

Pepperdine University
Pepperdine Digital Commons

Theses and Dissertations

2017

# Evaluating satisfaction of participants within the outreach and engagement program of MECCA

Farrah K. Khaleghi

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/etd

## **Recommended Citation**

Khaleghi, Farrah K., "Evaluating satisfaction of participants within the outreach and engagement program of MECCA" (2017). *Theses and Dissertations*. 801. https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/etd/801

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Pepperdine Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Pepperdine Digital Commons. For more information, please contact bailey.berry@pepperdine.edu.

Pepperdine University

Graduate School of Education & Psychology

# EVALUATING SATISFACTION OF PARTICIPANTS WITHIN THE OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM OF MECCA

A clinical dissertation presented in partial satisfaction

Of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Psychology

by

Farrah K. Khaleghi

June, 2017

Miguel E. Gallardo, Psy.D. - Dissertation Chairperson

This clinical dissertation, written by

# Farrah K. Khaleghi

under the guidance of a Faculty Committee and approved by its members, has been submitted to and accepted by the Graduate Faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

# DOCTOR OF PSYCHOLOGY

Doctoral Committee:

Miguel E. Gallardo, Psy.D., Dissertation Chairman

Shelly P. Harrell, Ph.D., Committee Member

Maryam Sayyedi, Ph.D., Committee Member

© Copyright by Farrah K. Khaleghi (2017)

All Rights Reserved

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| LIST OF TABLES   | vi   |
|--|--|
| LIST OF FIGURES  | vii  |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS   | . viii   |
| VITA   | ix   |
| ABSTRACT   | xi   |
| INTRODUCTION   | 1  |
| Importance & Levels of Stigma Associated with Mental Health<br>Purpose of Program Evaluation   | 4  |
| Community-Based Programs and Participant Satisfaction<br>Important Factors that Impact Participant Satisfaction  |  |
|  |  |
| METHOD   | 20   |
| Subjects<br>Procedures   | 22   |
| Instrument   | 23   |
| RESULTS  | 25   |
| Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for Full Sample from Fiscal Year 2012-2013<br>Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for ABRAZAR from Fiscal Year 2012-2013<br>Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for VNCOC from Fiscal Year 2012-2013<br>Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for OCCTAC from Fiscal Year 2012-2013<br>Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for OMID from Fiscal Year 2012-2013<br>Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for KCS from Fiscal Year 2012-2013<br>Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for ACCESS CAL from Fiscal Year 2012-2013.<br>Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for ABRAZAR from Fiscal Year 2013-2014<br>Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for ABRAZAR from Fiscal Year 2013-2014<br>Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for VNCOC from Fiscal Year 2013-2014<br>Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for OMID from Fiscal Year 2013-2014<br>Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for ABRAZAR from Fiscal Year 2013-2014<br>Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for OMID from Fiscal Year 2013-2014<br>Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for OMID from Fiscal Year 2013-2014<br>Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for COMID from Fiscal Year 2013-2014<br>Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for ACCESS CAL from Fiscal Year 2013-2014 | 26<br>27<br>28<br>29<br>29<br>29<br>29<br>31<br>32<br>33<br>34<br>34 |
| DISCUSSION   | 36   |
| REFERENCES   | 43   |

| TABLES  | 48 |
|---|----|
| FIGURES   | 61 |
| APPENDIX A: Extended Review of the Literature     | 63 |
| APPENDIX B: Satisfaction Survey                   | 76 |
| APPENDIX C: Notice of Approval for Human Research | 79 |

# LIST OF TABLES

Page

| Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Full MECCA Sample from Fiscal Year 2012-201348 |
|--|
| Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for ABRAZAR Sample from Fiscal Year 2012-2013      |
| Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for VNCOC Sample from Fiscal Year 2012-2013        |
| Table 4. Descriptive Statistics for OCCTAC Sample from Fiscal Year 2012-2013       |
| Table 5. Descriptive Statistics for OMID Sample from Fiscal Year 2012-2013         |
| Table 6. Descriptive Statistics for ACCESS CAL Sample from Fiscal Year 2012-2013   |
| Table 7. Descriptive Statistics for Full MECCA Sample from Fiscal Year 2013-2014   |
| Table 8. Descriptive Statistics for ABRAZAR Sample from Fiscal Year 2013-2014      |
| Table 9. Descriptive Statistics for VNCOC Sample from Fiscal Year 2013-2014        |
| Table 10. Descriptive Statistics for OCCTAC Sample from Fiscal Year 2013-2014      |
| Table 11. Descriptive Statistics for OMID Sample from Fiscal Year 2013-2014        |
| Table 12. Descriptive Statistics for KCS Sample from Fiscal Year 2013-2014         |
| Table 13. Descriptive Statistics for ACCESS CAL Sample from Fiscal Year 2013-2014  |

# LIST OF FIGURES

# Page

| Figure 1. MECCA's outreach and engagement Services       | 61 |
|--|----|
| Figure 2. Satisfaction criteria and satisfaction domains | 61 |
| Figure 3. Satisfaction survey questions                  | 62 |

## ACKNOWEDLGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Morteza Khaleghi, Dr. Karen Khaleghi, Seymone Khaleghi, Dustin Khaleghi, Skylar Khaleghi, Dr. Margaret Rubin, Kingston, and Lulu for their love and support of my personal, professional, and academic growth. I would like to thank my mentor and dissertation chair, Dr. Miguel Gallardo, for his unwavering nurturance of my development as a culturally responsive and collaborative person and professional. I would also like to thank my colleague and research partner Sheva Assar for her comradery and support throughout our graduate school careers. Finally, I would like to thank my dissertation committee for their guidance and encouragement.

Sheva Assar, M.A. ASC Lab partner and Co-authorMelanie Afshar, M.A. ASC Lab partner and Co-authorMiguel E. Gallardo, Psy.D., Dissertation ChairmanShelly P. Harrell, Ph.D. & Maryam Sayyedi, Ph.D., Committee Members

# VITA

# **EDUCATION**

| 9/2013 - Present | Pepperdine University   |
|------------------|---|
|                  | Graduate School of Education & Psychology                                     |
|                  | Los Angeles, CA   |
|                  | Doctor of Psychology in Clinical Psychology                                   |
|                  | Expected May 2017   |
| May 2013         | Pepperdine University   |
|                  | Graduate School of Education & Psychology                                     |
|                  | Malibu, CA  |
|                  | Master of Arts (M.A) in Clinical Psychology, with an emphasis in Marriage and |
|                  | Family Therapy  |
| May 2011         | University of San Francisco   |
|                  | San Francisco, CA   |
|                  | Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) in Psychology   |

# CLINICAL EXPERIENCE

| 9/2016 – Present | Twin Towers Correctional Facility and Century Regional Detention Facility<br>Los Angeles, CA |
|------------------|--|
|                  | Chief, Psychological Services/Director of Training: Cheryl D. van der Zaag, Ph.D.            |
|                  | Supervisors: Rachel Tapscott, Psy.D., Farida Anwar, Ph.D., Maureen                           |
|                  | Gonzalez-Burris, Ph.D., & Krystle Madrid, Psy.D.   |
| 9/2015 - 7/2016  | Harbor-UCLA Medical Center- Department of Psychiatry   |
|                  | Dual Diagnosis Treatment Program   |
|                  | Los Angeles, CA  |
|                  | Director: John Tsuang, M.D.  |
|                  | Supervisor: Lee M. Gomberg, Ph.D.  |
| 9/2013 - 7/2016  | Pepperdine Psychological and Educational Clinic  |
|                  | West Los Angeles Community Counseling Center   |
|                  | Los Angeles, CA  |
|                  | Supervisors: Aaron Aviera, Ph.D. & Dity Brunn, Psy.D.  |
| 9/2015 - 7/2016  | Union Rescue Mission   |
|                  | Los Angeles, CA  |

|                 | Supervisor: Aaron Aviera, Ph.D.  |
|-----------------|--|
| 9/2013 – 7/2015 | Union Rescue Mission<br>Los Angeles, CA<br>Supervisor: Aaron Aviera, Ph.D., Neva Chauppette, Psy.D., & Cary Mitchell,<br>Ph.D. |
| 9/2014 - 8/2015 | Los Angeles County + USC Medical Center<br>Neuropsychological Services<br>Los Angeles, CA<br>Supervisor: Nora Jimenez, Ph.D.   |
| 1/2012 - 6/2013 | Interface Children Family Services<br>Ventura, CA<br>Supervisor: Kim Patterson, MFT  |

#### ABSTRACT

The present study aimed to provide literature on community-based programs and correlated participant satisfaction, to examine the factors that contribute to participant satisfaction within community-based programs, and to evaluate outcomes of participant satisfaction for MECCA's O&E program, as well as reflection on components of the O&E program that produce satisfaction ratings. The primary research question of the present study was: Were participants satisfied with their participant in MECCA's O&E program for both fiscal years and if so, what factors may have contributed to their satisfaction? Through use of description analyses on outcomes of the Participant Satisfaction Survey from MECCA's six community-based agencies, findings indicate that MECCA provided culturally-responsive and linguistically congruent services. Additionally, participants were satisfied overall with the O&E services and would elect to obtain services from the O&E program again. O&E's success can be attributed to MECCA's foundation in cultural responsiveness, diversity empowerment, destigmatizing mental health services, and collaboration with the communities to create and provide community-based programs.

## Introduction

The Multi-ethnic Collaborative of Community Agencies (MECCA) in Orange County, California, consists of six ethnocultural community mental health agencies, specifically a Vietnamese-speaking (Vietnamese Center of Orange County [VNCOC]), Korean-speaking (Korean Community Services [KCS]), two Spanish-speaking (Orange County Children's Therapeutic Art Center [OCCTAC] and ABRAZAR, Farsi-speaking [OMID Multicultural Institute of Development], and Arabic-speaking agencies [ACCESS CAL]. The collaborative of agencies was unified to pursue resources for the underserved ethnic communities and empower community members in Orange County, California. The agencies each serve particular ethnic communities, often providing services to monolingual individuals and families. MECCA serves the needs of ethnic communities by providing services that include support groups, psychoeducation workshops, skill-building classes, case management, and culturally appropriate referrals. Within these six community-based agencies, two county-funded programs are conducted: Early Intervention Program for Older Adults (formerly called the Socialization Program), and Outreach and Engagement Program (O&E). Both programs focus on uplifting ethnic communities through support and resources that have frequently been inaccessible for marginalized communities. The Early Intervention Program for Older Adults has recently been modified and granted county support to become a more clinically oriented program that focuses on mental health needs, reintegrating isolated individuals back in the community in a culturally congruent manner, as well as case management. The Outreach and Engagement (O&E) program strives to assist and connect community members with resources and referrals to culturally responsive agencies and services, as well as engage members through agency-specific and MECCA collaborative classes and events. Due to the unique opportunity provided within the

O&E program of empowering participants as cultural beings within the context of their lives, and equipping participants with strength-focused coping skills, the O&E program will be the primary focus of this study. This program is of particular interest because of the impact it has had, and continues to have, in the lives of various individuals from numerous cultures, especially in the prevention of mental health conditions through individual and culture-specific interventions. In addition to individual services such as case management, life coaching, and skill building, participants are invited to participate in group classes that aim to facilitate mutual sharing of experiences and skill building, with a focus on culture as the foundation of class experiences. The classes vary and involve topics such as learning how to speak English, complete government forms, play guitar, cooking, art, sewing and making clothing, and other skill-based classes with the purpose of gaining knowledge while sharing experiences. Participants achieve short-term goals through short-term life coaching and case management. The program provides mental health services as well as medical, legal, and social services. The O&E program seeks to reduce risk factors by increasing support through referrals and linkages to other community agencies and culturally responsive treatments, with early intervention and prevention of worsening problems as the goals of this program. The O&E program strives to decrease stigma associated with mental health issues, as well as increase protective factors to aid community members in overcoming external and internal stressors.

#### Importance & Levels of Stigma Associated with Mental Health

When looking at diverse ethnic groups living within low socioeconomic conditions, it is important to understand the barriers that make accessing mental health services difficult (Kaczorowski et al., 2011). Accordingly, research has targeted barriers and indicate that access to mental health treatment can be improved by making transportation and child care available, providing low-cost assistance that is optional for home-based forms, offering independent, phone-based, or video-based treatments, and creating a community treatment approach that integrates other families (Snell-Johns, Mendez, & Smith, 2004). For diverse ethnic groups, researchers highlight the importance of cultural beliefs of the individual while living within United States culture as crucial in understanding the individual's outlook on accessing mental health treatment (Sood, Mendez, & Kendall, 2010). Additionally, research has emphasized reducing stigma and doing so through promoting awareness, as well as, providing accurate information about mental health (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1999). Furthermore, diverse and low socioeconomic families have been found to have early treatment dropout rates (Kazdin & Mazurisk, 1994). Researchers found that, amongst Latinos, barriers to treatment included mental health treatment stigma, concern surrounding legal status in the United States, and fear of discrimination due to ethnicity (Rastogi, Massey-Hastings, & Wieling, 2012). As a result of these issues that inhibit diverse communities from accessing mental health services, it is important to consider the development and implementation of community-based services that are capable of engaging and providing culturally responsive services.

Various levels of stigma are a product of a vast history within psychology where a lack of attention was placed on the diversity of the human experience. Research shows that racism is embedded in the history of psychology and education as a whole with the extinction of "Indigenous Knowledge" and the eclipse of Eurocentrism (Dumbrill & Green, 2008). The important message to extract is that racism is a powerful, omnipresent foundation of society that clinical psychology is not immune to. Furthermore, it is imperative that mental health professionals work intensely to have awareness, focus, and compassion for overt and covert acts of racism (Thompson-Miller & Feagin, 2007). Additionally, it is critical that mental health

professionals evaluate their racist frame of thinking, feeling, behaving, and conceptualizing that has been inherited through the environment within which the mental health professional has been shaped (Thompson-Miller & Feagin, 2007). A valuable, central component in the discussion of the construct of "race" is the lived experience of individuals and groups. Daily experiences of undeniable racism facilitate long-term "racism-related stress" and thus influence humanity constantly. Harrell (2000) suggests that mental health professionals should explore the major ways individuals experience racism, including "racism-related life events, vicarious racism experiences, daily racism microstressors, chronic contextual stress, collective experiences of racism, and the transgenerational transmission of group traumas" (p. 45). Through an assessment of an individual's lived experiences of "racism-related stress," the program provider can work towards establishing rapport and cultural competence, cautiously hoping to lead towards trust and safety in the therapeutic context. However, the reality of embedded racism in many facets of psychology calls for true cultural competency, including further research and greater awareness on the role of the construct of "race" in clinical psychology practices.

#### **Purpose of Program Evaluation**

Given the multi-ethnic, community-based focus of the services provided by MECCA, it is essential to implement a program evaluation for various reasons. Evaluation is an essential principle that allows for the measurement of the efficacy of a program and provides guidance for future program improvement (Baron-Epel, 2003). In addition, program evaluation can provide insight regarding identifying and solving existing problems in the implementation of the program (Chyung, Wisniewski, Inderbitzen, & Campbell, 2013), as well as highlight the strengths of the program and areas that should continue to be focused on. By evaluating the Outreach and Engagement Program within MECCA, the objective is to provide stakeholders with knowledge of the effectiveness of the program with the goal of improving consumer satisfaction, enhancing staff performance levels, and increasing cultural awareness and humility in engaging with consumers of mental health.

## **Community-Based Programs and Participant Satisfaction**

Reflecting on the development and implementation of other community-based programs can illuminate important components to be considered in the development and evaluation of community-based programs, including MECCA's Outreach and Engagement program. Sink, Covinsky, Newcomer, and Yaffe (2004) present an evaluation of the prevalence and pattern of behavior for individuals with dementia related symptoms within a community. With regards to prevalence, they found that there was a significantly greater number of Black and Latino individuals living with dementia symptoms within the community (Sink et al., 2004). The researchers explored the ways these multi-ethnic individuals managed their symptoms, specifically regarding their rationale for not seeking a higher level of care and their experience of living within the community as a multi-ethnic individual with dementia symptoms. Researchers have identified a number of components that may affect the higher prevalence of Black and Latino individuals within the community that have dementia symptoms in comparison to White individuals with dementia symptoms. For example, Black and Latino caregivers of Black and Latino individuals do not wish to put the individual struggling with dementia symptoms in an institution and Black and Latino caregivers may conceptualize and report the symptoms of the individual struggling in a different way (as cited in Sink et al., 2004). There are many components to this research that affect the development of community-based programs that are effective and congruent with the community members. For the multi-ethnic community members struggling with dementia symptoms, the prevalence and pattern of behavior within the

community is based on an individual's cultural context that in turn determines the need for intervention. In the process of developing a community-based program that aims to assist community members from a wide variety of cultural backgrounds, one must consider that the program should include various modes of delivering services as well as a collaborative conceptualization in defining, supporting, and creating interventions that are best suited for the community member.

In a study by Nicolaidis et al. (2012), a community-based program was developed and implemented to help African American women who have survived Intimate Partner Violence. The researchers utilized a community-based participatory research approach in creating a program that was consistent with the needs of the African American women and then implemented the program that was congruent with the development process (Nicolaidis et al., 2012). In their collaborative process, the researchers conducted a needs assessment to understand the women's needs, as well as their experience of current services. The researchers noted that the women reported "perception of racism, with a deep mistrust of the healthcare system as a 'white' system" (Nicolaidis et al., 2012, p. 531). The women also reported for a community-based program to most appropriately meet their needs the program should be implemented by African Americans who had also struggled with similar experiences (Nicolaidis et al., 2012). Due to the collaborative process, the researchers shifted their conceptualization of the program development to accommodate the needs of the women, which meant that the program would be implemented in a community-based center that was specifically utilized to support those struggling with domestic violence (Nicolaidis et al., 2012). The program intervention consisted of providing services for six months by an African American Intimate Partner Violence survivor, referred to as a Health Advocate. The Health Advocate managed the participant's care, provided

psychoeducation, promoted self-care, and created links for the participant to receive services from the healthcare system (Nicolaidis et al., 2012). The researchers used a variety of self-report questionnaires to evaluate depression, self-esteem, and various self-care behaviors. Upon completion of the intervention, participants were asked to answer open-ended questions during termination interviews regarding their experience within the program. Findings from the intervention indicated increases in self-care behavior, improvement in depression symptoms, and improved self-esteem (Nicolaidis et al., 2012). The researchers gathered themes from the interviews with participants regarding their experience in the program, specifically soliciting the participants to identify why and how the program was effective. The themes identified include: "African-American focus and community setting," "Ability to trust," and "Information and strategies with practical, lasting value" (Nicolaidis et al., 2012, pp. 534-535). These themes were qualitatively gathered and provided rationale as to why the participants felt satisfied and reported improvement as a result of the program's intervention. When reflecting on the outcomes of this community-based program and the reported satisfaction with the program, it is important to consider the development of the program. The program developers took considerable efforts to collaboratively construct a program that was directed by the needs of the individuals within the community, as well as their desire for ethnic matching between provider and participant.

