Psychologist, 58*, 377-402.
- Arredondo, P., Toporek, R., Brown, S. P., Jones, J., Locke, D. C., Sanchez, J., et al. (1996). Operationalization of the multicultural counseling competencies. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 24*, 42-78.
- Bentancourt, H., & López, S. R. (1993). The study of culture, ethnicity and race in American psychology. *American Psychologist, 48*, 629-637.
- Bernal, G., Trimble, J. E., Burlew, A. K., & Leong, F. T. L. (2003). Introduction: The psychological study of racial and ethnic minority psychology. In G. Bernal, J. E. Trimble, A. K. Burlew, & F. T. L. Leong (Eds.), *Handbook of racial & ethnic minority psychology* (pp. 1-12). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Beutler, L., Brown, M., Crothers, L., Booker, K., & Seabrook, M. (1996). The dilemma of factitious demographic distinctions in psychological research. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64*, 892-902.
- Buboltz, W. C., Jr., Miller, M., & Williams, D. J. (1999). Content analysis of research in the *Journal of Counseling Psychology* (1973-1998). *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 46*, 496-503.
- Carter, R. T. (1991, August). *A literature review of racial-ethnic research in counseling*. Paper presented at the 99th annual convention of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco.
- Carter, R. T., Akinsulure-Smith, A. M., Smailes, E. M., & Clauss, C. S. (1998). The status of racial/ethnic research in counseling psychology: Committed or complacent? *Journal of Black Psychology, 24*, 322-334.
- Castro, A., & Ramirez, M., III. (1997). *The Latino representation in the psychological literature: A 25-year review of 6 APA journals*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Coleman, H. L. K., Norton, R. A., Miranda, G. E., & McCubbin, L. (2003). An ecological perspective on cultural identity development. In D. B. Pope-Davis, H. L. K. Coleman, W. M. Liu, & R. L. Toporek (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural competencies* (pp. 38-58). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cross, W. E., & Vandiver, B. J. (2001). Nigrescence theory and measurement: Introducing the Cross Racial Identity Scale (CRIS). In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed., pp. 371-393). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Diaz McConnell, E., & Delgado-Romero, E. A. (2004). Panethnic options and Latinos: Reality or methodological construction? *Sociological Focus, 4*, 297-312.
- Fish, J. M. (1995). Why psychologists should learn some anthropology. *American Psychologist, 50*, 44-45.
- Fish, J. M. (2000). What anthropology can do for psychology: Facing physis envy, ethnocentrism, and a belief in "race." *American Anthropologist, 102*, 552-563.

- Flores, L. Y., Rooney, S. C., Heppner, P. P., Browne, L. D., & Wei, M. (1999). Trend analysis of major contributions in *The Counseling Psychologist* cited from 1986-1996: Impact and implications. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 27, 73-95.
- Fouad, N. A., & Brown, M. T. (2000). Role of race and social class in development: Implications for counseling psychology. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (3rd ed., pp 369-410). New York: John Wiley.
- Gelso, C. J., Betz, N. E., Friedlander, M. L., Helms, J. E., Hill, C. E., Patton, M. J., et al. (1988). Research in counseling psychology: Prospects and recommendations. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 16, 385-406.
- Giordano, J., & McGoldrick, M. (1996). European families: An overview. In M. McGoldrick, J. Giordano, & J. K. Pearce (Eds.), *Ethnicity and family therapy* (pp. 427-441). New York: Guilford.
- Gomez, M. J., & Fassinger, R. E. (1994). An initial model of Latina achievement: Acculturation, biculturalism, and achieving styles. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 41, 205-215.
- Graham, S. (1992). "Most of the subjects were White and middle class": Trends in published research on African Americans in selected APA journals, 1970-1989. *American Psychologist*, 47, 629-639.
- Guthrie, R. V. (1976). *Even the rat was White: A historical view of psychology*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hall, C. I. (1997). Cultural malpractice: The growing obsolescence of psychology with the changing U.S. population. *American Psychologist*, 52, 642-651.
- Hall, G. C. N., & Maramba, G. G. (2001). In search of cultural diversity: Recent literature in cross-cultural and ethnic minority psychology. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 7, 12-26.
- Haney López, I. F. (2000). The social construction of race. In R. Delgado & J. Stefancic (Eds.), *Critical race theory: The cutting edge* (2nd ed., pp. 163-175). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Helms, J. E. (1984). Toward a theoretical explanation of the effects of race on counseling: A Black and White model. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 12, 153-165.
- Helms, J. E. (1990). *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Helms, J. E. (1992). Why is there no study of cultural equivalence in standardized cognitive ability testing? *American Psychologist*, 47, 1083-1101.
