

NURSING RESEARCH REVIEW FORM

1st Review

Manuscript # 2005/003
Manuscript title: Psychometric evaluation of the cultural competence assessment instrument among health care providers
Manuscript type: Regular
Number of text pgs.: 12
Number of figures: 2
Number of tables: 0
Reviewer: Marsha L. Ellett
Stat reviewer assigned?: No -- do you recommend a stat reviewer? No

Please evaluate the following with these choices: (1) adequate, (2) inadequate (describe in written review) or (3) not appropriate (describe in written review)

Problem statement: 2
Attention to relevant literature: 2
Theoretical framework: 2
Research design: 1
Data analysis: 1
Discussion of results: 1
Organization: 1
Writing style: 1

Please rate the following topics 1-5 (with 5 being the highest rating):

Value of topic: 4
Probable reader interest in topic: 4
Importance of present contribution to nursing: 4
Priority of topic for publication: 4
Rank this manuscript for its value: 3

Reviewer's Recommendation (please type "X" after your choice):

Accept without revisions
Accept with revisions X
Maybe accept with revisions
Do not accept

Comments for Editor only:

This manuscript fits under the general call for "submission of manuscripts on a wide range of topics and approaches related to health disparities;" however, it does not fit any of the areas about which experts on health disparities have called for the development of knowledge.

**Please provide a comprehensive and integrated review of this manuscript.
Be sure to present a balanced view of the manuscript's strengths and weaknesses.**

The psychometric evaluation of the Cultural Competence Assessment (CCA) instrument was a strength of this manuscript. On the other hand, the researcher(s) need to exert more energy in establishing that there is a gap in the current armament of instruments that this instrument fills. There is lack of sufficient information about any currently available general cultural competence assessment instrument(s) leaving the reader to accept the general, albeit referenced, statement that valid and reliable general cultural competence instruments are lacking. If there are currently available instruments, these need to be presented in the relevant literature section along with why they are deficient. If there are none, this needs to be stated.

This reviewer can appreciate that the researcher(s) want to limit discussion of the Cultural Congruence Model in this manuscript; however, the two figures will not stand alone with only a title. Some explanation of how they were used in developing the CCA is needed, possibly in the form of a note. On page 5 line 10, the researcher(s) allude to the use of a broad definition of cultural diversity in developing the CCA; providing this broad definition would be helpful. Including the Cronbach alphas for the subscales of the CCA would be helpful in paragraph 1 page 6. On page 8 line 13, the internal consistency reliability previously reported for the CCA total score is given as $> .80$. It was reported as $.92$ in the last line of page 5. On page 8 paragraph 3, it was not clear why participants were asked to personally rate their cultural competence. This became more clear on page 11 paragraph 3. Explaining the reason earlier would be helpful. This reviewer wonders if this rating was significantly affected by social desirability bias.

The researcher(s) have made a few statements that are either not clear or are not supported. For example, on page 12 lines 8 and 9, this reviewer was not convinced that “stability over a four-month time period in the CCA scores indicated that the concept of cultural competence may be a state rather than a trait.” On page 13, lines 1 and 2, it is not clear how it was determined that “Cultural competence was a clear and strong factor in both hospice and health care providers.”

Lastly, on page 14, lines 9 and 10, beginning “For example, whether provider knowledge/ awareness improve after training ...is not a complete sentence.