In a study by Kiger (2003), the prevalence and severity of breast and cervical cancer for women within low-income African American and Hispanic communities was identified as significantly greater than Caucasian women. Specifically, in the geographic region of Los Angeles African American and Hispanic women with such a significantly greater prevalence correlated to the underutilization of services available within the community (Kiger, 2003). Kiger identified a number of reasons that African American and Hispanic women do not seek resources and screenings like Caucasian women in Los Angeles, such as lack of exposure or beliefs that they are unqualified for services, fear and confusion about the process of screening for cancer, decreased time for self-care behaviors, and the unawareness of the value of early screening and treatment. Additionally, Kiger identified specific challenges such as barriers of language differences, the lack of "ethnically appropriate educational materials" regarding the value or early screening and cancer treatment (p. 309), historical and systemic context of seeking services, concerns regarding trust and modes of communication, and the exclusionary nature of the eligible population identified for many early screening and cancer treatment programs (Kiger, 2003). In order to promote awareness and increase the participation of women from varying ethnic backgrounds, the project included three specific tools to disseminate information: "Tell A Friend, The Witness Project, and Promatoras" (Kiger, 2003, p. 311). The project utilized professionals and trained volunteers from the community who worked with the community in a collaborative process to share information about resources that provide support to multi-ethnic women that need early screening and cancer treatment. As a result of this project, the study identified important lessons that should be shared with other program developers. Kiger found that cultural beliefs, the need for transportation and childcare, and the lack of time for women in low-income communities affected their ability to engage in services identified by the project. Additionally, this project highlighted that a compilation of methods should be implemented in creating an approach to community-based interventions with multi-ethnic, underserved populations (Kiger, 2003). In conjunction, Kiger found that it is important to align a new project with pre-existing programs and find avenues for new programs within the community in order to foster a collaborative, coherent community of programs that are designed to assist women of the community. Kiger also found that it is important to consider ways to increase convenience for

women in order to improve the likelihood of seeking community-services, thus creating mobile services that can adjust to the geographic location as well as the schedules of women that need services (Kiger, 2003). Finally, Kiger found that it is imperative to work with community leaders in creating and implementing programs that seek to bring services to community members because community leaders are aware of the beliefs that will guide program implementation and utilization.

In a study by Andrade, Filha, Vianna, Silva, & Costa (2012), researchers examined the development and effectiveness of Community Therapy in Brazil. The Family Health Strategy was developed in Brazil in 1994 to "ensure that primary health care services were made available to families and communities, primarily those economically underprivileged and at greater risk for disease" (p. 326). As part of the Family Health Strategy development, it was suggested that mental health support be integrated into the community-based health care model (Andrade et al., 2012). Due to this integration of mental health needs, Community Therapy was highlighted as a useful tool in supporting community members. Andrade et al. identified the development of Community Therapy, 21 years ago in Brazil in order to support communities enduring emotional distress. This modality of mental health support is facilitated by community therapists in community gatherings during which community members are encouraged to share their concerns and struggles, which results in community members that "exhibit fortitude and increasingly solidified community identity" (p. 326). In a study of one 198 participants who engaged with community therapists within the Family Health Strategy, Andrade et al. gathered participants' satisfaction with Community Therapy through implementation of the Brazilian Mental Health Services Use Satisfaction Scale (Satis-BR). This self-report measure evaluating participants' satisfaction with mental health services rendered through Community Therapy consists of 44

questions that participants respond to using a 5-point Likert scale. Additionally, Andrade et al. utilized the Client Satisfaction Questionnaire because it is specifically designed to ascertain participants' satisfaction with Community Therapy. Findings indicate that 165 participants felt respected, 109 felt adequately listened to, 87 felt carefully listened to, 110 felt well understood, and 85 felt well understood. Additionally, researchers found through use of the 5-point Likert scale of satisfaction, 146 participants reported feeling satisfied with the therapists' listening skills and 52 felt very satisfied with the therapists' listening skills, 142 felt they were receiving accurate assistance for their needs through Community Therapy, and 118 felt that Community Therapy was excellent at being receptive to their individuals needs (Andrade et al., 2012). Specifically in regards to satisfaction with the Community Therapy program intervention overall, 95 participants were very satisfied, 103 noted the intervention to be good, 170 stated that they would return for services should more issues arise, 178 reported they would refer loved ones to Community Therapy, 100 reported to be very satisfied with community meetings for Community Therapy, and 98 stated that they were satisfied with community meetings for Community Therapy. The researchers discuss the rationale for the satisfaction outcomes, identifying Community Therapy as flexible to the needs of the group within a support group setting because such a group setting fosters a space of mutual understanding for shared experiences. An important aspect of understanding the satisfaction outcomes of this study is the framework that Community Therapy operates from, such that there is a collaborative process in the intervention. Community Therapy fosters a community to form within the larger community that collaborates to progress through five phases: "welcoming, selecting a theme, contextualization, problematization, and closing" (Andrade et al., 2012, p. 330). It is noted that there is no maximum number of people who can join the intervention and the community therapists are

empowered to incorporate as many participants into the group. The quantitative methodology implemented to gather participants' satisfaction and feedback regarding this community-based intervention is a valuable model to understanding the context within which community-based programs operate, as well as their method of gathering feedback from their participants.

In a study by Goodkind et al. (2014), researchers reflect on the prevalence of adult African refugees struggling with psychological distress within the United States and existing interventions targeted to aid adult African refugees. Goodkind et. al., noted the profound need for mental health services for refugees within the United States and the prevailing challenges within the current mental health system, such that the current mental health system is not consistently responsive of specific needs of refugees and the pervasive stigma associated with seeking help (as cited in Goodkind et al., 2014). Goodkind is cited in this study for developing and testing a community-based program for adult Hmong adult refugees that is focused on: "increasing environmental mastery through individual and group learning opportunities, improving refugees' access to resources through advocacy, creating meaningful social roles by valuing refugees' culture, experiences, and knowledge, and reducing refugees' social isolation" (p. 335). The researchers utilized the program developed by Goodkind for adult Hmong adult refugees and adapted the 6-month program with adult African refugees participating in the Refugee Well-Being Project (Goodkind et al., 2014). Goodkind et al. described the intervention to consist of Learning Circles, which is a forum for cultural exchange between participants and program facilitators, and Advocacy, during which program facilitators worked with participants to engage with community resources. The researchers described the Learning Circles to consist of the families of the refugee adult, which integrated the sharing of the lived experiences of the refugees' children. This study occurred over a three-year period (2006-2008) and was facilitated

by trained undergraduate students. Experiences of participants were gathered through openended interviews that took place in the participants' home and were facilitated by a facilitator that was both trained and bilingual (with interpreters available when needed). Additionally, Goodkind et al. utilized many quantitative measures to evaluate participants' experiences and outcomes, such as Rumbaut's (1985) Psychological Well-Being Scale (as cited in in Goodkind et al., 2014), Satisfaction with Life Areas scale (as cited in in Goodkind et al., 2014), Life Satisfaction Index A (as cited in in Goodkind et al., 2014), Satisfaction with Resources scale (as cited in in Goodkind et al., 2014), the Difficulty Obtaining Resources scale (as cited in in Goodkind et al., 2014), Basic English Skills Test (BEST), Rumbaut's 1989 4-item scale for Perceived English proficiency (as cited in in Goodkind et al., 2014), and the Whitbeck Encultural Scale (as cited in in Goodkind et al., 2014). Additionally, the 36 participants (each completed four interviews) were asked to describe their satisfaction with the program using a seven-point Likert-scale that ranged from 'very dissatisfied' to 'very satisfied' during an interview at the end of the intervention. Findings indicate a high level of satisfaction with the intervention, such that overall project satisfaction resulted in a mean score of 4.8, the Learning Circles component resulted in a scored a mean score of 4.9, and the Advocacy component resulted in a mean score of 5.4 (Goodkind et al., 2014). During the interviews, participants were asked to provide feedback on outcomes of the intervention and aspects that were helpful. This qualitative data gathering yielded crucial information, specifically that participants found improved English fluency to be central to feeling like they are part of the community and that a significant increase in access to resources was imperative to participants' improved life experience (Goodkind et al., 2014). The resources identified as important to the participants were: "housing, education, transportation, identity cards, learning how to drive, computer skills, health care, employment,

and assessing food and food stamps" (Goodkind et al., 2014, p. 340). Synthesizing outcomes from quantitative and qualitative measures, Goodkind et al. (2014) found that participants benefit with increased English proficiency and improvements in quality of life as well as decreases in psychological distress. However, the researchers stated that there was not the same level of increase in access to resources when applying the intervention to adult African refugees in comparison to the Hmong refugees (Goodkind et al., 2014). This study suggests that fostering collaborative relationships that empower the refugees' strengths and individual experiences, while also facilitating access to resources could significantly impact refugees' well-being and quality of life (Goodkind et al., 2014).

The process of gathering a participant's feedback requires consideration of the measures utilized and the administrative protocol by which feedback is gathered. In a study of an intervention program intended to service HIV-positive youth, participant satisfaction was gathered and analyzed through a participant feedback questionnaire (LaGrange et al., 2012). LaGrange et al. (2012) identified and used one measure, the participant feedback measure, to gather participant feedback and satisfaction. Through convenience sampling, the researchers recruited and enrolled participants that were HIV-positive youth. The participants engaged in the group and individual sessions, and then were asked for their feedback regarding their experience in the program. The researchers differentiated satisfaction outcomes into subsequent sections: participant satisfaction, session-specific preferences, activity helpfulness, participant attendance, and limitations (LaGrange et al., 2012). The researchers stated that the participant feedback questionnaire consisted of a "three-point Likert scale in response to the question, 'what did you like?'" (LaGrange et al., 2012, p. 122). The researchers described a significant amount of data that indicated varying levels of satisfaction with the program's individual and group

interventions. The researchers identified a number of ways to increase participant satisfaction, such as consideration of scheduling of interventions, incentives, and implementation of a program that provides services in both group and individual modalities (LaGrange et al., 2012).

In other intervention programs, researchers have utilized quantitative methodologies to gather participant satisfaction. Woods, Catroppa, Giallo, and Anderson (2012) implemented an intervention program for families with a child that struggles with brain injury. Woods et al. (2012) utilized The Consumer Satisfaction Scale [25] that consists of 9 items for which participants used a five-point scale, ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree.' Additionally, Woods et al. (2012) asked the parents of the children with brain injury to complete The Consumer Satisfaction Scale [25] with a focus on rating "their feasibility" (p. 193) of the intervention materials. As a result of the methodology implemented, the researchers gathered a wealth of data regarding the parents' experience of the intervention. In another intervention program, Bakas et al. (2009) implemented a program for stroke caregivers. Bakas et al. developed rating forms that would be administered during telephone interviews by assistants to the study. The satisfaction rating forms were comprised of questions that asked participants to rate their experience on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 'strongly disagree' to 'strongly agree' (Bakas et al., 2009). In addition to this quantitative measure of participant satisfaction, the researchers implemented an open-ended question aspect of the telephone interview that was recorded in order to provide exact feedback that could later be evaluated (Bakas et al., 2009). Bakas et al. described the usefulness in gathering quantitative, as well as qualitative measures of participants' satisfaction with the intervention program.

## **Important Factors that Impact Participant Satisfaction**

The process of developing and implementing culturally-responsive mental health services is challenging, as it highlights programs that lack optimal outcomes and demands new programs be effective in meeting the needs of ethnocultural communities. Prior to enrolling participants in community-based programs, there is a vital process of engaging community members in community-based agencies. The process of engaging community members is wrought with a variety of factors that create the underlying foundation upon which a community member decides whether or not to access mental health services or support outside of their current support system. A large component that affects access to mental health services is the experience of disenfranchisement, wherein community members have continuously felt minimized and "less than" by the dominant culture. Consequently, these experiences of disenfranchisement have inhibited their sense of self-efficacy in seeking and utilizing resources, which can then lead to further negative consequences and deterioration of the relationship between community members and community-based agencies (Miliora, 2000). Once participants are enrolled in communitybased programs, there are a variety of methods to evaluate their overall satisfaction. More literature is needed that focuses on the impact of culture and how culture is the foundation upon which an individual experiences services as well as report of those services. Participants' responses to services and feedback may be impacted by many different variables and thus a myriad of evaluation methods are necessary to appropriately capture their satisfaction levels.

Within community-based programs are providers and program developers, which call for cultural competence that empowers the providers and consumers to have services within the programs that are culturally responsive. To be culturally competence, one "acknowledge and incorporates- at all levels- the importance of culture, assessment of cross-cultural relations, vigilance toward the dynamics that results from cultural differences of services to meet culturally

unique needs" (Betancourt, Green, Carrillo, & Ananeg-Firempong II, 2003, p. 294).

Furthermore, embodying cultural competence within a community-based program entails:

understanding the importance of social and cultural influences on patients' health beliefs and behaviors; considering how these factors interact at multiple levels of the health care delivery system... and, finally, devising interventions that take these issues into account to assure quality health care delivery to diverse patient populations. (Betancourt et al., 2003, p. 297)

A provider's cultural competence will undoubtedly impact their ability to recognize variations in participants' culture, needs, and experience within a community-based program wherein mental health services and support are rendered. Meyer and Zane (2013) identified the importance of conceptualizing and treating the participant within their cultural context, then fully integrating it into their mental health experience. The more the participant feels understood and validated through the use of culturally responsive interventions, the greater likelihood that the participant will feel satisfied with the program and continues accessing services (Meyer & Zane, 2013). Researchers suggest a key method of improving the experience for multi-ethnic participants is to bring in members of the "communities targeted by the programs" (p. 489) to facilitate the program, such that doing this "capitalizes on the community-based staff member's inherent sensitivity to, or awareness of, the targeted community's customs and contexts, thereby ensuring culturally sensitive service delivery" (Mistry, Jacobs, & Jacobs, 2009, p. 489). In developing and conceptualizing programs and interventions, researchers have constructed a framework that can aid in development and implementation, which consists of: "language, persons, metaphors, content, concepts, goals, methods, and context" (Bernal & Saez-Santiago, 2006, p. 127). Through consideration, reflection, and conceptualizing a program's development and

implementation from a culturally responsive, community-based approach, a program will hopefully achieve better outcomes with participants.

In the process of considering the outcomes and satisfaction ratings reported by participants, it is important to consider the nature of the interventions being offered within the community-based program. A participant's satisfaction with a program is a result of the type, exposure, experience, and results of exposure to interventions within the program. Every intervention within a program is "culturally embedded" (Ingraham & Oka, 2006, p. 133), which serves as the foundation of the intervention and thus creates challenge in evaluating the level of success and satisfaction with the program. If the intervention is described to be unsatisfactory, there is a dilemma in understanding whether the intervention is problematic, whether the provider is problematic, or whether it was a poor fit between the intervention and the cultural group represented by the participant (Ingraham & Oka, 2006). Within community-based work, interventions vary across settings, populations, and ethnicities. Embedded within communities are multi-ethnic consumers who illuminate the need to reconsider interventions that are integrated within community-based programs. There are various ways to make this adjustment, one of which is to adapt interventions provided in all mental health settings for the specific cultural needs of the participant (Hall, 2001, 2005). With a desire to utilize culturally congruent interventions, it would be beneficial for community-based programs to train providers from a culturally responsive framework, as well as have bilingual and multi-ethnic members as part of the program employment. For example, researchers utilized data from the U.S. Census Bureau (2010) that identified 34.5 million people that speak Spanish in the United States, with half of those people with low English proficiency, thus experiencing great difficulty in obtaining mental health services due to only 5% of the mental health field providing services in Spanish (Verdinelli & Biever, 2013).

For program developers that strive to cultivate a meaningful relationship with the community and collaboratively construct a program to be implemented within the community, there are guiding principles that can be followed. Goodman et al. (2004) suggest awareness of one's personal values, equal power amongst collaborators, empowering those who have been oppressed, heightened awareness of historical context as well as the current systemic framework, significant attention paid to strengths of the community and individuals, and a meaningful collaboration that provides tools to the community and individuals in order to facilitate change. Collaboration as the nucleus of conceptualizing community-based program development and implementation is critically important in establishing a foundation upon which community members engage in programs. Implementation of a program that is consistent with the community's needs, experiences, and beliefs, as well as consistent with those of diverse communities, is important in ultimately serving the community's needs, and attaining optimal outcomes and satisfaction ratings. In addition to increased cultural responsiveness and inclusion of multi-ethnic staff, participant satisfaction can be improved through the empowerment and conceptualization of the O&E program as a multicultural collaborative. A significant amount of the literature has focused on increasing cultural responsiveness of the providers within a single community-based agency. However, when considering the unique collaborative of MECCA, it would be beneficial to conceptualize the process of engagement between members of the different agencies in an effort to improve satisfaction throughout the collaborative. With conceptualization of O&E as collaboration, the program developers and the program providers can mutually share ideas, needs, and beliefs during the formulation of the program and

implementation of interventions. In this rare experience, there are at least two levels of collaboration. One level of collaboration is between the agency leaders and community. Another level of collaboration is between the community organization and members. Through collaboration, program developers work with "the people who live within a geographic boundary, the people served by a certain agency or program, or a group of people who have shared identity and experiences, similar beliefs, values, and norms" (Flaskerud, 2007, p. 122). In this process of collaboration, program development is created alongside those who live within the community and thus the program gains insight to needs, beliefs, and experiences that can be formative in how participants access, receive, and experience program services.

#### Method

The present study aimed to add to the current body of literature on participant satisfaction with community-based programs through descriptive analysis of the subjective reports of satisfaction for participants of the Outreach & Engagement (O&E) program, which is a community-based program that provides culturally responsive services to multi-ethnic individuals within the community-based participatory action research framework. This study intended to add to the current literature in three ways. The first objective was to provide literature on community-based programs and correlated participant satisfaction. The second objective was to examine the factors that contribute to participant satisfaction within communitybased programs. The third objective was to evaluate outcomes of participant satisfaction for MECCA's Outreach and Engagement program, as well as reflect on components of the O&E program that produce satisfaction ratings. The primary research question in this study was: To what degree were participants in MECCA's Outreach and Engagement (O&E) program satisfied with their participation in the program? This study identified factors that could contribute to participant satisfaction within community-based programs. This study identified the outcomes of participant satisfaction for MECCA's Outreach and Engagement (O&E) program. Descriptive analysis of the data assisted in understanding participant satisfaction with the Outreach and Engagement program and gained awareness of satisfaction across MECCA as a whole. This study hoped to gather satisfaction outcomes of the O&E program and, through looking at aspects of the Satisfaction Survey (see Appendix B), hypothesized on factors and services of the O&E program that may have been helpful to program participants (see Figure 1.), which will hopefully add to the current body of literature and provide future implications for culturally responsive community-based programs.

# **Subjects**

The proposed study utilized quantitative data from the Outreach and Engagement program during the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 fiscal years. The quantitative data was gathered from one measure completed by male and female participants, between ages of 6-60-years-old or older, enrolled in the O&E program as well as participants who engaged in outreach and educational classes/workshops facilitated at the six community-based agencies of MECCA. Each of the six community-based agencies of MECCA served specific ethnic communities, thus participants will include Latina/o, Iranian, Korean, Vietnamese, White, Arabic, Black/African American, and Japanese individuals.

Of the individuals who received services from the O&E program in fiscal year 2012-2013, 17.2% were of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin, 23.9% Asian, .1% Pacific Islander, and 18% Iranian. Regarding language preference during fiscal year 2012-2013, 25.4% were non-English speaking, 10% were American Sign Language, and 28.8% were Limited English Proficiency. Of the individuals who received services from the O&E program in fiscal 2013-2014, .5% were Black or African-American, 9.62% were Iranian, 57.72% were Korean, 6.15% were Vietnamese, 1.98% were White or Caucasian, 21.97% were Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish Origin, and 1.1% were Arab. Regarding primary language, 0.96% spoke Arabic, 7.86% spoke English, 9.51% spoke Farsi, 55.26% spoke Korean, 20.36% spoke Spanish, and 5.83% spoke Vietnamese.