- Helms, J. E. (1994). How multiculturalism obscures racial factors in the therapy process: Comment on Ridley et al. (1994), Sadowsky et al. (1994), Ottavi et al. (1994), and Thompson et al. (1994). *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 41, 162-165.
- Helms, J. E. (1995). An update of Helms's White and people of color racial identity models. In J. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 181-198). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Helms, J. E. (1996). Toward a methodology for measuring and assessing racial identity as distinguished from ethnic identity. In G. Sadowsky & J. Impara (Eds.), *Multicultural assessment in counseling and clinical psychology* (pp. 285-311). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurement.
- Helms, J. E. (2002). A remedy for the Black-White score disparity. *American Psychologist*, 57, 303-305.
- Helms, J. E., & Cook, D. A. (1999). *Using race and culture in counseling and psychotherapy: Theory and process*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Helms, J. E., & Richardson, T. Q. (1997). How "multiculturalism" obscures race and culture as differential aspects of counseling competency. In D. Pope-Davis & H. Coleman (Eds.),

- Multicultural counseling competencies: Assessment, education, and training and supervision* (pp. 60-79). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Helms, J. E., & Talleyrand, R. M. (1997). Race is not ethnicity. *American Psychologist*, *52*, 1246-1247.
- Heppner, P. P., Casas, J. M., Carter, J., & Stone, G. L. (2000). The maturation of counseling psychology: Multifaceted perspectives, 1978-1998. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Handbook of counseling psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 3-49). New York: John Wiley.
- Heppner, P. P., Kivlighan, D. M., Jr., & Wampold, B. E. (1999). *Research in design in counseling* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Holliday, B. G., & Holmes, A. L. (2003). A tale of challenge and change: A history and chronology of ethnic minorities in psychology in the United States. In G. Bernal, J. E. Trimble, A. K. Burlew, & F. T. L. Leong (Eds.), *Handbook of racial & ethnic minority psychology* (pp. 15-64). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jones, J. M. (2003). Constructing race and deconstructing racism: A cultural psychology approach. In G. Bernal, J. E. Trimble, A. K. Burlew, & F. T. L. Leong (Eds.), *Handbook of racial & ethnic minority psychology* (pp. 276-290). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lehrman, S. (2003). The reality of race. *Scientific American*, *288*, 32.
- Leung, A., Ivey, D., & Suzuki, L. (1994). Factors affecting the career aspirations of Asian Americans. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *72*, 404-409.
- McGoldrick, M., & Giordano, J. (1996). Overview: Ethnicity and family therapy. In M. McGoldrick, J. Giordano, & J. K. Pearce (Eds.), *Ethnicity and family therapy* (pp. 1-27). New York: Guilford.
- Munley, P. H., Anderson, M. Z., Baines, T. C., Borgman, A. L., Briggs, D., Dolan, J. P., Jr., et al. (2002). Personal dimensions of identity and empirical research in APA journals. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *8*, 358-366.
- Neville, H. A., Worthington, R. L., & Spanierman, L. B. (2001). Race, power, and multicultural counseling psychology: Understanding White privilege and color-blind racial attitudes. In J. P. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed., pp. 257-288). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Oboler, S. (1995). *Ethnic labels, Latino lives: Identity and the politics of (re)presentation in the United States*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Office of Management and Budget. (1997). *Revisions to the standards for the classification of federal data on race and ethnicity*. Retrieved October 30, 1997, from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg/ombdir15.html>
- Padilla, A. M., & Lindhoiwt, K. J. (1995). Quantitative educational research with ethnic minorities. In J. A. Banks & C. A. McGee-Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 97-113). New York: Macmillan.
- Parham, T. A. (2001). Beyond intolerance: Bridging the gap between imposition and acceptance. In J. P. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas, L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (2nd ed., pp. 871-881). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Perez, R. P., Constantine, M. G., & Gerard, P. A. (2000). Individual and institutional productivity of racial and ethnic minority research in the *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *47*, 223-228.
- Phinney, J. (1996). When we talk about American ethnic groups, what do we mean? *American Psychologist*, *51*, 918-927.
- Phinney, J. (2000). Ethnic identity. In A. E. Kazdin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of psychology* (pp. 254-259). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ponterotto, J. G. (1988). Racial/ethnic minority research in the *Journal of Counseling Psychology*: A content analysis and methodological critique. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *35*, 410-418.

- Ponterotto, J. G. (2002). Qualitative research methods: The fifth force in psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist, 30*, 394-406.
