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Abstract

by
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This study explored the initial validity and reliability of the Multicultural Supervision Inventory-MSI, previously named the Multicultural Supervision Competence Scale-MSCS (Pope-Davis, Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, 1999). The Multicultural Supervision Inventory consists of two parallel versions intended to be used in both research and counselor training activities. A supervisor version assesses the multicultural competence of supervisors from their own perspective, and a supervisee version assesses the multicultural competence of supervisors from the perspective of the supervisee. Exploratory factor analyses yielded distinct underlying factor structures for the supervisor and supervisee versions. MSI scores yielded adequate reliability coefficients (supervisor MSI $a = .88$, supervisee MSI $a = .92$) for both samples. This study provided a foundation for further validation work.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Most of the counseling profession’s attention to multicultural factors has centered on understanding how cultural elements affect the process of counseling. A lot less is known about the process of multicultural or cross-cultural supervision. Research aimed at understanding the complexities of promoting multicultural competence and sensitivity in supervisory activities is in its beginning stages (Bernard, 1994). However, supervision is a critical part of every counselor’s professional development and training. Therefore, research that helps us to understand how multicultural variables impact supervision is instrumental to the field’s efforts to train culturally sensitive practitioners.

D’Andrea and Daniels (1997) described multicultural supervision as the supervisory situations that are affected by cultural factors. Some examples of multicultural supervision experiences include: supervisor and supervisee having different cultural backgrounds (ethnicity, race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, or ability status); supervisee and client having different cultural backgrounds; supervision that addresses client presenting concerns with cultural themes; supervision that takes place in a culturally diverse setting; and supervision that addresses the role of culture in counseling and training for educational purposes. D’Andrea and Daniels (1997), propose that multicultural supervision situations allow supervisors and supervisees the
opportunity to self-reflect about their competence and cultural identity in order to gain insight into the challenges and dynamics that they may experience in supervision.

The term *multicultural competence* was originally identified and defined in the counseling profession within a set of practice standards proposed by Sue, Arredondo and McDavis (1992). This model of standards and competencies has been recognized and adapted by the American Psychological Association’s Division 17 and Division 45, in order to facilitate the counseling field’s response to the needs of diverse clients (Toporek & Reza, 2001). The Sue et al. (1992) model of competence is concentrated in three broad areas. The first area is awareness, centered on counselor’s self-awareness and understanding of cultural beliefs and attitudes about themselves and others. The second area centers on counselor’s knowledge and understanding of the cultural values, beliefs, and experiences of their clients, and how these impact treatment. The third area centers on counselor’s ability to use sensitive intervention strategies and skills in working with culturally diverse clients. These three areas have been translated into the development of 34 specific multicultural counseling competencies (Sue et al, 1998). For the purpose of item development for the MSI, the Multicultural Counseling Competencies were adapted for supervisors by the authors (for complete list see Appendix C). *Multicultural competence in supervision* is defined as an activity centered on fostering the trainee’s personal, professional, and skill development while focusing on how the supervisor and supervisee’s cultural identity and level of cultural competence affect the supervision processes.

For this study, it is assumed that supervisors’ adhere to the multicultural counseling competencies as they apply to their work with clients and in their interactions
with supervisees. Additionally, supervisor multicultural competence involves assessing the cultural appropriateness of established supervision models; recognition of the impact of culture on communication styles and intervention approaches; and ability to assess and facilitate the supervisee’s development of multicultural counseling competence. In this study multicultural will be defined broadly to include experiences connected to race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and physical ability status. This study’s broader definition of culture is congruent with an evolution in the field that has led to expand the multicultural construct to provide a deeper and more inclusive conceptualization of culture and difference, away from the initial conceptualization that culture focused solely on race (Fuertes, Bartolomeo and Nichols, 2001).

Leong and Wagner’s (1994) review of the existing literature in cross-cultural supervision focused on three categories. The first includes theory outlining the effects of cultural variables within the context of supervision. This line of research includes descriptions of the relevance of supervision in counseling, problem areas, and future recommendations for the training and development of multicultural competencies in supervision (D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997; Fong & Lease, 1997; Stone, 1997). The second area of theoretical inquiry includes articles that propose models or frameworks describing supervisees’ multicultural competency development and provide suggestions on how supervisors can help trainees gain competence (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992; Carney & Kahn, 1984; Porter 1994). The last main area of research outlined by Leong and Wagner includes empirical studies addressing race and cultural factors in supervision. Based on their review Leong and Wagner concluded that most of the writing addressing the effect of culture on supervision is theoretical in nature, and most of the conceptual models
proposed have not been empirically validated. Consequently, they suggest that more empirical studies need to be conducted.