This study utilized participants who were enrolled in the O&E program during the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 fiscal years. In fiscal year 2012-2013, a total number of 254 participants participated in services and of those 254 participants enrolled in the program 153 (60.23%) completed the satisfaction survey. In fiscal year 2013-2014, a total number of 292 individuals

participated in services and of those 292 participants enrolled in the program 258 (88.36%) completed the satisfaction survey. The sample included males and females whose ages ranged between 6-60-years-old or older. This sample consisted of people from multi-ethnic communities and is comprised of the following ethnic groups: Latina/o, Iranian, Korean, Vietnamese, White, Arabic, Black/African American, and Japanese.

In the data set for fiscal year 2012-2013, the initial sample size was 153 participants but nine participants were missing data for responses to the three components of item number nine and were therefore excluded from all subsequent analyses. This resulted in a final sample size of 144 for fiscal year 2012-2013. In the data set for fiscal year 2013-2014, the initial sample size was 258 participants but 16 participants were missing data for responses to the three components of item number nine and were therefore excluded from all subsequent missing data for responses to the three components of item number size was 258 participants but 16 participants were missing data for responses to the three components of item number nine and were therefore excluded from all subsequent analyses. This resulted in a final sample size of 242 fiscal year 2013-2014.

For this study, data analysis included data cleaning and screening in order to eliminate and organize data outcomes. Question number nine on the Participant Satisfaction Survey asks participants to reflect on their overall experience in the Outreach and Engagement program, specifically asking participants to rate their experience of language and cultural responsiveness employed by program staff. Thus, participants missing responses to the three components of question number nine on the Participant Satisfaction Survey were excluded because their Participant Satisfaction Survey would be incomplete on a critical survey item. Additionally, participants were organized into one large sample size with each participant identified based on the agency they obtained O&E services. During subsequent descriptive analyses, means on satisfaction criteria and satisfaction domains were gathered.

#### Procedures

Through convenience-based sampling, data was gathered from participants enrolled in the O&E program during 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 who completed the Participant Satisfaction Survey. This data was collected, organized, and entered into a SPSS statistical format by research assistants.

Throughout participants' involvement in the O&E program, agency staff collaborated with participants to complete agency paperwork as well as baseline and follow-up measures regarding their well-being and subjective experience of depression. The agency staff that worked at the O&E program was most often from the same cultural background as the participants seeking services at the agency and thus could often speak in the preferred language of the participant. At the point of the participants' completion in the O&E program, participants were asked to complete a survey on their subjective experience of the services provided in the O&E program. The staff would provide the participants with the hard-copy measure and ask the participant to "do their best" in completing the measure without support from the agency staff member. In order to assist participants' autonomy in completing the satisfaction survey, the Participant Satisfaction Survey was provided in the culture's predominant language, for example the Korean-speaking agency (KCS) was provided Participant Satisfaction Survey in Korean. Upon completion of the measure, the participant submitted the survey to the staff member.

## Instrument

For the purposes of this study, satisfaction was evaluated based on criteria (see Figure 2.) that were formulated based on the MECCA O&E Participant Satisfaction Survey (see Figure 3.).

This study utilized the Participant Satisfaction Survey (see Appendix B), which is a measure that was developed by the Orange County Healthcare Agency in collaboration with the MECCA agencies and MECCA program developers. The Participant Satisfaction Survey aims to

23

gather information regarding participants' experiences in the O&E program. The Participant Satisfaction Survey is a quantitative, self-report, 11-item measure. Of the 11 items on the Participant Satisfaction Survey, 10 items are scored using a 5-point Likert scale (1 to 5, where 1 equals 'strongly disagree,' 2 equals 'disagree,' 3 equals 'agree,' 4 equals 'strongly agree,' and 5 equals 'don't know/unsure' which is removed from statistical computation so answers scored 5 do not inaccurately skew results) and one item is scored on a 10-point Likert scale (0 to 10, where 0 is the 'worst' and 10 is the 'best').

### Results

Participant satisfaction domains (overall satisfaction, cultural competency among staff, program impact, and access to care) are discussed for participants' satisfaction with the MECCA O&E program. Satisfaction domains were determined by participants' responses on the Satisfaction Survey.

### Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for Full Sample from Fiscal Year 2012-2013

**Overall satisfaction.** Overall satisfaction was found across 144 participants with a mean score of 13.049, with a standard deviation of 3.5406, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction. Overall satisfaction scores were found through a summing of questions one, two (reverse coded), and question eight. Participants' scores were found to be high when answering question two, "I could have received the MECCA O&E services through another agency" which was reverse scored to mean "I couldn't have received the MECCA O&E services through another agency." Participants' satisfaction scores were rated high when answering question eight as well, "To rate my overall satisfaction with the MECCA O&E as a program in the past 30 days, where 0 is the worst program possible and 10 is the best program possible, the number I would use is."

**Cultural competency among staff.** Cultural Competency Among Staff was found across 144 participants with a mean score of 16.229, with a standard deviation of 3.0536, with higher scores indicating greater cultural competency. Cultural competency among staff scores were found through a summing of questions four, seven, nine (part a), nine (part b, reverse coded), and nine (part c). Participants' satisfaction scores were found to be high when answering question nine (part a), "Thinking about my overall experience with the MECCA O&E Program within the past 30 days, I would say that: Sessions were provided in my preferred language." **Program impact.** Positive program impact was found across 137 participants with a mean score of 3.380, with a standard deviation of .6545, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with the program's impact. Program impact scores were found through question six. Participant scores were found to be relatively high when answering question six, "The MECCA O&E staff helped me achieve my goals."

Access to care. An increase in access to care was found across 133 participants with a mean score 3.489, with a standard deviation of .6230, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with accessibility of care. Access to care scores were found through question five. Participant scores were found to be relatively high when answering question five, "I would say that my meeting places and times with the MECCA O&E Program in the past 30 days have been convenient."

Descriptive statistics of the full sample for fiscal year 2012-2013 Satisfaction Scores are indicated (see Table 1.). Further analysis on agency-specific satisfaction outcomes will help understand variations amongst agencies. KCS, the Korean-speaking community agency, had insufficient data to conduct these agency-specific analyses.

### Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for ABRAZAR from Fiscal Year 2012-2013

**Overall satisfaction.** Overall satisfaction was found across 26 participants with a mean score of 14.15, with a standard deviation of 3.00, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction.

**Cultural competency among staff.** Cultural Competency Among Staff was found across 26 participants with a mean score of 16.50, with a standard deviation of 2.75, with higher scores indicating greater cultural competency.

**Program impact.** Positive program impact was found across 23 participants with a mean score of 3.35, with a standard deviation of .4870, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with the program's impact.

Access to care. An increase in access to care was found across 21 participants with a mean score 3.62, with a standard deviation of .498, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with accessibility of care.

Descriptive statistics of the ABRAZAR sample for fiscal year 2012-2013 Satisfaction Scores are indicated (see Table 2.).

### Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for VNCOC from Fiscal Year 2012-2013

**Overall satisfaction.** Overall satisfaction was found across 39 participants with a mean score of 13.41, with a standard deviation of 1.85, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction.

**Cultural competency among staff.** Cultural Competency Among Staff was found across 39 participants with a mean score of 15.54, with a standard deviation of 3.58, with higher scores indicating greater cultural competency.

**Program impact.** Positive program impact was found across 35 participants with a mean score of 3.40, with a standard deviation of .775, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with the program's impact.

Access to care. An increase in access to care was found across 37 participants with a mean score 3.5, with a standard deviation of .77, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with accessibility of care.

Descriptive statistics of the VNCOC sample for fiscal year 2012-2013 Satisfaction Scores are indicated (see Table 3.).

### Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for OCCTAC from Fiscal Year 2012-2013

**Overall satisfaction.** Overall satisfaction was found across 54 participants with a mean score of 12.54, with a standard deviation of 4.04, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction.

**Cultural competency among staff.** Cultural Competency Among Staff was found across 54 participants with a mean score of 16.3, with a standard deviation of 3.16, with higher scores indicating greater cultural competency.

**Program impact.** Positive program impact was found across 54 participants with a mean score of 3.33, with a standard deviation of .70, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with the program's impact.

Access to care. An increase in access to care was found across 52 participants with a mean score 3.4, with a standard deviation of .603, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with accessibility of care.

Descriptive statistics of the OCCTAC sample for fiscal year 2012-2013 Satisfaction Scores are indicated (see Table 4.).

### Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for OMID from Fiscal Year 2012-2013

**Overall satisfaction.** Overall satisfaction was found across 12 participants with a mean score of 14.67, with a standard deviation of 1.61, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction.

**Cultural competency among staff.** Cultural Competency Among Staff was found across 12 participants with a mean score of 17.67, with a standard deviation of 2.06, with higher scores indicating greater cultural competency.

**Program impact.** Positive program impact was found across 12 participants with a mean score of 3.75, with a standard deviation of .45, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with the program's impact.

Access to care. An increase in access to care was found across 11 participants with a mean score 3.82, with a standard deviation of .40, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with accessibility of care.

Descriptive statistics of the OMID sample for fiscal year 2012-2013 Satisfaction Scores are indicated (see Table 5.).

### Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for ACCESS CAL from Fiscal Year 2012-2013

**Overall satisfaction.** Overall satisfaction was found across 13 participants with a mean score of 10.4, with a standard deviation of 5.5, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction.

**Cultural competency among staff.** Cultural Competency Among Staff was found across 13 participants with a mean score of 16.3, with a standard deviation of 1.75, with higher scores indicating greater cultural competency.

**Program impact.** Positive program impact was found across 13 participants with a mean score of 3.23, with a standard deviation of .44, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with the program's impact.

Access to care. An increase in access to care was found across 12 participants with a mean score 3.3, with a standard deviation of .49, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with accessibility of care.

Descriptive statistics of the ACCESS CAL sample for fiscal year 2012-2013 Satisfaction Scores are indicated (see Table 6.).

#### Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for Full Sample from Fiscal Year 2013-2014

**Overall satisfaction.** Overall program satisfaction was found across 236 participants with a mean score of 13.441, with a standard deviation of 3.6845, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction. Overall satisfaction scores were found through a summing of questions one, two (reverse coded), and question eight. Participants' scores were found to be high when answering question eight, "To rate my overall satisfaction with the MECCA O&E as a program in the past 30 days, where 0 is the worst program possible and 10 is the best program possible, the number I would use is."

**Cultural competency among staff.** Cultural Competency Among Staff was found across 242 participants with a mean score of 16.686, with a standard deviation of 3.3964, with higher scores indicating greater cultural competency. Cultural competency among staff scores were found through a summing of questions four, seven, nine (part a), nine (part b, reverse coded), and nine (part c). Participants' scores were found to be high when answering question nine (part a), "Thinking about my overall experience with the MECCA O&E Program within the past 30 days, I would say that: Sessions were provided in my preferred language." Participants' scores were found to be high when answering question nine (part c), "Thinking about my overall experience with the MECCA O&E Program within the past 30 days, I would say that: Sessions were provided in my preferred language." Participants' scores were found to be high when answering question nine (part c), "Thinking about my overall experience with the MECCA O&E Program within the past 30 days, I would say that: Sessions were provided in my preferred language." Participants' scores were found to be high when answering question nine (part c), "Thinking about my overall experience with the MECCA O&E Program within the past 30 days, I would say that: I felt the MECCA Staff was sensitive to my language and ethnicity."

**Program impact.** Positive program impact was found across 216 participants with a mean score of 3.458, with a standard deviation of .6456, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with the program's impact. Program impact scores were found through question six. Participant scores were found to be relatively high when answering question six, "The MECCA O&E staff helped me achieve my goals."

Access to care. An increase in access to care was found across 219 participants with a mean score of 3.479, with a standard deviation of .6305, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with accessibility of care. Access to care scores were found through question five. Participant scores were found to be relatively high when answering question five, "I would say that my meeting places and times with the MECCA O&E Program in the past 30 days have been convenient."

Descriptive statistics of the full sample for fiscal year 2013-2014 Satisfaction Scores (see Table 7.). Further analysis on agency-specific satisfaction outcomes will help understand variations amongst agencies.

### Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for ABRAZAR from Fiscal Year 2013-2014

**Overall satisfaction.** Overall satisfaction was found across 15 participants with a mean score of 13.60, with a standard deviation of 3.04, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction.

**Cultural competency among staff.** Cultural Competency Among Staff was found across 15 participants with a mean score of 17.6, with a standard deviation of 1.99, with higher scores indicating greater cultural competency.

**Program impact.** Positive program impact was found across 15 participants with a mean score of 3.73, with a standard deviation of .46, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with the program's impact.

Access to care. An increase in access to care was found across 15 participants with a mean score 3.5, with a standard deviation of .52, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with accessibility of care.

Descriptive statistics of the ABRAZAR sample for fiscal year 2013-2014 Satisfaction Scores are indicated (see Table 8.).

### Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for VNCOC from Fiscal Year 2013-2014

**Overall satisfaction.** Overall satisfaction was found across 114 participants with a mean score of 13.43, with a standard deviation of 3.82, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction.

**Cultural competency among staff.** Cultural Competency Among Staff was found across 116 participants with a mean score of 16.32, with a standard deviation of 3.64, with higher scores indicating greater cultural competency.

**Program impact.** Positive program impact was found across 101 participants with a mean score of 3.44, with a standard deviation of .65, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with the program's impact.

Access to care. An increase in access to care was found across 103 participants with a mean score 3.5, with a standard deviation of .61, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with accessibility of care.

Descriptive statistics of the VNCOC sample for fiscal year 2013-2014 Satisfaction Scores are indicated (see Table 9.).

### Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for OCCTAC from Fiscal Year 2013-2014

**Overall satisfaction.** Overall satisfaction was found across 97 participants with a mean score of 13.53, with a standard deviation of 3.7, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction.

**Cultural competency among staff.** Cultural Competency Among Staff was found across 101 participants with a mean score of 16.9, with a standard deviation of 3.34, with higher scores indicating greater cultural competency.

**Program impact.** Positive program impact was found across 90 participants with a mean score of 3.43, with a standard deviation of .67, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with the program's impact.

Access to care. An increase in access to care was found across 92 participants with a mean score 3.43, with a standard deviation of .7, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with accessibility of care.

Descriptive statistics of the OCCTAC sample for fiscal year 2013-2014 Satisfaction Scores are indicated (see Table 10.).

#### Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for OMID from Fiscal Year 2013-2014

**Overall satisfaction.** Overall satisfaction was found across three participants with a mean score of 11.33, with a standard deviation of 6.03, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction.

**Cultural competency among staff.** Cultural Competency Among Staff was found across three participants with a mean score of 16.67, with a standard deviation of 2.52, with higher scores indicating greater cultural competency.

**Program impact.** Positive program impact was found across three participants with a mean score of 3.67, with a standard deviation of .6, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with the program's impact.

Access to care. An increase in access to care was found across two participants with a mean score 3.5, with a standard deviation of .71, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with accessibility of care.

Descriptive statistics of the OMID sample for fiscal year 2013-2014 Satisfaction Scores are indicated (see Table 11.).

### Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for KCS from Fiscal Year 2013-2014

**Overall satisfaction.** Overall satisfaction from one participant with a score of 13.00.

**Cultural competency among staff.** Cultural Competency Among Staff from one participant with a score of 20.00.

**Program impact.** Positive program impact from one participant with a score of 4.0.

Access to care. An increase in access to care from one participant with a score 4.0.

Descriptive statistics of the KCS sample for fiscal year 2013-2014 Satisfaction Scores are indicated (see Table 12.).

### Data Analysis of Satisfaction Scores for ACCESS CAL from Fiscal Year 2013-2014

**Overall satisfaction.** Overall satisfaction was found across six participants with a mean score of 12.8, with a standard deviation of 1.72, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction.

**Cultural competency among staff.** Cultural Competency Among Staff was found across six participants with a mean score of 18.00, with a standard deviation of 1.9, with higher scores indicating greater cultural competency.

**Program impact.** Positive program impact was found across six participants with a mean score of 3.33, with a standard deviation of .52, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with the program's impact.

Access to care. An increase in access to care was found across six participants with a mean score 3.3, with a standard deviation of .52, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with accessibility of care.

Descriptive statistics of the ACCESS CAL sample for fiscal year 2013-2014 Satisfaction Scores are indicated (see Table 13).

#### Discussion

The results of participant satisfaction outcomes of fiscal year 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 of the O&E program indicate the culturally-responsive nature of the community-based O&E program. Results show that one of the primary reasons this program may have been satisfactory for participants was that the program delivered culturally responsive and linguistically congruent services to participants. Participants' satisfaction scores indicate that the O&E program, including staff, were culturally-responsive to the ethnicity and language of participants. Further, participants' satisfaction scores indicate that participants were satisfied overall with the services received and would elect to obtain services from the O&E program again. O&E's success can be attributed to MECCA's foundation in cultural responsiveness, diversity empowerment, destigmatizing mental health services, and collaboration with the communities to create and provide community-based programs.

In working with MECCA's staff, researchers and program developers took time to understand the needs of each ethnic community being targeted and how those needs could be best conceptualized and served. The MECCA staff were members of each of the ethnic communities they served, while also being staff of MECCA and the community-based agency, which provided invaluable insight into the mental health needs as defined within the community. As Goodman et al. (2004) suggested, it is shared power, self-awareness, and empowerment of people that are marginalized from the process that will lead to change. MECCA's O&E program shows that collaboration with diverse ethnic communities is possible if done effectively, with sensitivity, and with the intention of creating satisfactory community-based programs that are steeped in the roots of the ethnic communities themselves.

Participants' satisfaction scores from fiscal year 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 can be compared across the four satisfaction domains, which consist of overall satisfaction, cultural competency, program impact, and access to care. Between fiscal year 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 the mean scores on overall satisfaction, cultural competency among staff, and program impact slightly increased, from 13.049 to 13.441 on overall satisfaction, from 16.229 to 16.686 on cultural competency among staff slightly increased, and from 3.380 to 3.458 on program impact. Between fiscal year 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 the mean score on access to care remained consistent, with 3.489 and 3.479. In hypothesizing about components of the O&E program that may have led to improvements in satisfaction scores across three of the four satisfaction domains, it is possible that the clarity in purpose of the program as well as the gained experiences of the MECCA O&E program staff led to more positive experiences for program participants. MECCA staff, program developers, researchers, and county funders underwent a process of adjustment at the outset of the O&E program that entailed a reconciliation of prioritizing the needs of the underserved ethnic communities targeted, providing culturally responsive services across six different ethnic community-based agencies, and adherence to mainstream-informed county funder's expectations on program development and implementation. Throughout the beginning phases of reconciling these factors, all of the factors involved had to find ways to co-exist while maintaining cultural responsiveness at the center of decision making. As MECCA staff became more informed on expectations placed upon them, MECCA staff became more equipped to gather data to fulfill the needs of the funders' outcome reporting requirements, while also prioritizing the services and timing for the diverse ethnic participants. As time went on with implementation of the O&E program, increased participant satisfaction and increases in the amount of data gathered could be due to the fact that MECCA

staff were able to provide better and more culturally responsive services while also becoming more skilled in gathering data within county funders' parameters. The county funders were also called upon to understand the diverse ethnic communities, learning that qualitative measures gathered more descriptive data and that diverse populations may not be immediately comfortable with revealing their thoughts, feelings, and experiences in requested, mainstream-informed, paper and pencil methods.

During fiscal year 2012-2013, there were 144 participants' scores for the overall satisfaction domain, 144 participants' scores for the cultural competency among staff domain, 137 participants' scores for the program impact domain, and 133 participants' scores for the access to care domain. During fiscal year 2013-2014, there were 236 participants' scores for the overall satisfaction domain, 242 participants' scores for the cultural competency among staff domain, 216 participants' scores for the program impact domain, and 219 participants' scores for the access to care domain. With an increase in participant satisfaction data gathered during the 2013-2014 fiscal year, it is important to consider what may have led to this outcome. It is likely that an increase in participants between the two fiscal years led to a greater number of participant scores on each domain. Between fiscal year 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, more participants were enrolled in the O&E program, from 254 participants (with 153 who completed satisfaction surveys) to 292 participants (with 258 who completed satisfaction surveys). It is also possible that program protocol and administration of the Participant Satisfaction Survey improved, which yielded a greater number of completed satisfaction surveys. Furthermore, MECCA staff and the O&E program developed more methods of meeting the needs of their communities while also following the documentation requests of the county funders.