- Ponterotto, J. G., & Casas, J. M. (1991). *Handbook of racial/ethnic minority counseling research*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Ponterotto, J. G., & Grieger, I. (1999). Merging qualitative and quantitative perspectives in a research identity. In M. Kopala & L. A. Suzuki (Eds.), *Using qualitative methods in psychology* (pp. 49-63). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Root, M. P. P. (Ed.). (1996). *The multiracial experience: Racial borders as the new frontier*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rushton, J. P. (1995). Construct validity, censorship, and the genetics of race. *American Psychologist, 50*, 40-41.
- Sellers, R. M., Rowley, S. A., Chavous, T. M., Shelton, J. N., & Smith, M. A. (1997). Multidimensional inventory of black identity: A preliminary investigation of reliability and construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 805-815.
- Sellers, R. M., Smith, M. A., Shelton, J. N., Rowley, S. A., & Chavous, T. M. (1998). Multidimensional model of racial identity: A reconceptualization of African American racial identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 2*, 18-39.
- Sodowsky, G. R., Lai, E. W. M., & Plake, B. S. (1991). Moderating effects of sociocultural variables on acculturation attitudes of Hispanics and Asian Americans. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70*, 194-203.
- Spickard, P. R. (1992). The illogic of American racial categories. In M. P. P. Root (Ed.), *Racially mixed people in America* (pp. 12-23). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Spickard, P., & Burroughs, J. (Eds.). (2000). *We are a people: Narratives and multiplicity in constructing ethnic identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Sue, D. W., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. J. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70*, 477-483.
- Sue, D. W., Bingham, R. P., Porche-Burke, L., & Vasquez, M. (1999). The diversification of psychology: A multicultural revolution. *American Psychologist, 54*, 1061-1069.
- Sue, D. W., Carter, R. T., Casas, J. M., Fouad, N. A., Ivey, A. E., Jensen, M., et al. (1998). *Multicultural counseling competencies: Individual and organizational development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sue, D. W., & Sue, S. (1999). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley.
- Sue, S. (1999). Science, ethnicity and bias: Where have we gone wrong? *American Psychologist, 54*, 1070-1077.
- Sue, S., & Sue, L. (2003). Ethnic research is good science. In G. Bernal, J. E. Trimble, A. K. Burlew, & F. T. L. Leong (Eds.), *Handbook of racial & ethnic minority psychology* (pp. 198-207). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Thompson, C. E., & Carter, R. T. (1997). *Racial identity theory: Applications to individual, group, and organizational interventions*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Thompson, C. E., & Neville, H. A. (1999). Racism, mental health, and mental health practice. *The Counseling Psychologist, 27*, 155-223.
- Thompson, C. E., Shin, C. E., & Stephens, J. (2005). Race and research evidence. In R. T. Carter (Ed.), *Handbook of racial-cultural psychology and counseling: Theory and research* (Vol. 1, pp. 277-294). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Trimble, J. (1991). Ethnic specification, validation prospects and future of drug abuse research. *International Journal of the Addictions, 25*, 149-169.
- Trimble, J. (1995). Toward an understanding of ethnicity and ethnic identification and their relationship with drug use research. In G. Botvin, S. Schinke, & M. Orlandi (Eds.), *Drug abuse prevention with multiethnic youth* (pp. 3-27). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Trimble, J. E., Helms, J. E., & Root, M. P. P. (2003). Social and psychological perspectives on ethnic and racial identity. In G. Bernal, J. E. Trimble, A. K. Burlew, & F. T. L. Leong (Eds.), *Handbook of racial & ethnic minority psychology* (pp. 239-275). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Umaña-Taylor, A. J., Diversi, M., & Fine, M. A. (2002). Ethnic identity and self-esteem of Latino adolescents: Distinctions among the Latino populations. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 17*, 303-327.
- Umaña-Taylor, A. J., & Fine, M. A. (2001). Methodological limitations of grouping Latino adolescents into one collective ethnic group. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 23*, 347-362.
- United States Census. (2002). *2000 Census of population and housing*. Retrieved December 12, 2002, from <http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html>
- United States Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Higher Education General Information Survey. (2002). *Fall Enrollment in Institutions of Higher Education surveys; and Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Fall Enrollment surveys*. Retrieved January 29, 2004, from <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d02/tables/dt206.asp>
- Waters, M. C. (1990). *Ethnic options: Choosing identities in America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Werth, J. L., Jr., Kopera-Frye, K., Blevins, D., & Bossick, B. (2003). Older adult representation in the counseling psychology literature. *The Counseling Psychologist, 31*, 789-814.
- Yee, A. H., Fairchild, H. H., Weizmann, F., & Wyatt, G. E. (1993). Addressing psychology's problems with race. *American Psychologist, 48*, 1132-1140.