While specific protocols were put in place for administering measures and facilitating the O&E program across MECCA, culture has an indelible influence on how any one person and agency operates. Thus, the nature of data collection could have varied from agency to agency and impacted the type and amount of data gathered. In looking at fiscal years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, there appears to be significant differences when looking at the amount of satisfaction outcome data gathered from each agency, which can be seen by looking at the number of scores for each domain. For fiscal year 2012-2013, there was insufficient data to complete agency-specific analyses for KCS.

The significant differences in number of participant outcomes provided by each agency raise specific questions, specifically questions about why certain agencies were able to provide many satisfaction surveys and some were unable to provide more than one. It is possible that the amount of data gathered was impacted by cultural variations in approach to providing services and interacting with others while also completing paperwork. When talking with MECCA staff and agency staff at KCS and VNCOC, staff remarked on their beliefs towards completing tasks and paperwork as requested. However, it is notable that KCS did not provide a significant amount of Satisfaction Surveys. An area to investigate further is the impact of culture through all of the agencies in the completion of surveys by its participants, specifically the Satisfaction Survey, because the survey asked participants to rate their experiences of the MECCA staff. Additionally, the Satisfaction Survey asked participants to rate their experiences of services, which could create a conflict with participants attempting to respond in socially desirable ways to maintain social norms or politeness and keeping personal information or experiences private. When talking with MECCA staff and agency staff at all of the agencies, staff remarked on the difficulty in completing measures overall due to cultural preferences of talking to provide

information instead of writing personal information and stated that quantitative measures are not congruent with the more descriptive, open-ended conversational style of their cultures. In looking at the amount of Satisfaction Surveys provided by OCCTAC and ABRAZAR, it is possible that the staff at those agencies had previously developed strong relationships within their communities and thus with participants, which may have led to more comfort in administration and completion of Satisfaction Surveys. In looking at both fiscal years, OCCTAC and VNCOC provided the highest number of Satisfaction Surveys. It is possible that the staff at each of these agencies had an impact on these outcomes and further research would be useful to understand the impact of the cultural beliefs of the Spanish-speaking and Vietnamese-speaking communities.

In considering limitations of this study, there are a number to consider. The Participant Satisfaction Survey was developed by the Orange County Healthcare Agency in collaboration with the MECCA agencies and MECCA program developers. The Participant Satisfaction Survey did not undergo a formalized process of validation across different populations, rather it was developed and adjusted during discussions and with feedback from community members. This lack of validation for the Participant Satisfaction Survey is further complicated by the possibility that implementation of the survey could have varied across the six community-based agencies providing the O&E program. Thus, the gathered data could be compromised and possibly not accurately representative of participants' satisfaction with the O&E program. Further in regard to limitations, MECCA staff initially did not have knowledge of research or clinical relevance of material that may have impacted the gathering of measures. An additional limitation of the data presented in this study is the possible impact that social desirability placed in the responses participants endorsed on the self-report measure. It is possible that participants were worried that staff would think less of them should the participant provide a low satisfaction rating of the services provided. Additionally, while it is a strength that the Participant Satisfaction Survey was translated into the preferred language of each of the six communitybased agencies (e.g. Korean, Farsi, Spanish, Arabic, and Vietnamese) it is also a limitation, as it is possible that the translated versions of the measure did not accurately inquire about the intended domain or may have been translated in a manner that may have been linguistically inconsistent with the community members language usage. Lastly, the participant satisfaction data that was gathered was not directly linked to the services obtained by each participant which limits the causality that can be drawn between services received and participant satisfaction.

In future research that aims to gather participant satisfaction with community-based services, it would be beneficial to utilize both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection. Goodkind et al. (2014) and Bakas et al. (2009) utilized open-ended questions during interviews alongside quantitative measures to ascertain detailed information on participant satisfaction, an approach to data collection that could be utilized in future research within community-based programs for ethnically diverse, underserved communities. Additionally, it would be beneficial for improvement in tracking of services received by participants in order to draw more detailed and accurate correlations between services received, location of services received, demographic data of participants, and reported satisfaction with programmatic services.

In the quest to understand participant satisfaction with MECCA's Outreach and Engagement (O&E) program, this study found that participants were satisfied with the O&E program on domains of overall satisfaction, cultural competency among staff, program impact, and access to care. The culturally-focused, collaborative mindset woven into the ethos of MECCA has manifested through an unwavering commitment to providing culturally responsive community-based services while challenging the expectations expressed by county funders. Through collaboration, MECCA and the funders have undergone reciprocal education on the needs and preferences of ethnic communities as well as the ways in which funders prefer to gather information on program impact.

#### REFERENCES

- Andrade, F. B., Filha, M.O.F., Vianna, R.P.T., Silva, A.O., & Costa, I.C.C. (2012). Evaluation of participant satisfaction with community therapy: A mental health strategy in primary care. *Psychiatric Quarterly*, 83, 325-334. doi:10.1007/s11126-011-9202-2
- Bakas, T., Farran, C. J., Austin, J. K., Given, B. A., Johnson, E. A., & Williams, L. S. (2009).
   Content validity and satisfaction with a stroke caregiver intervention program. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 41(4), 368-375. doi:10.1111/j.1547-5069.2009.01282.x
- Baron-Epel, O. (2003). Consumer-oriented evaluation of health education services. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 49, 139-147. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0738-3991(02)00073-3.
- Betancourt, J. R., Green, A. R., Carrillo, J. E., & Ananeh-Firempong II, O. (2003). Defining cultural competence: A practical framework for addressing racial/ethnic disparities in health and health care. *Public Health Reports*, 118, 293-302
- Bernal, G., & Saez-Santiago, E. (2006). Culturally centered psychosocial interventions. *Journal* of Community Psychology, 34(2), 121-132.
- Chyung, S., Wisniewski, A., Inderbitzen, B., & Campbell, D. (2013). An improvement- and accountability-oriented program evaluation: An evaluation of the Adventure Scouts program. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 26(3), 87-115. doi:10.1002/piq.21155
- Dumbrill, G. C., & Green, J. (2008). Indigenous knowledge in the social work academy. Social Work Education, 27(5), 489-503. doi:10.1080/02615470701379891
- Flaskerud, J. H. (2007). Cultural competence: What is it? *Issues in mental health nursing*, 28, 121-123. doi:10.1080/01612840600998154

- Goodkind, J. R., Hess, J. M., Isakson, B., LaNoue, M., Githinji, A., Roche, N.... & Parker, D. P. (2014). Reducing refugee mental health disparities: A community-based intervention to address postmigration stressors with African adults. *Psychological Services*, *11*(3), 333-346. doi:10.1037/a0035081
- Goodman, L. A., Liang, B., Helms, J. E. Latta, R. E., Sparks, E., & Weintraub, S. R. (2004). Training counseling psychologists as social justice agents: Feminist and multicultural principles in action. *The Counseling Psychologist*, *32*, 793-837.
- Hall, G. C. (2005). Introduction to the special section on multicultural and community psychology: clinical psychology in context. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73(5), 787-789. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.73.5.787
- Hall, G. C. N. (2001). Psychotherapy research with ethnic minorities: Empirical, ethical, and conceptual issues. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 69, 502–510.
- Harrell, S. P. (2000). A multi-dimensional conceptualization of racism-related stress: implications for the well-being of people of color. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 70, 42-57.
- Ingraham, C. L. & Oka, E. R. (2006). Multicultural issues in evidence-based interventions. *Multicultural Issues in School Psychology*, 127-149. doi:10.1300/J370v22n02\_07
- Kaczorowski, J. A., Williams, A. S., Smith, T. F., Fallah, N., Mendez, J. L., & Nelson–Gray, R.
   (2011). Adapting clinical services to accommodate needs of refugee populations.
   *Professional Psychology: Research And Practice*, 42(5), 361-367. doi:10.1037/a0025022
- Kazdin, A. & Mazurick, J. (1994). Dropping out of child psychotherapy: Distinguishing early and late dropouts over the course of treatment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 62, 1069–1074. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.62.5.1069

- Kiger, H. (2003). Outreach to multiethnic, multicultural, and multilingual women for breast cancer and cervical cancer education and screening; A model using professional and volunteer staffing. *Family & Community Health*, 26(4), 307-318
- LaGrange, R. D., Abramowitz, S., Koenig, L. J., Barnes, W., Conner, L., & Moschel, D. (2012).
   Participant satisfaction with group and individual components of Adolescent Impact: a secondary prevention intervention for HIV-positive youth. *AIDS Care*, 24(1), 119-128.
- Meyer, O. L., & Zane, N. (2013). The influence of race and ethnicity in clients' experiences of mental health treatment. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *41*(7), 884-901.
- Miliora, M. T. (2000). Beyond empathic failures: Cultural racism as narcissistic trauma and disenfranchisement of grandiosity. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 28(1), 43-54. doi:10.1023/A:1005159624872
- Mistry, J., Jacobs, F., & Jacobs, F. (2009). Cultural relevance as program-to-community alignment. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *37*(4), 487-504.
- Nicolaidis, C., Wahab, S., Trimble, J., Meja, A., Mitchell, R., Raymaker, D.... & Waters, A. S. (2012). The interconnections project: Development and evaluation of a community-based depression program for African American violence survivors. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 28(4), 530-538.
  - doi:10.1007/s11606-012-2270-7
- Rastogi, M., Massey-Hastings, N., & Wieling, E. (2012). Barriers to seeking mental health services in the Latino/a community: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Systemic Therapies*, 31(4), 1-17. doi:10.1521/jsyt.2012.31.4.1

- Sink, K. M., Covinsky, K. E., Newcomer, R., & Yaffe, K. (2004). Ethnic differences in the prevalence and pattern of dementia-related behaviors. *Journal of the American Geriatrics Society*, 52, 1277-1283.
- Snell-Johns, J., Mendez, J. L., & Smith, B. H. (2004). Evidence-based solutions for overcoming access barriers, decreasing attrition, and promoting change with underserved families. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 18, 19–35. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.18.1.19
- Sood, E., Mendez, J., & Kendall, P. (2010). Acculturation, religiosity, and ethnicity predict mothers' causal beliefs about separation anxiety disorder and preferences for helpseeking. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/0022022110389492
- Thompson-Miller, R., & Feagin, J. R. (2007). Continuing Injuries of Racism: Counseling in a Racist Context. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 35(1), 106-115. doi:10.1177/0011000006294664
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, (1999). *Mental health: A report of the surgeon general*. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Mental Health Services, National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Mental Health. *Retrieval from* https://profiles.nlm.nih.gov/ps/retrieve/ResourceMetadata/NNBBHS
- Verdinelli, S., & Biever, J. L. (2013). Therapists' experiences of cross-ethnic therapy with Spanish-speaking Latina/o clients. *Journal Of Latina/O Psychology*, 1(4), 227-242. doi:10.1037/lat0000004

Woods, D. T., Catroppa, C., Giallo, R., Anderson, & V.A. (2012). Feasibility and consumer satisfaction following an intervention for families who have a child with acquired brain injury. *NeuroRehabilitation*, 30, 189-198. doi:10.3233/NRE-2012-0744

## TABLES

Table 1.

| Descriptive Sta | atistics for Full | MECCA Sample fro | m Fiscal Year | 2012-2013 |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------|-----------|
|                 |                   |                  |               |           |

|                                    | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Standard Deviation |
|------------------------------------|-----|---------|---------|--------|--------------------|
| Satisfaction Question 1            | 138 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.406  | .7213              |
| Satisfaction Question 2            | 86  | 1.0     | 4.0     | 2.442  | .9406              |
| Satisfaction Question 3            | 133 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.383  | .6597              |
| Satisfaction Question 4            | 142 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.556  | .6471              |
| Satisfaction Question 5            | 133 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.489  | .6230              |
| Satisfaction Question 6            | 137 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.380  | .6545              |
| Satisfaction Question 7            | 123 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.455  | .6684              |
| Satisfaction Question 8            | 130 | 4.0     | 10.0    | 9.223  | 1.1086             |
| Satisfaction Question<br>9A        | 138 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.768  | .6076              |
| Satisfaction Question<br>9B        | 140 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 2.771  | 1.3213             |
| Satisfaction Question<br>9C        | 136 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.669  | .7703              |
| Overall Satisfaction               | 144 | 3.0     | 18.0    | 13.049 | 3.5406             |
| Program Impact                     | 137 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.380  | .6545              |
| Cultural Competency<br>Among Staff | 144 | 6.0     | 20.0    | 16.229 | 3.0536             |
| Access to Care                     | 133 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.489  | .6230              |
| Satisfaction Total                 | 144 | 17.0    | 46.0    | 35.715 | 6.0576             |
| Valid N (listwise)                 | 52  |         |         |        |                    |

### Table 2.

|                    |     |         |         |               | Standard  |
|--------------------|-----|---------|---------|---------------|-----------|
|                    | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean          | Deviation |
| Satisfaction       | 25  | 2.0     | 4.0     | 3.480         | .5859     |
| Question 1         | 23  | 2.0     | 4.0     | 5.460         | .3639     |
| Satisfaction       | 18  | 1.0     | 4.0     | 2.444         | .9835     |
| Question 2         | 18  | 1.0     | 4.0     | 2.444         | .9855     |
| Satisfaction       | 23  | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.565         | .5069     |
| Question 3         | 23  | 5.0     | 4.0     | 5.505         | .5009     |
| Satisfaction       | 25  | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.600         | .5000     |
| Question 4         | 23  | 5.0     | 4.0     | 5.000         | .5000     |
| Satisfaction       | 21  | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.619         | .4976     |
| Question 5         | 21  | 5.0     | 4.0     | 5.019         | .4970     |
| Satisfaction       | 23  | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.348         | .4870     |
| Question 6         | 23  | 5.0     | 4.0     | 5.540         | .+070     |
| Satisfaction       | 24  | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.542         | .5090     |
| Question 7         | 27  | 5.0     | ч.0     | 5.542         | .5070     |
| Satisfaction       | 25  | 5.0     | 10.0    | 9.480         | 1.0847    |
| Question 8         | 20  | 5.0     | 10.0    | 9.100         | 1.0017    |
| Satisfaction       | 25  | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000         | .0000     |
| Question 9A        | 20  | 1.0     | 1.0     | 1.000         | .0000     |
| Satisfaction       | 26  | 1.0     | 4.0     | 1.923         | 1.4120    |
| Question 9B        | 20  | 1.0     |         | 1.725         | 1.1120    |
| Satisfaction       | 26  | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000         | .0000     |
| Question 9C        |     |         |         |               |           |
| Overall            | 26  | 5.0     | 18.0    | 14.154        | 3.0026    |
| Satisfaction       |     |         |         |               |           |
| Program Impact     | 23  | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.348         | .4870     |
| Cultural           | • • |         | • • •   |               | /         |
| Competency         | 26  | 9.0     | 20.0    | 16.500        | 2.7459    |
| Among Staff        |     | •       |         | <b>2</b> (10) | 10-       |
| Access to Care     | 21  | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.619         | .4976     |
| Satisfaction Total | 26  | 19.0    | 45.0    | 36.538        | 6.0678    |
| Valid N            | 10  |         |         |               |           |
| (listwise)         |     |         |         |               |           |

Descriptive Statistics for ABRAZAR Sample from Fiscal Year 2012-2013

### Table 3.

|                    |    |         |         |        | Standard    |
|--------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|-------------|
|                    | N  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Deviation   |
| Satisfaction       | 38 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.342  | .8471       |
| Question 1         | 20 | 1.0     |         | 0.0.2  |             |
| Satisfaction       | 21 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 2.000  | 1.0488      |
| Question 2         | 21 | 1.0     | 1.0     | 2.000  |             |
| Satisfaction       | 33 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.303  | .7699       |
| Question 3         | 55 | 1.0     | 1.0     | 5.505  |             |
| Satisfaction       | 38 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.553  | .7604       |
| Question 4         | 50 | 1.0     | 1.0     | 5.555  | .7001       |
| Satisfaction       | 37 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.486  | .7682       |
| Question 5         | 51 | 1.0     | 1.0     | 5.100  | .7002       |
| Satisfaction       | 35 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.400  | .7746       |
| Question 6         | 55 | 1.0     | 1.0     | 5.100  | .//10       |
| Satisfaction       | 33 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.455  | .6657       |
| Question 7         | 55 | 1.0     |         | 5.100  |             |
| Satisfaction       | 39 | 7.0     | 10.0    | 9.077  | .9837       |
| Question 8         | 59 | /.0     | 10.0    | 2.011  | ., ., ., ., |
| Satisfaction       | 35 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.543  | .7413       |
| Question 9A        | 20 | 1.0     |         | 01010  | .,          |
| Satisfaction       | 38 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 2.895  | .9806       |
| Question 9B        | 20 | 1.0     |         | 2.070  |             |
| Satisfaction       | 37 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.324  | .8836       |
| Question 9C        |    | 1.0     |         | 0.02.  |             |
| Overall            | 39 | 8.0     | 16.0    | 13.410 | 1.8456      |
| Satisfaction       |    |         |         |        |             |
| Program Impact     | 35 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.400  | .7746       |
| Cultural           |    |         |         |        |             |
| Competency         | 39 | 6.0     | 20.0    | 15.538 | 3.5825      |
| Among Staff        |    |         |         |        |             |
| Access to Care     | 37 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.486  | .7682       |
| Satisfaction Total | 39 | 17.0    | 43.0    | 35.308 | 6.1651      |
| Valid N            | 16 |         |         |        |             |
| (listwise)         | 10 |         |         |        |             |

Descriptive Statistics for VNCOC Sample from Fiscal Year 2012-2013

# Table 4.

Descriptive Statistics for OCCTAC Sample from Fiscal Year 2012-2013

|                    | λ  | Minimum | Mauimum | Maan   | Standard Deviation |
|--------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|--------------------|
|                    | N  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Deviation          |
| Satisfaction       | 50 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.460  | .6131              |
| Question 1         |    |         |         |        |                    |
| Satisfaction       | 26 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 2.538  | .9047              |
| Question 2         |    |         |         |        |                    |
| Satisfaction       | 52 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.346  | .6827              |
| Question 3         | -  |         |         |        |                    |
| Satisfaction       | 54 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.500  | .6936              |
| Question 4         | 0. | 1.0     |         | 0.000  |                    |
| Satisfaction       | 52 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.404  | .6026              |
| Question 5         | 52 | 1.0     | 1.0     | 5.101  | .0020              |
| Satisfaction       | 54 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.333  | .7004              |
| Question 6         | 54 | 1.0     | ч.0     | 5.555  | .700+              |
| Satisfaction       | 41 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.293  | .8138              |
| Question 7         | 11 | 1.0     | ч.0     | 5.275  | .0150              |
| Satisfaction       | 47 | 4.0     | 10.0    | 9.319  | 1.2702             |
| Question 8         | ÷, | 4.0     | 10.0    | ).51)  | 1.2702             |
| Satisfaction       | 53 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.849  | .6012              |
| Question 9A        | 55 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 5.049  | .0012              |
| Satisfaction       | 51 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.196  | 1.2809             |
| Question 9B        | 51 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 5.190  | 1.2009             |
| Satisfaction       | 51 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.667  | .9092              |
| Question 9C        | 51 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 5.007  | .9092              |
| Overall            | 54 | 2.0     | 10.0    | 10 527 | 4.0409             |
| Satisfaction       | 54 | 3.0     | 18.0    | 12.537 | 4.0409             |
| Program Impact     | 54 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.333  | .7004              |
| Cultural           |    |         |         |        |                    |
| Competency         | 54 | 6.0     | 20.0    | 16.259 | 3.1574             |
| Among Staff        |    |         |         |        |                    |
| Access to Care     | 52 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.404  | .6026              |
| Satisfaction Total | 54 | 22.0    | 46.0    | 35.407 | 6.1691             |
| Valid N            |    |         |         |        |                    |
| (listwise)         | 14 |         |         |        |                    |

## Table 5.

Descriptive Statistics for OMID Sample from Fiscal Year 2012-2013

|                    |    |         |         |        | Standard  |
|--------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|-----------|
|                    | N  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Deviation |
| Satisfaction       | 12 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.333  | 1.1547    |
| Question 1         | 12 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 5.555  | 1.1347    |
| Satisfaction       | 9  | 2.0     | 4.0     | 3.222  | .6667     |
| Question 2         | )  | 2.0     | 1.0     | 5.222  | .0007     |
| Satisfaction       | 12 | 2.0     | 4.0     | 3.667  | .6513     |
| Question 3         | 12 | 2.0     | 1.0     | 5.007  | .0015     |
| Satisfaction       | 12 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.917  | .2887     |
| Question 4         |    | 5.0     |         | 5.717  | 007       |
| Satisfaction       | 11 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.818  | .4045     |
| Question 5         |    | 0.0     |         | 01010  |           |
| Satisfaction       | 12 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.750  | .4523     |
| Question 6         |    | 5.0     |         | 5.700  |           |
| Satisfaction       | 12 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.750  | .4523     |
| Question 7         |    | 0.0     |         | 01700  |           |
| Satisfaction       | 12 | 8.0     | 10.0    | 8.917  | .9003     |
| Question 8         |    |         |         |        |           |
| Satisfaction       | 12 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.917  | .2887     |
| Question 9A        |    | 0.0     |         | 01/11  |           |
| Satisfaction       | 12 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.167  | 1.3371    |
| Question 9B        |    |         |         |        |           |
| Satisfaction       | 9  | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.889  | .3333     |
| Question 9C        | -  |         |         |        |           |
| Overall            | 12 | 13.0    | 18.0    | 14.667 | 1.6143    |
| Satisfaction       |    |         |         |        |           |
| Program Impact     | 12 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.750  | .4523     |
| Cultural           |    |         |         |        |           |
| Competency         | 12 | 14.0    | 20.0    | 17.667 | 2.0597    |
| Among Staff        |    |         |         |        |           |
| Access to Care     | 11 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.818  | .4045     |
| Satisfaction Total | 12 | 32.0    | 44.0    | 39.583 | 3.1467    |
| Valid N            | 6  |         |         |        |           |
| (listwise)         | Ũ  |         |         |        |           |

# Table 6.

|                    | Ν  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Standard Deviation |
|--------------------|----|---------|---------|--------|--------------------|
| Satisfaction       | 13 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.308  | .4804              |
| Question 1         | 10 | 0.0     |         | 0.000  |                    |
| Satisfaction       | 12 | 2.0     | 3.0     | 2.417  | .5149              |
| Question 2         |    |         | 2.0     | ,      |                    |
| Satisfaction       | 13 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.154  | .3755              |
| Question 3         | 15 | 5.0     |         | 5.10   | .5,00              |
| Satisfaction       | 13 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.385  | .5064              |
| Question 4         | 15 | 5.0     | 1.0     | 5.505  |                    |
| Satisfaction       | 12 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.333  | .4924              |
| Question 5         | 12 | 5.0     | 1.0     | 5.555  | . 172 1            |
| Satisfaction       | 13 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.231  | .4385              |
| Question 6         | 15 | 5.0     | ч.0     | 5.251  |                    |
| Satisfaction       | 13 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.538  | .5189              |
| Question 7         | 15 | 5.0     | 1.0     | 5.550  | .0109              |
| Satisfaction       | 7  | 8.0     | 10.0    | 9.000  | 1.0000             |
| Question 8         | 1  | 0.0     | 10.0    | 2.000  | 1.0000             |
| Satisfaction       | 13 | 2.0     | 4.0     | 3.462  | .7763              |
| Question 9A        | 15 | 2.0     | ч.0     | 5.402  | .7705              |
| Satisfaction       | 13 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 2.077  | 1.2558             |
| Question 9B        | 15 | 1.0     | ч.0     | 2.077  | 1.2556             |
| Satisfaction       | 13 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.846  | .3755              |
| Question 9C        | 15 | 5.0     | ч.0     | 5.040  | .5755              |
| Overall            | 13 | 3.0     | 17.0    | 10.385 | 5.5458             |
| Satisfaction       | 15 | 5.0     | 17.0    | 10.505 | 5.5450             |
| Program Impact     | 13 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.231  | .4385              |
| Cultural           |    |         |         |        |                    |
| Competency         | 13 | 13.0    | 19.0    | 16.308 | 1.7505             |
| Among Staff        |    |         |         |        |                    |
| Access to Care     | 12 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.333  | .4924              |
| Satisfaction Total | 13 | 25.0    | 42.0    | 33.000 | 6.1373             |
| Valid N            | 6  |         |         |        |                    |
| (listwise)         |    |         |         |        |                    |

### Table 7.

Descriptive Statistics for Full MECCA Sample from Fiscal Year 2013-2014

|                                    | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Standard<br>Deviation |
|------------------------------------|-----|---------|---------|--------|-----------------------|
| Satisfaction Question 1            | 227 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.542  | .6253                 |
| Satisfaction Question 2            | 142 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 2.768  | .9503                 |
| Satisfaction Question 3            | 215 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.516  | .6474                 |
| Satisfaction Question 4            | 230 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.591  | .5969                 |
| Satisfaction Question 5            | 219 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.479  | .6305                 |
| Satisfaction Question 6            | 216 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.458  | .6456                 |
| Satisfaction Question 7            | 212 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.505  | .6272                 |
| Satisfaction Question 8            | 212 | 1.0     | 10.0    | 9.316  | 1.2234                |
| Satisfaction Question<br>9A        | 226 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.863  | .4256                 |
| Satisfaction Question<br>9B        | 225 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.253  | 1.1775                |
| Satisfaction Question<br>9C        | 226 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.823  | .5288                 |
| Overall Satisfaction               | 236 | 3.0     | 18.0    | 13.441 | 3.6845                |
| Program Impact                     | 216 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.458  | .6456                 |
| Cultural Competency<br>Among Staff | 242 | 4.0     | 20.0    | 16.686 | 3.3964                |
| Access to Care                     | 219 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.479  | .6305                 |
| Satisfaction Total                 | 242 | 8.0     | 46.0    | 36.029 | 7.9924                |
| Valid N (listwise)                 | 89  |         |         |        |                       |

# Table 8.

|                    |     |         |         |         | Standard      |
|--------------------|-----|---------|---------|---------|---------------|
|                    | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean    | Deviation     |
| Satisfaction       | 15  | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.800   | .4140         |
| Question 1         | 15  | 5.0     | ч.0     | 5.000   | .+1+0         |
| Satisfaction       | 11  | 1.0     | 4.0     | 1.818   | .8739         |
| Question 2         | 11  | 1.0     | 1.0     | 1.010   | .0759         |
| Satisfaction       | 15  | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.800   | .4140         |
| Question 3         | 10  | 0.0     |         | 2.000   |               |
| Satisfaction       | 15  | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.800   | .4140         |
| Question 4         | 10  | 5.0     | 1.0     | 5.000   | .1110         |
| Satisfaction       | 15  | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.467   | .5164         |
| Question 5         | 10  | 5.0     | 1.0     | 5.107   |               |
| Satisfaction       | 15  | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.733   | .4577         |
| Question 6         | 10  | 0.0     |         | 01700   |               |
| Satisfaction       | 14  | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.714   | .4688         |
| Question 7         |     | 0.0     |         | 01711   |               |
| Satisfaction       | 13  | 9.0     | 10.0    | 9.769   | .4385         |
| Question 8         |     |         |         |         |               |
| Satisfaction       | 15  | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000   | .0000         |
| Question 9A        |     |         |         |         |               |
| Satisfaction       | 14  | 1.0     | 4.0     | 2.500   | 1.5566        |
| Question 9B        |     |         |         |         |               |
| Satisfaction       | 15  | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000   | .0000         |
| Question 9C        |     |         |         |         |               |
| Overall            | 15  | 5.0     | 16.0    | 13.600  | 3.0426        |
| Satisfaction       | 1.5 | 2.0     | 1.0     | 2 7 2 2 | 1577          |
| Program Impact     | 15  | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.733   | .4577         |
| Cultural           | 1.5 | 15.0    | 20.0    | 17 (00  | 1 0000        |
| Competency         | 15  | 15.0    | 20.0    | 17.600  | 1.9928        |
| Among Staff        | 1.5 | 2.0     | 4.0     |         | <b>F1 C A</b> |
| Access to Care     | 15  | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.467   | .5164         |
| Satisfaction Total | 15  | 32.0    | 44.0    | 38.400  | 3.0190        |
| Valid N            | 7   |         |         |         |               |
| (listwise)         |     |         |         |         |               |

Descriptive Statistics for ABRAZAR Sample from Fiscal Year 2013-2014

## Table 9.

|                             |     |         |         |        | Standard  |
|-----------------------------|-----|---------|---------|--------|-----------|
|                             | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Deviation |
| Satisfaction<br>Question 1  | 107 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.551  | .6179     |
| Satisfaction<br>Question 2  | 75  | 1.0     | 4.0     | 2.787  | .9904     |
| Satisfaction<br>Question 3  | 98  | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.500  | .6619     |
| Satisfaction<br>Question 4  | 107 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.654  | .5338     |
| Satisfaction<br>Question 5  | 103 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.524  | .6079     |
| Satisfaction<br>Question 6  | 101 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.436  | .6545     |
| Satisfaction<br>Question 7  | 102 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.461  | .6081     |
| Satisfaction<br>Question 8  | 102 | 1.0     | 10.0    | 9.245  | 1.4312    |
| Satisfaction<br>Question 9A | 104 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.769  | .5614     |
| Satisfaction<br>Question 9B | 106 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.349  | 1.0424    |
| Satisfaction<br>Question 9C | 105 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.829  | .4694     |
| Overall<br>Satisfaction     | 114 | 3.0     | 18.0    | 13.439 | 3.8213    |
| Program Impact<br>Cultural  | 101 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.436  | .6545     |
| Competency<br>Among Staff   | 116 | 4.0     | 20.0    | 16.319 | 3.6442    |
| Access to Care              | 103 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 3.524  | .6079     |
| Satisfaction Total          | 116 | 9.0     | 46.0    | 35.647 | 8.5448    |
| Valid N<br>(listwise)       | 45  |         |         |        |           |

# Descriptive Statistics for VNCOC Sample from Fiscal Year 2013-2014

## Table 10.

|                                      | N         | Minimum    | Maximum     | Mean            | Standard Deviation |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|------------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Satisfaction<br>Question 1           | 95        | 1.0        | 4.0         | 3.495           | .6664              |
| Satisfaction<br>Question 2           | 49        | 1.0        | 4.0         | 3.000           | .8165              |
| Satisfaction<br>Question 3           | 92        | 1.0        | 4.0         | 3.467           | .6704              |
| Satisfaction<br>Question 4           | 98        | 1.0        | 4.0         | 3.480           | .6770              |
| Satisfaction<br>Question 5           | 92        | 1.0        | 4.0         | 3.435           | .6843              |
| Satisfaction                         | 90        | 1.0        | 4.0         | 3.433           | .6712              |
| Question 6<br>Satisfaction           | 86        | 1.0        | 4.0         | 3.523           | .6813              |
| Question 7<br>Satisfaction           | 88        | 5.0        | 10.0        | 9.466           | .9340              |
| Question 8<br>Satisfaction           | 97        | 3.0        | 4.0         | 3.959           | .1999              |
| Question 9A<br>Satisfaction          | 95        | 1.0        | 4.0         | 3.253           | 1.2460             |
| Question 9B<br>Satisfaction          | 96        | 1.0        | 4.0         | 3.812           | .6209              |
| Question 9C<br>Overall               |           |            |             |                 |                    |
| Satisfaction<br>Program Impact       | 97<br>90  | 3.0<br>1.0 | 18.0<br>4.0 | 13.526<br>3.433 | 3.6886<br>.6712    |
| Cultural<br>Competency               | 101       | 4.0        | 20.0        | 16.861          | 3.3378             |
| Among Staff                          |           |            |             |                 |                    |
| Access to Care<br>Satisfaction Total | 92<br>101 | 1.0<br>8.0 | 4.0<br>46.0 | 3.435<br>36.040 | .6843<br>8.0845    |
| Valid N<br>(listwise)                | 32        |            |             |                 |                    |

## Descriptive Statistics for OCCTAC Sample from Fiscal Year 2013-2014

## Table 11.

|                    |   |         |         |        | Standard  |
|--------------------|---|---------|---------|--------|-----------|
|                    | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Deviation |
| Satisfaction       | 3 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.667  | .5774     |
| Question 1         | 5 | 5.0     | 4.0     | 5.007  | .3774     |
| Satisfaction       | 2 | 2.0     | 3.0     | 2.500  | .7071     |
| Question 2         | 2 | 2.0     | 5.0     | 2.500  | .7071     |
| Satisfaction       | 3 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.333  | .5774     |
| Question 3         | 5 | 5.0     | ч.0     | 5.555  |           |
| Satisfaction       | 3 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.667  | .5774     |
| Question 4         | 5 | 5.0     | ч.0     | 5.007  |           |
| Satisfaction       | 2 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.500  | .7071     |
| Question 5         |   | 5.0     |         |        |           |
| Satisfaction       | 3 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.667  | .5774     |
| Question 6         | 5 | 5.0     | 1.0     | 5.007  |           |
| Satisfaction       | 3 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.333  | .5774     |
| Question 7         | 5 | 5.0     | 4.0     | 5.555  | .3774     |
| Satisfaction       | 2 | 8.0     | 10.0    | 9.000  | 1.4142    |
| Question 8         | - | 0.0     | 10.0    | 2.000  | 1.1112    |
| Satisfaction       | 3 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.667  | .5774     |
| Question 9A        | 5 | 5.0     |         | 5.007  | ,         |
| Satisfaction       | 3 | 1.0     | 4.0     | 2.333  | 1.5275    |
| Question 9B        |   |         |         |        |           |
| Satisfaction       | 3 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.667  | .5774     |
| Question 9C        | C | 0.0     |         | 2.007  |           |
| Overall            | 3 | 5.0     | 17.0    | 11.333 | 6.0277    |
| Satisfaction       |   |         |         |        |           |
| Program Impact     | 3 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.667  | .5774     |
| Cultural           |   |         |         |        |           |
| Competency         | 3 | 14.0    | 19.0    | 16.667 | 2.5166    |
| Among Staff        |   |         |         |        |           |
| Access to Care     | 2 | 3.0     | 4.0     | 3.500  | .7071     |
| Satisfaction Total | 3 | 25.0    | 40.0    | 34.000 | 7.9373    |
| Valid N            | 0 |         |         |        |           |
| (listwise)         | Ŭ |         |         |        |           |

Descriptive Statistics for OMID Sample from Fiscal Year 2013-2014

### Table 12.

|                    |   |         |         |        | Standard  |
|--------------------|---|---------|---------|--------|-----------|
|                    | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Deviation |
| Satisfaction       | 1 | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000  |           |
| Question 1         | 1 | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000  | -         |
| Satisfaction       | 0 |         |         |        |           |
| Question 2         | 0 |         |         |        |           |
| Satisfaction       | 1 | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000  |           |
| Question 3         | 1 | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000  |           |
| Satisfaction       | 1 | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000  |           |
| Question 4         | 1 | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000  | •         |
| Satisfaction       | 1 | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000  |           |
| Question 5         | 1 | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000  | •         |
| Satisfaction       | 1 | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000  |           |
| Question 6         | 1 | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000  |           |
| Satisfaction       | 1 | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000  |           |
| Question 7         | 1 | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000  |           |
| Satisfaction       | 1 | 9.0     | 9.0     | 9.000  |           |
| Question 8         | 1 | 7.0     | 7.0     | 9.000  |           |
| Satisfaction       | 1 | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000  |           |
| Question 9A        | 1 | 7.0     | т.0     | 7.000  |           |
| Satisfaction       | 1 | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000  |           |
| Question 9B        | 1 | 7.0     | т.0     | 7.000  |           |
| Satisfaction       | 1 | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000  |           |
| Question 9C        | 1 | 7.0     | т.0     | 7.000  |           |
| Overall            | 1 | 13.0    | 13.0    | 13.000 |           |
| Satisfaction       |   |         |         |        | -         |
| Program Impact     | 1 | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000  |           |
| Cultural           |   |         |         |        |           |
| Competency         | 1 | 20.0    | 20.0    | 20.000 | _         |
| Among Staff        |   |         |         |        |           |
| Access to Care     | 1 | 4.0     | 4.0     | 4.000  | _         |
| Satisfaction Total | 1 | 41.0    | 41.0    | 41.000 |           |
| Valid N            |   |         |         | -      |           |
| (listwise)         | 0 |         |         |        |           |

Descriptive Statistics for KCS Sample from Fiscal Year 2013-2014

## Table 13.

|                        | N  | Minimum | Maximum     | Mean    | Standard Deviation |
|------------------------|----|---------|-------------|---------|--------------------|
| Satisfaction           | 11 | winnun  | waxiiiiaiii | mean    | Deviation          |
| Question 1             | 6  | 3.0     | 4.0         | 3.333   | .5164              |
| Satisfaction           |    |         |             |         |                    |
| Question 2             | 5  | 2.0     | 3.0         | 2.400   | .5477              |
| Satisfaction           |    | •       |             |         | 4000               |
| Question 3             | 6  | 3.0     | 4.0         | 3.833   | .4082              |
| Satisfaction           |    | 2.0     | 1.0         | 2 ( (7  | 5164               |
| Question 4             | 6  | 3.0     | 4.0         | 3.667   | .5164              |
| Satisfaction           | 6  | 2.0     | 1.0         | 2 2 2 2 | 5164               |
| Question 5             | 6  | 3.0     | 4.0         | 3.333   | .5164              |
| Satisfaction           | 6  | 3.0     | 4.0         | 3.333   | .5164              |
| Question 6             | 6  |         |             |         | .5164              |
| Satisfaction           | 6  | 3.0     | 4.0         | 3.500   | .5477              |
| Question 7             | 0  | 5.0     | 4.0         | 5.500   | .5477              |
| Satisfaction           | 6  | 7.0     | 9.0         | 7.500   | .8367              |
| Question 8             | 0  |         |             |         | .0507              |
| Satisfaction           | 6  | 3.0     | 4.0         | 3.667   | .5164              |
| Question 9A            | Ũ  | 2.0     |             | 0.007   |                    |
| Satisfaction           | 6  | 3.0     | 4.0         | 3.667   | .5164              |
| Question 9B            | -  |         |             |         |                    |
| Satisfaction           | 6  | 3.0     | 4.0         | 3.500   | .5477              |
| Question 9C            |    |         |             |         |                    |
| Overall                | 6  | 11.0    | 16.0        | 12.833  | 1.7224             |
| Satisfaction           | 6  | 2.0     | 4.0         | 3.333   | 5164               |
| Program Impact         | 0  | 3.0     | 4.0         | 3.333   | .5164              |
| Cultural<br>Competency | 6  | 15.0    | 20.0        | 18.000  | 1.8974             |
| Among Staff            | 0  | 15.0    | 20.0        | 10.000  | 1.07/4             |
| Access to Care         | 6  | 3.0     | 4.0         | 3.333   | .5164              |
| Satisfaction Total     |    |         |             |         | 3.3912             |
| Substaction 10tul      | 6  | 35.0    | 44.0        | 37.500  | 5.5712             |
| Valid N                | _  |         |             |         |                    |
| (listwise)             | 5  |         |             |         |                    |

Descriptive Statistics for ACCESS CAL Sample from Fiscal Year 2013-2014

- Case management
- Life coaching
- Skill building
- Culturally responsive classes, with classes that emphasize: learning to speak English, completing government forms, playing guitar, cooking, art, sewing and making clothing, and mental health classes that facilitate sharing of experiences.
- Referral to mental health services, medical services, legal services, and social services.
- Connection to other community resources.

Figure 1. MECCA's outreach and engagement services

**Overall Satisfaction** 

- Criteria 1: Participant would recommend the program to someone they know.
- Criteria 2: Participant would choose to participate in the program again.
- Criteria 8: During the past 30 days, overall satisfaction with the MECCA O&E program is rated on a scale from 0 to 10 by participant.

Cultural Competency Among Staff

- Criteria 4: Participants feels that the staff treated himself or herself with courtesy and respect.
- Criteria 7: Participant understood everything communicated to himself or herself during their involvement with the program.
- Criteria 9 (a): Participant reports that the sessions were provided in preferred language.
- Criteria 9 (b): Participant reports that the program provider spoke with understandable words.
- Criteria 9 (c): Participant feels staff were sensitive to his or her language and ethnicity.

Program Impact

- Criteria 6: Participant feels staff helped him or her achieve their goals. Access to Care
  - Criteria 5: Participant feels that the meeting places and times of the program during the past 30 days were convenient.

Figure 2. Satisfaction criteria and satisfaction domains

- 1. I would recommend the MECCA O&E Program to a friend, relative or someone I know.
- 2. I could have received the MECCA O&E services through another agency.
- 3. The MECCA O&E staff responded to my needs in a timely manner.
- 4. During my most recent activity with the MECCA O&E Program, the staff treated me with courtesy and respect.
- 5. I would say that my meeting places and times with the MECCA O&E Program in the past 30 days have been convenient.
- 6. The MECCA O&E staff helped me achieve my goals.
- 7. I understood everything that was communicated to me during my involvement with the MECCA O&E Program.
- 8. To rate my *overall satisfaction* with the MECCA O&E as a program in the past 30 days, where 0 is the worst program possible and 10 is the best program possible, the number I would use is:

9.

- a. Thinking about my overall experience with the MECCA O&E Program within the past 30 days, I would say that: Sessions were provided in my preferred language
- b. Thinking about my overall experience with the MECCA O&E Program within the past 30 days, I would say that: When the staff was speaking to me, s/he used words that I did not understand.
- c. Thinking about my overall experience with the MECCA O&E Program within the past 30 days, I would say that: I felt the MECCA staff was sensitive to my language and ethnicity.

Figure 3. Satisfaction survey questions

### APPENDIX A

Extended Review of the Literature

| Author/ Year                 | Title               | Research Questions/<br>Objectives                            | Sample | Instrumentation | Research Approach/ Design                                     | Major Findings   |
|------------------------------|---------------------|--|--------|-----------------|---|--|
| Bernal, G., & Saez-Santiago, | ntered              | To highlight the importance of                               |        |                 | Literature review; discussion on                              | Growing number of ethnic individuals within the U.S.   |
| E. (2006)                    | interventions       | cultural-focused treatment within<br>the field of psychology |        |                 | culture centered treatment;<br>framework for culture centered | indicate the necessity for culture centered treatment due<br>to the powerful role of culture; call for research on the |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 | treatment discussed   | efficacy of culture centered treatments; offer a method of adapting interventions for work with ethnic                 |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | individuals: "eight elements or dimensions that must be  |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | incorporated into treatment to augment both the<br>ecological validity and the overall external validity of a          |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | treatment study. These centering elements are: (a)   |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | language, (b) persons, (c) metaphor, (d) content, (e)  |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | concepts, (f) goals, (g) methods, and (h) context. In  |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | addition, this model emphasizes the consideration of   |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | developmental, tecnnical, and theoretical issues (p.   |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | 12/; key to understand environment within which  |
| Dumbrill, G. C., & Green, J. | Indigenous          | To understand the impact of                                  |        |                 | Literature review; examining                                  | "The term 'Indigenous knowledge' refers to the   |
| (2008)                       | knowledge in the    | Eurocentrism on mental health                                |        |                 | đ   | traditional ways of knowing and being of Aboriginal  |
|                              | social work academy | social work academy provider education and to                |        |                 | identity; offering of a new model                             | peoples" (p. 489); domination of native peoples during   |
|                              |                     | Indigenous knowedge into                                     |        |                 | to the Burney   | removal of unique identities; "successful inclusion does   |
|                              |                     | mental health services                                       |        |                 |   | not hinge on being sensitive to Aboriginal ways of   |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | knowing and open to including this knowledge in the  |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | academy, but on being sensitive to the ways European   |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | knowledge dominates the academy and open to  |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | disrupting this domination" (p. 490); "storytelling is   |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | of teaching that invites listeners to find meaning through   |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | reflection and analysis of the narrative" (p. 492); "The   |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | Medicine Wheel provides a means of re-conceptualizing  |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | both academic and societal space there are four  |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | four face of mother earth: red yellow, black, and white;   |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | (b) four seasons: spring, summer, fall, and winter; (c)  |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | four components of our being: spiritual, emotional,  |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | physical, and mental; and (d) four aspect of life: infant,   |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | youth, adult, and elder" (p. 495); the model also provides   |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | new configuration, with "east: engage in critical historical analysis south: explore difference and other              |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | knowledgewest: make space for other knowledge and  |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   | establish academi standardsnorth: evaluation and   |
|                              |                     |  |        |                 |   |  |

|                             | THA                    | Research Questions/  | <u>0</u>                    | T                        | Parata A second / Dosim                                 |  |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| Fieldered III (2007)        |                        | To the second sector of the se | Sambre                      |                          | T iteration in Approach, Design                         | Trialiante dense for allocate to coltant                   |
| · monerus, e.r.: (2007)     | What is it? competence | competence   |                             |                          |   | comptence: "cultural knowledge cultural sensitivity and    |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | collaboration with the community to be served. Cultural    |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | knowledge means actively learning about the community-     |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | its ethnicities, languages, origins, immigration or        |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | migration history, acculturation level, economy, sources   |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | of income, family and social structures and roles, value   |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | systems and beliefs, education levels and literacy,        |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | geography, and ecologic environment. Cultural              |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | sensitivity includes an ethic or a moral imperative to     |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | value and respect the beliefs, norms, and practices of the |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | people to be served. This begins with an awareness of      |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | our own cultural beliefs and practices and moves toward    |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | beingnon-judgmental and respectful in dealing with         |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | people whose culture is different than our own" (p. 121-   |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | 122). "Collaboration with the community to be served       |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | can mean the people who live within a geographic           |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | boundary, the people served by a certain agency or         |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | program, or a group of people who have shared identity     |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | and experiences, similar beliefs, values, and norms.       |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | Collaboration with the community in research means         |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | that community members participate in all aspects of       |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | research from question identification and design to        |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   | implementation, analysis and evaluation, to                |
| Goodkind, J.R., Hess, J.M., | Reducing Refugee       | To understand the mental health  | Sample = $36$ , 19 of which | Rumbaut's Psychological  | Extensive literature review;                            | Qualitative is important in getting information about a    |
| Isakson, B., LaNoue, M.,    | Mental Health          | needs of refugees within the   | were women and 17 of        | Well-Being Scale (1985); | Well-Being Scale (1985); administration of measures and | participants' experience; "participants in both studies    |
| Githinji, A., Roche, N.,    | Disparities: A         | U.S., specifically through   | which were men ranging      | Satisfaction with life   | interviews during four markers of                       | experienced significant increases in English proficiency   |
| Vadnais, K., & Parker, D.P. | community-based        | discussing research findings of  | from 18 to 71 years-old,    | Areas scale (Ossorio,    | study (every three months) in                           | and quality of life and significant decerases in           |
| (2014)                      | intervention to        | causes of refugee stress and   | consisting of 17 Burundian, | 1979); Satisfaction with | order to gather longitudinal                            | psychological distress" (p. 342); the Refugee Well-being   |
|                             | address                | implementing a community-  | one Rwandan, 13 from        | Resources scale;         | information   | Project was adaptable to other cultures and can be         |
|                             |                        | based program to service the   | Democratic Republic of      | Difficulty Obtaining     |   | "adapted for ethnically and linguistically diverse refugee |
|                             | stressors with         | needs of the Arican refugee  | Congo, three Liberian, and  | Resources scale; Basic   |   | who settle in different parts of the United States" (p.    |
|                             | 0.                     | community; examining the   | two Eritrean.               | English Skills Test      |   | 342)   |
|                             |                        | effectiveness and competency of  |                             | (BEST); Whitbeck         |   |  |
|                             |                        | une Keilugee weit-Being Froject<br>with individuals from African   |                             | interviews               |   |  |
|                             |                        |  |                             |                          |   |  |

| <ul> <li>Highlight interdependence as a key difference in diverse ethnic communities when compared to European American culture; spirituality can vary and impacts treatment so it is important to understand the role of spirituality in that ehtnic community; important to not blame individual for reactions and experiences of racism due to their identity; 10 steps are outlined for making empirically supported therapies more culturally responsive; "1. Identify expert EST and CST researchers to collaborate on all components of the project 2. Identify a disorder from which there is a well-established EST 3. Identify an ethnic minority population to study and a site where there is access to this population 4. Identify the unique cultural aspect of the ethnic minority group relate to other groups 5. Identify cultural dimensions that have a specific bearing on the disorder to be studied 6. Identify relevant outcome measures</li> <li>7. Adapt the treatment to be culturally sensitive 8. Include therapists of a different ethnicity as the clients as well as therapists of a different ethnicity to examine the possible effect of ethnic matching 9. Solicit and respond to client feedback on therapy 10. Evaluate the reatment of the structure the feedback.</li> </ul> | Extensive literature review |                 |        | Examining the difference<br>between culturally sensitive<br>therapy and empirically<br>supported therapies; examining<br>the integration of culture within<br>psychotherapy and how research<br>is utilized<br>is utilized   | Psychotherapy<br>minorities:<br>Empirical, ethical,<br>and conceptual<br>issues   | Hall, G. C. N (2001)  |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------|--------|--|---|---|
| Highlights the importance of maintaing emic and etic<br>perspectives in doing clinical work and conceptualizing<br>individuals; key to learn and use multicultural and<br>community dynamics as foundation to understanding  | Literature review           |                 |        | To understand how to meld<br>multiculturalism and community<br>psychology  | Introduction to the<br>special section on<br>multicultural and<br>community<br>psychology: clinical<br>psychology in<br>context | Hall, G.C. (2005)   |
| Found important "principles for social justice work in<br>courseling psychology" (p.798), which includes<br>"ongoing self-examinationsharing powergiving<br>voiceconsciousness raisingfocus on<br>strengthsleaving clients with tools" (p. 799-807); had<br>first-year graduate students immersed in community-<br>based treatment as foundational clinical experience for<br>their first year that facilitated "skills in prevention,<br>interprofessional collaboration, and advocacy" (p. 808)<br>and through this process the students were challenged<br>and trained to embody social justice in their clinical<br>conceptualizations and collaborative work; it is an<br>ethical imperative to tailor services to each unique<br>consumer and empowerment alongside collaboration is a<br>requirement; highlight difficulties in this kind of work as<br>emotional toll, the experience of systemic barriers, and<br>the lack of focus on social justice during clinical training  | Extensive inerature review  |                 |        | I o discuss the way that work for<br>social justice can be informed by<br>feminism and multicultural<br>counseling; to explore how to<br>adapt a graduate program to be<br>oriented toward social justic;<br>how to manage difficulties in<br>implementing social justice as<br>psychologists<br>psychologists | 1 raming Counseting<br>Psychologists as<br>Social Justice<br>Agents: Feminist and<br>Multicultural<br>Principles in Action      | Goodman, L.A., Liang, B.,<br>Helms, J. E. Latta, R.E.,<br>Sparks, E., & Weintraub, S.R.<br>(2004) |
| Major Findings   | Research Approach/ Design   | Instrumentation | Sample | Research Questions/<br>Objectives  |   | Author/ Year  |

| A Loud Waxe                |                                 | Research Questions/   | <u>o1</u> | T                |                                     | MARINE - TYPE LIFE AN  |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|-----------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Harrall C D (2000)         | A multi dimensional             | Deaning ona's understanding of                                | защре     | THSU UITCHTATION | , II                                | Econd that for attain people "life stress must also  |
|                            |                                 | stress caused by racism;                                      |           |                  | historical context through previous | include consideration of experiences that are related to   |
|                            | racism-related stress:          | racism-related stress: understanding historical context       |           |                  | research and key perspectives on    | theunique person-environment transactions involving  |
|                            | implications for the            | of racism; conceptualizing the                                |           |                  | the timeline of racism and its mark | the timeline of racism and its mark race" (p. 44) and "experiences of racism are embedded                      |
|                            |                                 | wellbeing of ethnic people and                                |           |                  | on time                             | within interpersonal, collective, cultural-symbolic, and   |
|                            |                                 | improvement of wellbeing for                                  |           |                  |                                     | sociopolitical context, and can be sources of stress" (p.  |
|                            |                                 | ethnic people within the context                              |           |                  |                                     | 44); identified six forms of racism-related stress: "racism-   |
|                            |                                 | of racism, and its stress                                     |           |                  |                                     | related life events vicarious racism experiences daily   |
|                            |                                 |   |           |                  |                                     | racism microstressors chronic-contextual stress  |
|                            |                                 |   |           |                  |                                     | collective experiences transgenerational transmission"   |
|                            |                                 |   |           |                  |                                     | (p. 45-46); wellbeing on all levels of the individuals is  |
|                            |                                 |   |           |                  |                                     | impacted by the various forms of racism-related stress   |
|                            |                                 |   |           |                  |                                     | and the ethnic individual's characteristics at birth, as well  |
|                            |                                 |   |           |                  |                                     | as socioculturally, have tremendous impact on overall  |
|                            |                                 |   |           |                  |                                     | wellbeing and experiences of distress; research also   |
|                            |                                 |   |           |                  |                                     | highlights mediators of such distress (internal versus   |
| Harrell S.P. & Bond M.A.   | Listening to diversity          | I istening to diversity Examination of the Diversity          |           |                  | Reginning with each of the three    | Found: "every community has multilayered cultural  |
| (2006)                     | stories: Principles for         | stories: Principles for Principles for Community              |           |                  |                                     | characteristics and diversity dynamics" (p. 366),  |
|                            | practice in                     | Research and Action   |           |                  | d Action,                           | important to ask one's self "how do dimensions of  |
|                            | ' research                      | ("Community Culture,  |           |                  |                                     | diversity and their interactions currently affect this   |
|                            | and action                      | Community Context, and Self-in-                               |           |                  | literature reviews and experiences  | community?" (p. 366), understand the community's   |
|                            |                                 | Community" (p. 365)) with the                                 |           |                  | to provide well-rounded             | structure as functional and a result of factors that have  |
|                            |                                 | intention of deeping  |           |                  | description of the elements of each | description of the elements of each molded the community, one's personhood is always                           |
|                            |                                 | understanding of diversity and                                |           |                  | principle                           | present in one's work, "informed compassion" (p. p. 368)   |
|                            |                                 | guiding one's actions within                                  |           |                  |                                     | is critical; "each of the stances embedded in the three<br>Diversity Principles-informed compassion            |
|                            |                                 |   |           |                  |                                     | contextualized understanding, and empowered humility-  |
|                            |                                 |   |           |                  |                                     | incorporate a combination of respect and challenge, and  |
|                            |                                 |   |           |                  |                                     | they synergistically fold into a stance of connected   |
|                            |                                 |   |           |                  |                                     | disruption " (p. 374).   |
| Ingraham, C.L. & Oka, E.R. | Multicultural issues            | Navigating the implementation                                 |           |                  | Literature review                   | In considering use of treatments, researchers highlight  |
| (2006)                     | in evidence-based interventions | of evidence-based intervention within multiethnic communities |           |                  |                                     | that it is important to evaluate "the quality of evidence<br>available to support a given intervention and the |
|                            |                                 | and diverse settings  |           |                  |                                     | generalizability and transferability of the given  |
|                            |                                 |   |           |                  |                                     | intervention to their intended setting and context" (p.  |
|                            |                                 |   |           |                  |                                     | embedded" (p. 133)   |
|                            |                                 |   |           |                  |                                     |  |

| Kiger, H. (2003) Outreach to<br>multiethnic,<br>multilingual women<br>for breast cancer and<br>cervical cancer<br>education and<br>screening: A model<br>using professional<br>and volunteer<br>staffing.  | Kazdin, A., & Mazurick, J. Dropping out of<br>(1994) child psychotherapy:<br>Distinguishing early<br>and late dropouts<br>over the course of<br>treatment.   | Author/ Year     Title       Kaczorowski, J. A., Williams,     Adapting clinical       A. S., Smith, T. F., Fallah, N.,     services to       Mendez, J. L., &     accommodate needs       Nelson-Gray, R. (2011)     of refugee       populations     populations   |
|--|--|--|
| Screening, education, and causes Studied beahviors of women<br>are targeted in this study in order at Center for Healthy Aging<br>to understand and provide more<br>men accessible services for<br>multethnic women in need of<br>screening<br>del<br>adel<br>adel   | To examine factors (e.g. child, try:<br>parent, family) that predict<br>rly children's drop out from therapy in<br>when seeking treatment for<br>volatile behavioral problems, and<br>corresponding diagnoses  | Objectives<br>Focusing on refugees within the<br>U.S. and their experiences,<br>identifying barriers to treatment<br>for refugees and developing and<br>implementing methods to<br>providing culturally competent<br>services  |
| studied beahviors of women<br>at Center for Healthy Aging  | Sample = 257, consisting of<br>5 girls and 201 boys<br>between the ages of 4 and<br>13, with 154 White children, 9<br>91 Black children, 2 Asian<br>children, and 1 child of<br>mixed ethnicity  | Sample<br>Clinicians (graduate students<br>under the supervision of<br>licensed clinical<br>psychologists) providing<br>services at a graduate<br>school's training clinic who<br>elected to be part of a team<br>that responded to the a small<br>grant to adapt clinic services<br>to be provided efficaciously<br>to underserved communities<br>(specifically refugees); team<br>consisted of two superivosrs<br>and four clinicians  |
|  | General information<br>Shet; Research<br>Diagnostic Interview;<br>Parenting Stress Index;<br>Beck Depression<br>Inventory; Hopkins<br>Symptoms Checklist;<br>Behavior; Self-Report<br>Behavior; Self-Report<br>Delinquency Checklist;<br>Wechsler Intelligence<br>Scale for Children-<br>Revised; Child Behavior<br>Checklist; Child<br>Behavior Checklist-<br>Teacher Report Form   | Instrumentation<br>Treatment team adapted<br>the clinic's assessment<br>protocol to allow for<br>qualitative methods of<br>gathering individual's<br>experiences due to<br>research findings that<br>indicated that qualitative<br>(e.g. open-ended<br>questions) data collection<br>yields more culturally<br>competent and rich<br>information   |
| Examined prevalence rates and<br>demographics within Los Angeles<br>County, hypothesized on elements<br>of the Center for Healthy Aging<br>that makes it accessible for diverse<br>women and what could be<br>improved   | Participants completed assessment<br>measures; children and their<br>parents participated in treatment<br>that varied based on the age of the<br>child (all receiving "Cognitive<br>problem-solving skills training<br>(PSST) for the child and parent<br>management training (PMT)" (p.<br>1070)); completion (seven to eight<br>months for full course) was<br>tracked for each child; ANOVA,<br>Chi-square tests, and regression<br>analyses used to analyze data<br>gathered | Research Approach/ Design<br>6-week discussion period to<br>prepare clinicians to provide<br>culturally competent services,<br>spoke with multiculturally-focused<br>faculty, and became more<br>knowledgeable of struggles within<br>the refugee community (e.g.<br>attended conference), preparing<br>and using interpreters in clinical<br>practice, integration of CBT tools,<br>and treatment team reflection on<br>successes and processes of<br>working with refugee population   |
| Reasons that African American and Hispanic women do<br>not seek resources and screenings like Caucasian women<br>in Los Angeles: lack of exposure or beliefs that they are<br>unqualified for services, fear and confusion about the<br>process of screening for cancer, decreased time for self-<br>care behaviors, and the unawareness of the value of<br>early screening and treatment; identified specific<br>challenges such as barriers of language differences, the<br>lack of "ethnically appropriate educational materials"<br>regarding the value or early screening and cancer<br>treatment (pg. 309), historical and systemic context of<br>seeking services, concerns regarding trust and modes of<br>communication, and the exclusionary nature of the<br>eligible population identified for many early screening<br>and cancer treatment programs | Found that "younger mothers, single parents, and<br>children from homes headed by a nonbiological parent<br>were more likely to terminate treatment" (p. 1071).  | Major Findings<br>Clinically important distress found amongst refugees<br>receiving the adapted treatment team's services in two<br>areas: "culture-of-origin issues and issues related to<br>refugee status and acculturation" (p. 364); when using<br>interpreters in practice it is important to be in a<br>therapeutic team as all parties are part of the emotional<br>exchange in therapy and interpreters can provide<br>valuable sentiments; "consistent attendance, low<br>attrition, a strengthen bond between the client and<br>therapist, more frequent in-session laughter, increased<br>understanding of mental health treatment, and utilization<br>of coping skills are better indicators of progress than<br>traditional assessment methods" (p. 365); imperative to<br>continue adaption of clinical services to meet the needs<br>of growing refugee population within the U.S. |

| Author/ Year  | Title   | Research Questions/<br>Objectives  | Sample   | Instrumentation  | Research Approach/ Design   | Major Findings  |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| LaGrange, R.D., Abramowitz, Participant<br>S., Koenig, L.J., Barnes, W., satisfaction<br>Conner. L. & Moschel. D. group and i | ı with<br>ndividual   | To examine participant Sample = 166 betwee satisfaction of HIV-positive and 21 years-old, 949 vouth in an intervention program African-American or   | Sample = 166 between 12<br>and 21 years-old, 94%<br>African-American or  | Demographics;<br>participant feedback<br>questionnaires  | Convenience sample; participated<br>in Adolescent Impact program<br>over 13 weeks then we asked to  | A significant amount of data that indicated varying<br>levels of satisfaction with the program's individual and<br>group interventions: researchers identified a number of  |
| (2012)  | components of<br>Adolescent Impact: a<br>secondary prevention<br>intervention for HIV-<br>positive youth.             |  | Hispanic, 53% female   |  | report; satisfaction divided into<br>participant satisfaction, session-<br>specific preferences, activity<br>helpfulness, participant<br>attendance, and limitations;<br>satisfaction with the program  | ways to increase participant satisfaction, such as<br>consideration of scheduling of interventions, incentives,<br>and implementation of a program that provides services<br>in both group and individual modalities  |
| Meyer, O. L., & Zane, N.<br>(2013)  | The influence of race<br>and ethnicity in<br>clients' experiences<br>of mental health<br>treatment                    | The influence of race       To determine the impact that       Sample = 102, consisting of       Cultural Acceptability o         and ethnicity in       cultural responsiveness has on       57 White Americans, nine       Treatments Survey;         clients' experiences       individuals seeking mental health       Asian/Pacific Islanders, nine       Mental Health Statistics         of mental health       services       Latinos, 16 A frican       Mental Health Statistics         treatment       Americans, and three       Americans, and three       Improvement Program         to 65 years-old       to 65 years-old       18       Improvement Program | Sample = 102, consisting of<br>57 White Americans, nine<br>Asian/Pacific Islanders, nine<br>Latinos, 16 African<br>Americans, eight Native<br>Americans, and three<br>biracial; age range from 18<br>to 65 years-old | Cultural Acceptability of<br>Treatments Survey;<br>Mental Health Statistics<br>Improvement Program   | Participants seeking outpatient<br>mental health treatment; asked for<br>completion of measures; used<br>multivariate analysis of variance<br>and regression analyses   | "These results indicate a generally higher level of<br>importance of cultural elements for ethnic minority<br>clients compared with White clients" (p. 891);<br>"minorities also felt that it was significantly more<br>important that their provider by knowledgable about<br>their ethnic/ racial group's history of prejudice and<br>discriminations than Whites" (p. 891); "when mental<br>health clients felt like a cultural element was important<br>in their care, but did not perceive it to be present, they<br>were less satisfied with aspects of their treatment" (p.<br>894)  |
| Miliora, M. T. (2000)   | Beyond empathic<br>failures: Cultural<br>racism as narcissistic<br>trauma and<br>disenfranchisement<br>of grandiosity | To understand the impact of<br>cultural racism on the individual   |  |  | Synthesized existing ego<br>psychology research and early<br>psychodynamic literature, as well<br>as examples from literature and a<br>clinical example to compile in-<br>depth understanding of the impact<br>of cultural racism on one's sense of<br>self | Synthesized existing egoFound that "how one imagines he or she is perceived bypsychology research and earlyothers, including the therapist, is related to one'spsychodynamic literature, as wellpersonal and social history. This Illusion or apperceptionas examples from literature and aaffects one's sense of self. A racially-mixed therapeuticclinical example to compile in-relationship presents special challenges in this regard. itdepth understanding of the impactis important to explore a patient's imagined perceptionof cultural racism on one's sense of by the therapist and in the case where a patient has beenthe victim of cultural racism to examine a possible linkbetween the person's perception and his or her history of |
| Mistry, I., Jacobs, F., &<br>Jacobs, F. (2009)  | Cultural relevance as<br>program-to-<br>community<br>alignment  | Cultural relevance as Cultural competence in<br>program-to-<br>community-based programs; to<br>see cultural competence and<br>alignment sensitivity of programs  | Sample = "data from a large-<br>scale evaluation of a family<br>support program for young<br>families" (p. 491); used<br>three different programs  | Personnel Demographic<br>Survey; observation;<br>ethnographic interviews;<br>participant data system | Looked at three programs,<br>"focused on documenting and<br>understanding the program's<br>operations and implementations,<br>while the outcome study examined<br>whether it had achieved its<br>intended results" (p. 491)                                 | Looked at three programs,Researchers suggest a key method of improving the<br>experience for multi-ethnic participants is to bring in<br>members of the "communities targeted by the programs"<br>operations and implementations,<br>while the outcome study examined<br>"topratalizes on the community-based staff member's<br>intended results" (p. 491)Researchers suggest a key method of improving the<br>experience for multi-ethnic participants is to bring in<br>members of the "communities targeted by the programs"<br>to facilitate the program, such that doing this<br>inherent sensitivity to, or awareness of, the targeted<br>community's customs and contexts, thereby ensuring<br>culturally sensitive service delivery (p. 489)  |

| Amongst Black and Latino dementia patients living<br>within the community, there appears to be higher rate of<br>behaviors related to dementia status in comparison to<br>White patients thus it is critical to develop more<br>resources of education for caregivers of patients within<br>these ethnic communities as well as more dementia<br>assistancee within these communities.   | Used analyses of variance to<br>examine relationships amongst<br>patient and their dementia-related<br>symptoms, caregiver traits, and<br>ethnicity  | f Clinical interview, Mini-<br>l Mental State<br>Examination; impairment<br>organized based on<br>patient's ability to<br>independently complete<br>actitites of daily living;<br>Zartt Burden Interview | Sample = 5,776, consisted of Clinical interview; Mini-<br>5,090 White, 469 Black, and Mental State<br>217 Latino Medicare Examination; impairment<br>consumers who were part of organized based on<br>the Medicare Alzheimer's patient's ability to<br>Disease Demonstration and<br>Evaluation study from 1989 actiities of daily living;<br>to 1991 in the U.S. | Examining individuals with<br>varying degrees of dementia to<br>determine impact of ethnicity on<br>behaviors related to dementia  | Ethnic differences in<br>the prevalence and<br>pattern of dementia-<br>related behaviors  | Sink, K.M., Covinsky, K.E.,<br>Newcomer, R., & Yaffe, K.<br>(2004)   |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Found that 12 of the 18 particiapnts would "seek a<br>Spanish-speaking provider" (p. 8), "five people felt that<br>the Latino community needs more information about<br>potential resources in order to access MHS" (p. 8),<br>family problems were highlighted by 15 of the 18<br>participants as reasons for seeking help, "seven of the 18<br>respondents noted that they and other individuals were<br>"ignorant" about mental health programs and providers"<br>(p. 9); "isx participants pointed out that when Latinos<br>seek MHS, their family might be stignatized" (p. 9);<br>"four participants believed that their community did not<br>have much information or knowledge about mental<br>illness" (p. 9); many cited they would go to primary care<br>physician first for help instead of mental health<br>providers; many expressed concern that legal status in<br>the U.S. would be jeopardized if they received mental<br>health services; "the cost of MHS and lack of medical<br>insurance was cited by 13 out of 18 participants as the<br>major reason that Latinos did not seek MHS" (p. 10);<br>study particiapnts emphasize the importance of<br>"increasing awareness and information improving<br>access to mental health supporting other Latinos in<br>seeking help" (p. 10-12) and integration of Spanish-<br>speakers amongst mental health providers | Asked study participants to<br>particate in five focus groups, one<br>individual interview, and to<br>provide demographic information;<br>data analysis of information<br>gathered was done through<br>constant comparison<br>constant comparison  | Demographic<br>questionnaire (Spanish<br>and English version);<br>focus groups (90 minutes<br>each); individual<br>interviews with Mexican<br>American, Spanish<br>speaking graduate<br>student          | Sample = 18 individuals,<br>consisting of 15 women and<br>30, ethnic breakdown: 10<br>Mexican, 4 Puetro-Rican, 1<br>Latino, 1 Guatemalan, 1<br>Ecuadorian;   | Barriers to seeking<br>mental health       Targeted Latinos living in the<br>Midwest to understand barriers<br>to mental health treatment and if<br>A qualitative       Sample = 18 individuals,<br>consisting of 15 women ar<br>services are appropriate for their<br>90, chrice breakdown: 10<br>Mexican, 4 Puetro-Rican,<br>Mexican, 4 Puetro-Rican,<br>Mexican, 1 Latino, 1 Guatemalan, 1<br>Ecuadorian; | Barriers to seeking<br>mental health<br>services in the<br>A qualitative<br>analysis.<br>analysis.  | Rastogi, M., Massey-<br>Hastings, N., & Wieling, E.<br>(2012)  |
| Major Findings<br>Findings from the intervention indicated increases in self-<br>care behavior, improvement in depression symptoms,<br>and improved self-esteem (Nicolaidis et al., 2012). The<br>researchers gathered themes from the interviews with<br>participants regarding their experience in the program,<br>specifically soliciting the participants to identify why<br>and how the program was effective. The themes<br>identified include: "African-American focus and<br>community setting," "Ability to trust," and "Information<br>and strategies with practical, lasting value" (Nicolaidis et<br>al., 2012, pgs. 534-535). These themes were<br>qualitatively gathered and provided rationale as to why<br>the participants felt satisfied and reported improvement<br>as a result of the program's intervention.  | Research Approach/ Design<br>Used CBPR approach to<br>understand needs of community<br>then implemented program; took<br>time to understand needs and what<br>culturally responsive services<br>would look like; facilitated<br>intervention for six months,<br>intervention for six months,<br>for participation in termination<br>interviews | Instrumentation<br>Demographics: Conflict<br>Tactics Scale-Revised;<br>Women's Experiences of<br>Battering Scale; Patient<br>Health Questionnaire  | Sample<br>Sample = 59 African<br>American women, with<br>history of Intimate Partner<br>Violence and current<br>depression   | Research Questions/<br>Objectives<br>To examine a community-based<br>program for African American<br>women who survived Intimate<br>Partner Violence   | Title<br>The interconnections<br>project:<br>Development and<br>evaluation of a<br>community-based<br>depression program<br>for African<br>American violence<br>survivors | Author/ Vear<br>Nicolaidis, C., Wahab, S.,<br>Trimble, J., Meja, A.,<br>Mitchell, R., Raymaker, D.,<br>Thomas, M.J., Timmons, V.,<br>& Waters, A.S. (2012) |

| Sue, S., Fujino, D.C., Hu, L.,<br>Takeuchi, D. T., & Zane,<br>N.W.S. (1991)   | Sood, E., Mendez, J., &<br>Kendall, P. (2010)  | Snell-Johns, J., Mendez, J. L.,<br>& Smith, B. H. (2004)  | Author/ Year                      |
|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| Community mental<br>health services for<br>ethnic minority<br>groups: a test of the<br>cultural<br>responsiveness<br>hypothesis<br>hypothesis   | Acculturation,<br>religiosity, and<br>ethnicity predict<br>motherts' causal<br>beliefs about<br>separation anxiety<br>disorder and<br>preferences for help-<br>seeking   | Evidence-based<br>overcoming access<br>barriers, decreasing<br>attrition, and<br>promoting change<br>with underserved<br>families   | Title                             |
| Examined mental health<br>treatment seeking behaviors and<br>outcomes for Asian-Americans,<br>African-Americans, Mexican-<br>Americans, and Whites in Los<br>Angeles County, specifically<br>mental healthcare<br>mental healthcare   | Focused on Indian American,<br>Latin American, and European<br>American mothers in<br>investigating their beliefs about<br>separation anxiety as well as<br>their help-seeking behaviors.  | To understand factors that create<br>underserved families, to develop<br>methods of improving assess to<br>treatment for underserved<br>families, to identify ways to<br>increase treatment engagement,<br>and to identify methods of<br>encouraging change   | Research Questions/<br>Objectives |
| Gathered sample from 1983<br>to 1988; sample = 3.1%<br>Asian American, 20.5%<br>A frican Americans, 25.5%<br>Latinos, 43% Whites, and<br>7.9% other   | Sample = 117, consisted of<br>39 Indian American<br>mothers, 39 Puerto Rican<br>mothers, and 39 European<br>American mothers   |   | Sample                            |
| Automated Information<br>System (AIS); Diagnostic<br>Mantal Disorers, 3rd<br>edition (DSM-III)  | Gathered demographic<br>information, used the<br>Hollingshed Four-Factor<br>Index to gather SES<br>information, used the<br>Vancouver Index of<br>Acculturation information,<br>and used the Santa Clara<br>Strength of Religious<br>Faith Questionnaire to<br>gather information on the<br>importance of religion in<br>their life. |   | Instrumentation                   |
| Researchers gathered data from<br>AIS (tracking system used by LA<br>County DMH) of demographic<br>information as well as onset,<br>frequency, and duration of services<br>used; AIS also tracked therapist<br>demographics; LA County DMH<br>was utilizing DSM-III to diganose<br>mental health needs of individuals<br>receiving services; through overall<br>regression analyses and within-<br>group analyses, researchers<br>examined; client and therapist<br>demoographics,<br>ethnic/gender/language match, and<br>duration of services rendered  | Gathered participants from<br>medical services' waiting rooms<br>and community centers; asked<br>participants to complete<br>questionnaires, vignette, and<br>measures; used "hietrarchical<br>multiple regression analyses" and<br>"exploratory regression analyses"<br>(p. 400) in analyzing data                                  | Empirical litearture review   | Research Approach/ Design         |
| Found "Asian Americans and Latino Americans were<br>underrepresented, whereas African Americans were<br>overrepresented in the mental health system in<br>comparison with their respective County populations"<br>(p. 535-536), however less African American women<br>were found to have received services; "In general, the<br>SES of clients was low, with African Americans having a<br>higher percentage of clients qualifying for Medi-Cal than<br>Mexican Americans, who were higher than Asians and<br>Whites" (p. 536); 1/3 of individuals experienced ethnic<br>matching in comparison to 3/4 of White clients receiving<br>services from White therapists; dropout rates (dropout =<br>missing 1 session): "19.4% for African Americans, and<br>10.7% for Whites, 14.6% for Mexican Americans, and<br>10.7% for Asian Americans" (p. 536); "results indicated<br>that for all groups except African Americans, ethnic<br>matched resulted in substaintially lower odds of<br>dropping out than for unmatched clients" (p. 536) | Acculturation to U.S. and role of religion in mothers'<br>lives had a significant impact on the mothers' beliefs<br>about separation anxiety and preferred ways of getting<br>help.  | Methods of increasing access: "offer transportation,<br>child case, and low-cost services use the telephone<br>provide home-based services facilitate self-directed<br>and video-based interventions use the format of<br>multiple-faemily groups" (p. 21-25); methods to increase<br>treatment engagement: "decrease time families spend on<br>the waiting list monitor therapists' behaviors and<br>expectations offer incentives for attendance conduct<br>brief interventions make therapists readily available<br>address parents' individual needs" (p. 26-28); methods of<br>encouraging change: "prepare families for theapy and<br>address expectations provide culturally competent<br>services give family task assignments focus on<br>families' strengths conduct motivational interviewing"<br>(p. 30-31) | Major Findings                    |

| Author/ Year  | Title   | Research Questions/<br>Objectives  | Sample   | Instrumentation   | Research Approach/ Design   | Major Findings  |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| Sue, S., Zane, N., Nagayama<br>Hall, G.C., & Berger, L.K.<br>(2009) | The case for cultural<br>competency in<br>psychotherapeutic<br>interventions                  | understanding<br>npetency, examining<br>ants and opponents,<br>be a culturally<br>mental health  |  |   | Examined existing literature on<br>defining cultural competence and<br>the importance of it; extensie<br>literature review on various<br>culturally competent resources<br>available; literature review on the<br>impact and importance of cultural<br>competency of mental health<br>providers | To be culturally competent, one must have "knowledge,<br>skills, and problem solving germane to the cultural<br>background of the help seeker" (p. 529); disagreements<br>regarding cultural competence is largely due to<br>misunderstanding and requires attention in oder to<br>refocus the necessity of cultural competence as a<br>response to the many centuries of injustice and biases<br>towards culture; deficits in cultural comptence and its<br>impact have been addressed in provider guidelines; key<br>components of cultural competent interventions are<br>adressing "method of delivery content storytelling<br>family CBT" (p. 534-537) as areas for adjustment<br>based on the culture of origin of the individual seeking<br>services; interventions that are adapted for cultural<br>competency have been found to produce better outcomes |
| Sullivan, C. M., & Bybee, D.<br>I. (1999)                           | Reducing violence<br>using community-<br>based advocacy for<br>women with abusive<br>partners | Examine effectiveness of<br>community-based program for<br>women enduring violence within<br>their relationship, specifically<br>ways to reduce violence | Sample = 278 women, 45%<br>African American, 42%<br>European American, 7%<br>Latina, 2% Asian American;<br>ranged from 17 to 61 years-<br>old  | Modified Conflict<br>Tactics Scale; Index of<br>Psychological Abuse;<br>Paychological Abuse;<br>Paychological Studies-<br>Epidemiological Studies-<br>Depression Scale;<br>quesionnaire on "social<br>support, effectiveness in<br>obtaining resources, and<br>difficulty obtaining<br>resources" (p. 46) | Trained advocates who were<br>providing intervention, provided<br>intervention and asked participants<br>to complete measures, analyzed<br>data using multivariate analysis of<br>variance  | "Women who received the free services of<br>paraprofessional advocates for 10 weeks experienced<br>less physical violence over time and reported kinreased<br>quality of life, higher social support, less depressive<br>symptoms, and increased effectiveness in obtaining<br>resources compared with women in the control<br>condition" (p. 49-50); "women who has worked with<br>advocates experienced less abuse at each time point<br>except the 6-month follow-up. This temporary increase<br>was likely due to the removal of the advocate as a<br>"protective factor" after the cessation of the 10-week<br>intervention" (p. 50)   |
| Surgeon General (1999)  | Mental Health: A<br>report of the Surgeon<br>General  | Highlighting knowledge gained<br>on the prevalence and impact of<br>mental health issues on the<br>overall human experience within<br>the United States  | Surgeon General sites<br>Global Burden of Disease<br>study, the World Health<br>Organization, the World<br>Bank, and Harvard<br>University as resources in<br>gathering data on the<br>international prevalance of<br>mental illness and it's impact<br>on economy and the total<br>percentage of people facing<br>of mental illness<br>international compared to<br>other significant life<br>conditions such as accidents<br>and medical conditions. |   | Synthesizes information from<br>international resources and<br>empirical studies to provide<br>findings on mental health's<br>significance, treatment, and<br>systemic impact   | Requires a public sector response; mental illness has a<br>profound impact on individuals and the societies they<br>inhabit; mental illness occurs on a spectrum; mental<br>illness treatment requires hollistic conceptualization;<br>stigma has had a profound impact on how people seek<br>help, pay for help, and how stigma needs to be<br>intentionally address and reduced in order to help<br>individuals with mental illness heal  |

| Author/ Year                                   | Title   | Research Questions/<br>Objectives   | Sample  | Instrumentation   | Research Approach/ Design   | Major Findings   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Thompson-Miller, R., &<br>Feagin, J. R. (2007) | Continuing Injuries<br>of Racism:<br>Counseling in a<br>Racist Context                              | Cite Robert T. Carter's (2007)<br>article as launching point for<br>their research; examining the<br>effect of racism (e.g.<br>discrimination and oppression)<br>and it's cumulative/long-term<br>impact; emphasizing the<br>importance of understanding  |   |   | Extensive literature review;<br>experiential commentary; expound<br>on foundational article by Robert<br>T. Carter (2007) | Extensive literature review;       Historical trauma for the Black community has produced experiential commentary; expound long-term impact that shapes mental health, "a past and continuing reality that must be kept constantly in mind when a mental health clinician is attempting to help a person of color deal with racism's chronic health consequences" (p. 108); impact of trauma and ways of people experiencing racism of energy and take emotional   |
|  |   | minportance of understanding<br>White privilege's impact as<br>shaping of society's<br>perspective/beliefs/valuess and<br>the mind's of most all (especially<br>important for those preparing to<br>be clinicians)  |   |   |   | people experiencing racism of energy and take emotional<br>toll; important for mental health providers to put their<br>client's experiences in historical and environmental<br>context, highlighting that their experiences are not<br>abnormal and require respect; imperative to hold White<br>community accountable for current and future<br>environments of direct or indirect racism   |
| Verdinelli, S., & Biever, J. L.<br>(2013)      | Therapists'<br>experiences of cross-<br>ethnic therapy with<br>Spanish-speaking<br>Latina/o clients | Therapists'       To understand bilingual       Sample = 14, consisting of       Demographics; evi         experiences of cross-       therapists and their development       eight women, 6 men; 13       based interviews to         ethnic therapy with       into comfort and preferences in       White, one african American       based interviews to         Spanish-speaking       providing mental health       White, one african American       experiences         Latina/o clients       treatment to diverse individuals       white, one african American       experiences | Sample = 14, consisting of<br>eight women, 6 men; 13<br>White, one african American | Demographics; evidence-<br>based interviews to<br>gather participants'<br>experiences | Demographies; evidence-<br>based interviews to<br>gather participants'<br>experiences                                     | Following themes were found: "interesting in the<br>Spanish language: immersion experiences and class<br>(general) living abroad (typical) genuine interest in<br>another culture (typical) traveling (typical) spanish<br>was easy to learn (typical) need for Spanish-speaking<br>therapists and job benefits (general) support from<br>others (general) practice in the field: learning by doing<br>therapy and from clents (typical)pride in serving the<br>underserved (typical)attending to client's culture<br>(general)showing appreciation and interest<br>(typical)acknowledging ethnic and linguistic<br>differences (typical)addressing the impact of values<br>(general) boundaries (varient) linguistic challenges<br>(general) clients' context and immigration issues<br>(typical)" (p. 232-237) |

| "parents reported a high level of confidence in<br>managing their children's beahvior. All parents approved<br>of the skils taught and a majority felt the materials were<br>helpful in dealing with challenging behavior as well as<br>teaching new skills. In its two services delivery modes<br>the program was strongly received by parents of children<br>with mild. moderate, and severe brain injury" (p. 195);<br>positive satisfaction ratings for telephone interventions  | Provided intervention; gathered<br>information on family regarding<br>social risk; implemented<br>satisfaction measure  | Consumer Satisfaction<br>Scale [25]; Acquired<br>Brain Injury (ABI)<br>Booklet;  | Sample = 48 families with<br>children 3 to 12 years old<br>varying severities of brain<br>injury  | To understand the needs of<br>families with children struggling<br>with brain injury and to<br>determine the satisfaction with<br>an intervention program<br>(Signposts for Building Better<br>Behavior)  | Feasibility and<br>consumer<br>satisfaction<br>following an<br>intervention for<br>families who have a<br>child with acquired<br>brain injury                    | Woods, D.T., Catroppa, C.,<br>Giallo, R., Anderson, V.A.<br>(2012)  |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Found "nearly three fourths (73.5% of the adults in the<br>sample (81.4% men; 71.1% women) met DSM-III-R<br>criteria for lifetime alcohol abuse. Of these, 15.1% of<br>the adults met DSM-III-R 12-month criteria for alcohol<br>abuse (15.7% women; 13.3% men)" (p. 413); "perceived<br>discrimination was strongly positively associated with<br>historical loss historical loss, in turn, was positively<br>associated with alcohol abuse among women" (p. 413);<br>"enculturation did not mediate the effects of<br>discrimination among American-Indian adults<br>perceived discrimination was possitively associated with<br>enculturation and with alcohol abuse enculturation<br>was negatively associated with alcohol abuse" (p. 415);<br>enculturation was not found to be a protective factor  | Collaborated with reservations to<br>obtain "tribal resolutions" (p. 411)<br>in order to conduct project and an<br>advisory board on the reservation<br>was established; participants<br>provided interview prior to joining<br>project; participants completed<br>measures and diagnostic interview;<br>statistical analysis using bivariate<br>correlations and structural<br>equation modeling | American-Indian cultural<br>identification items by<br>Oetting and Beauvais<br>(1990-1991) adapted;<br>Historical Loss scale;<br>Historical Loss scale;<br>Historical Loss<br>Associated Symptom<br>Scale; an 11-item<br>measure on perceptions<br>of discimination;<br>University of Michigan<br>Composite Internaional<br>Diagnostic Interview | Sample = 452 American-<br>Indian parents or caretakers<br>who had children between<br>10 and 12-years-old,<br>consisting of 351 women<br>(average age of 35 for<br>women and 42 for men);<br>sample collected from<br>"Healing Pathways Project"<br>on two American-Indian<br>reservations that lasted three<br>years | Amongst American-Indian     Sample = 452 American-people, understanding the impact       prople, understanding the impact     Indian parents or caretakers       of "interrelated factors of     who had children between       discrimination, historical loss     10 and 12-years-old,       and enculturation" (p. 411) on     consisting of 351 women       ald children between     (average age of 39 for       behavioral problems" (p. 411))     sample collected from       "Healing Pathways Project"     on two American-Indian       reservations that lasted three     years | Discrimination,<br>historical loss and<br>enculturation:<br>Culturally specific<br>risk and resiliency<br>factors for alcohol<br>abuse among<br>American Indians | Whitbeck, L. B., Chen, X.,<br>Hoyt, D. R., & Adams, G. W.<br>(2004) |
| "Culture can be defined as a dynamic process involving<br>worldviews and ways of living in a physical and social<br>environment shared by groups, which are passed from<br>generation to generation and may be modfied by<br>contacts between cultures in a particular social,<br>historical, and political context" (p. 564); "view cultural<br>competence as a set of problem-solving skills that<br>includes (a) the ability to recognize and understand the<br>dynamic interplay between the heritage and adaptation<br>dimensions of culture in shaping human behavior; (b)<br>the ability to use the knowledge acquired about an<br>individual's heritage and adaptational challenges to<br>maximize the effectiveness of assessment, diagnosis,<br>and treatment; and (c) internalization (i.e., incorporation<br>into one's clinical problem-solving reperiole) of this<br>process of recognition, acquisition, and use of cultural<br>dynamics tso that it can be routinely applied to diverse<br>groups" (p. 565); increases in ethnically diverse<br>populations within the U.S. indicate the need for valid,<br>researched, ethical, culturally competent mental health<br>treatment; important to identify how therapeutic change<br>is established for diverse ethnic communities; critical to<br>adapt and evaluate effectiveness of evidence-based<br>treatments within ethnic communities | Extensive literature review   |  |   | To understand the intersection of<br>cultural competence and<br>evidence-based mental health<br>treatment   | Cultural competence<br>and evidenced-based<br>practice in mental<br>health services  | Whaley, A.L. & Davis, K.E.  |
| Major Findings   | Research Approach/ Design   | Instrumentation  | Sample  | Objectives  |  | Author/ Year  |
|  |   |  |   | Research Onestions/   |  |   |

|                               |                         | <b>Research Questions</b> /  |  |                            |                                     |   |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Author/ Year                  | Title                   | Objectives   | Sample   | Instrumentation            | Research Approach/ Design           | Major Findings  |
| Yaffe K., Fox P., Newcomer,   | , Patient and caregiver | Yaffe K., Fox P., Newcomer, Patient and caregiver Focus on the field of treatment Sample = 5,788 people                              |  | Demographic                | Participants completed assessment   | Participants completed assessment Found that both Hispanic and Black patients were "less                        |
| R., Sands, L., Lindquist, K., | characteristics and     | R., Sands, L., Lindquist, K., characteristics and for diverse ethnic patients with divided into the development information gathered | divided into the development                             | information gathered       | measures and interview;             | likely to be placed in a nursing home throughout the  |
| Dane, K., & Covinsky, K.E.    | nursing home            | dementia; create set of  | cohort (mean age of 78.9; through in-home                | through in-home            | participants' outcomes were         | three years" (p. 2094); the following were factors for  |
| (2002)                        | placement in patients   | placement in patients predictors of level and setting of ethnicity breakdown: 3,378 interview; Mini-Mental                           | ethnicity breakdown: 3,378                               | interview; Mini-Mental     | tracked through Medicare records;   | tracked through Medicare records; patients being placed in a nursing home: lower Mini-                          |
|                               | with dementia           | treatment for these individuals White, 320 Black, 145  |  | State Examination; Katz    | participants randomly separated     | State Examination; Katz   participants randomly separated   Mental State Examination scores, more activities of |
|                               |                         |  | Hispanic) and the validation activities of daily living; | activties of daily living; | into a development cohort and a     | into a development cohort and a daily living that required the assistance of anoyher                            |
|                               |                         |  | cohort (mean age of 78.8; Zarit Scale; Geriatric         | Zarit Scale; Geriatric     | validation cohort; analyses through | validation cohort; analyses through person, living alone, and a minimum of one                                  |
|                               |                         |  | ethnicity breakdown: 1,712   Depression Scale;           | Depression Scale;          | Kaplan-Meier and Coz                | problemmatic behavior; "caregivers who were 65 years  |
|                               |                         |  | White, 149 Black, 63                                     | Medicare records to        | proportional hazards to generate    | or older (compared with those <65 years of age) and   |
|                               |                         |  | Hispanic), within the US that track time frame of        | track time frame of        | data points on who and when         | who had higher Zarit Burden scores were more likely to  |
|                               |                         |  | were part of the Medicare                                | patient's placement in a   | patients began residing in nursing  | have their family member go to a nursing home" (p.  |
|                               |                         |  | Alzheimer's Disease                                      | nursing home               | homes, including information on     | 2094)   |
|                               |                         |  | Demonstration and  |                            | caregivers of patients prior to     |   |
|                               |                         |  | Evaluation study from 1989                               |                            | moving into a nursing home          |   |
|                               |                         |  | to 1994  |                            |                                     |   |

## APPENDIX B

Satisfaction Survey



## **MECCA O&E Participant Satisfaction Survey**

Thank you for choosing to provide your feedback about the MECCA Outreach & Engagement (O&E) Program, a service provided with support from the Orange County Health Care Agency. Your feedback will be used to help improve the program's services, and will not affect your services in any way. <u>Please do not write your name on this form.</u>

Please check the box of the response that most closely shows how you feel. Please tell the truth when responding to these statements. You may skip items if they do not make sense to you or make you feel uncomfortable.

|    |   | Strongly<br>Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly<br>Agree | Don't<br>Know/Unsure |
|----|---|----------------------|----------|-------|-------------------|----------------------|
| 1. | I would recommend the MECCA O&E<br>Program to a friend, relative or someone I<br>know.                                  |                      |          |       |                   |                      |
| 2. | I could have received the MECCA O&E services through another agency.  |                      |          |       |                   |                      |
| 3. | The MECCA O&E staff responded to my needs in a timely manner.   |                      |          |       |                   |                      |
| 4. | During my most recent activity with the MECCA O&E Program, the staff treated me with courtesy and respect.              |                      |          |       |                   |                      |
| 5. | I would say that my meeting places and<br>times with the MECCA O&E Program in<br>the past 30 days have been convenient. |                      |          |       |                   |                      |
| 6. | The MECCA O&E staff helped me achieve my goals.   |                      |          |       |                   |                      |
| 7. | I understood everything that was<br>communicated to me during my<br>involvement with the MECCA O&E<br>Program.          |                      |          |       |                   |                      |

| FOR OFFICE USE ONLY   |           |    |    |      |                           |                     |
|-----------------------|-----------|----|----|------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| PartID#:1             | Location: | HV | OV | Phon | e Other                   | Today's Date: / / / |
| Staff/Volunteer Name: |           |    |    |      | Staff/Volunteer Signature | :                   |

MECCA FY13-14

Prepared by RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES |



# MECCA O&E Participant Satisfaction Survey

| 8. Overall Satisfaction   |       |           |         |        |                           |  |  |  |  |
|---|-------|-----------|---------|--------|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| To rate <i>my overall satisfaction</i> with <b>MECCA O&amp;E</b> as a program in the past 30 days,<br>where 0 is the worst program possible and 10 is the best program possible, the number I would use is:<br>( <i>circle one number below</i> ) |       |           |         |        |                           |  |  |  |  |
| Worst 0 1 2 3 4   |       | 6 7       | 8       | 9 10   | Best                      |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Thinking about my overall experience with<br/>the MECCA O&amp;E Program within the past<br/>30 days, I would say that:</li> </ol>  | Never | Sometimes | Usually | Always | Don't<br>Know /<br>Unsure |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>Sessions were provided in my preferred<br/>language.</li> </ul>  |       |           |         |        |                           |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>When the staff was speaking to me, s/he<br/>used words that I did not understand.</li> </ul>   |       |           |         |        |                           |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>c. I felt the MECCA staff was sensitive to<br/>my language and ethnicity.</li> </ul>   |       |           |         |        |                           |  |  |  |  |
| Additional Feedback   |       |           |         |        |                           |  |  |  |  |
| beneficial to me: (Please check all that apply)<br>Outreach and Engagement Program<br>% Individual Engagement<br>% Educational/Skills Classes<br>% Referrals/Linkages<br>% Transportation   |       |           |         |        |                           |  |  |  |  |
| Some suggestions I have to improve the services I have received from the MECCA O & E program are:   |       |           |         |        |                           |  |  |  |  |
| Additional Comments:  |       |           |         |        |                           |  |  |  |  |
| Please check one of the boxes below:  |       |           |         |        |                           |  |  |  |  |
| I completed this survey myself.<br>A friend or family member helped me complete this survey.<br>A staff person helped me complete this survey.  |       |           |         |        |                           |  |  |  |  |
| Thank you for your help! Your feedback is important to us!  |       |           |         |        |                           |  |  |  |  |

| FOR OFFICE USE ONLY   |           |    |    |       |                            |                     |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|-----------|----|----|-------|----------------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|
| PartID#:1             | Location: | HV | OV | Phone | Other                      | Today's Date: / / / |  |  |  |
| Staff/Volunteer Name: |           |    |    |       | Staff/Volunteer Signature: |                     |  |  |  |

MECCA FY13-14

Prepared by RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES | 2

## APPENDIX C

Notice of Approval for Human Research



Pepperdine University 24255 Pacific Coast Highway Malibu, CA 90263 TEL: 310-506-4000

#### NOTICE OF APPROVAL FOR HUMAN RESEARCH

Date: July 06, 2016

Protocol Investigator Name: Sheva Assar

Protocol #: 16-05-267

Project Title: Evaluating a Community-Based Program within Multi-ethnic Communities: Examining the Outreach and Engagement Program of MECCA

School: Graduate School of Education and Psychology

Dear Sheva Assar:

Thank you for submitting your application for exempt review to Pepperdine University's Institutional Review Board (IRB). We appreciate the work you have done on your proposal. The IRB has reviewed your submitted IRB application and all ancillary materials. Upon review, the IRB has determined that the above entitled project meets the requirements for exemption under the federal regulations 45 CFR 46.101 that govern the protections of human subjects.

Your research must be conducted according to the proposal that was submitted to the IRB. If changes to the approved protocol occur, a revised protocol must be reviewed and approved by the IRB before implementation. For any proposed changes in your research protocol, please submit an amendment to the IRB. Since your study falls under exemption, there is no requirement for continuing IRB review of your project. Please be aware that changes to your protocol may prevent the research from qualifying for exemption from 45 CFR 46.101 and require submission of a new IRB application or other materials to the IRB.

A goal of the IRB is to prevent negative occurrences during any research study. However, despite the best intent, unforeseen circumstances or events may arise during the research. If an unexpected situation or adverse event happens during your investigation, please notify the IRB as soon as possible. We will ask for a complete written explanation of the event and your written response. Other actions also may be required depending on the nature of the event. Details regarding the timeframe in which adverse events must be reported to the IRB and documenting the adverse event can be found in the *Pepperdine University Protection of Human Participants in Research: Policies and Procedures Manual* at community.pepperdine.edu/irb.

Please refer to the protocol number denoted above in all communication or correspondence related to your application and this approval. Should you have additional questions or require clarification of the contents of this letter, please contact the IRB Office. On behalf of the IRB, I wish you success in this scholarly pursuit.

Sincerely,

Judy Ho, Ph.D., IRB Chairperson

cc: Dr. Lee Kats, Vice Provost for Research and Strategic Initiatives

Mr. Brett Leach, Regulatory Affairs Specialist

Page: 1