Supervision is based on the assumption that supervisors are more advanced in their understanding of the process of counseling than their supervisees which creates a power differential (D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997). In an empirical study exploring salient issues of supervision, Constantine (1997), found that 70% of the supervisors in her study had not completed a formal multicultural training course, whereas the majority of interns had completed a formal course. Because the multicultural counseling movement is relatively recent in the counseling profession, presumably few counselors or supervisors have benefited from formal multicultural training in this area. In their theoretical paper addressing central issues in supervision, D’Andrea and Daniels pointed out the importance of assessing the supervisor’s level of multicultural competence. They state “multicultural supervision should be conducted by persons who have developed a broad awareness and knowledge base in multicultural counseling” (p. 303). The lack of training means that supervisors may be at the same or even lower level of multicultural competency as their supervisees. This lack of parity in multicultural training experiences between trainees and supervisors in the field may strongly affect the nature of the supervisory relationship. This effect may be more salient in situations in which supervisor’s and supervisees’ perceived multicultural competencies are noticeably discrepant, thus the level of support, communication, and perceptions of overall counseling competency may be affected. Therefore, it is crucial that future empirical research exploring supervisor's multicultural supervision competence integrates the views and opinions of supervisees.
D’Andrea and Daniels (1997) provided suggestions for helping supervisors to deal with situations in which their training is limited. First, supervisors need to be aware of their own multicultural competence. Second, they need to foster a collaborative relationship with supervisees at a similar competency level. Last, they need to actively solicit information, advice, and suggestions from those supervisees whose level of awareness exceeds their own. These steps would help supervisors become more effective in dealing with multicultural dynamics by enabling them to recognize the power differential and to discuss their limitations with supervisees. D’Andrea and Daniels point out that urging supervisors to consult and be open to learning from their supervisees is a very nontraditional view of training, but a preferable one to supervisors providing guidance in multicultural areas in which they have little experience or knowledge. Further, they propose that awareness of one’s own level of multicultural competence as a supervisor is the first step toward becoming multiculturally effective. Currently, there are no empirically validated tools that assess multicultural competence in supervision.

The purpose of this study is to explore the initial validity and reliability of the Multicultural Supervision Inventory-MSI, (Pope-Davis, Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, 1999). The MSI was created to assess perceptions of a supervisor’s multicultural competence, and the supervisory relationship from the perspective of both supervisors and supervisees. The validation of this measure can help increase our understanding of how supervisors and supervisees respond to the challenge of addressing multicultural situations in supervision. This increased understanding may enhance the effectiveness of supervision, and enable training programs to develop training interventions that enhance the effectiveness of multicultural supervision.
Few empirical studies have examined the phenomena of multicultural supervision (Leong & Wagner, 1994). Even fewer studies have explored how competency in dealing with cultural factors in counseling situations affect the training interactions between supervisor and supervisee. Fukuyama (1994) investigated critical incidents in supervisory pairs and Constantine (1997) explored differences in perceptions of communication, multicultural training, and suggestions for improvement. Recently, Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice and Ho (2001) explored the experiences of four counselors in training and recommended that supervisors use instruments to facilitate and assess their own multicultural awareness as well as that of their supervisees. Gatmon et al. (2001) explored the discussion of ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation variables in supervision and found that in their sample, limited discussions over cultural factors ensued, and that when they took place they enhanced supervisees’ satisfaction and working alliance in supervision. Duan and Roehlke (2001) provided a “descriptive snapshot,” of racially different pre-doctoral internship supervision pairs and found that participants viewed supervision experiences with a racially different individual as satisfying. In this investigation they used two versions of the cross-racial supervision survey composed of both scaled and open-ended questions, neither of which was tested for construct validity.

To date there are no empirically validated tools that have focused on measuring the perceptions of supervisor multicultural competence from the perspective of both the supervisor (self-ratings) and the ratings of trainees. Assessing supervisor’s multicultural competence becomes of greater importance when considering the possibility of great discrepancies in supervisors’ and supervisees’ levels of multicultural training. Duan and
Roehlke (2001) highlighted the need for future research aimed at understanding the perceptual differences of supervisor and supervisees within the same dyad, and how these perceptions affect satisfaction or influence supervisee learning. Developing and validating the supervisee and supervisor versions of the MSI, would be a first step toward increasing our understanding of how multicultural competence in supervision in perceived and experienced by the dyad.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

To provide a foundation for the need to empirically assess supervisor and supervisee experiences within multicultural supervision settings, literature in several areas will be reviewed. The first area of literature focuses on the relationship dynamics in counselor supervision. The second and third areas provide an overview of the existing theoretical and empirical literature in multicultural supervision.

Relationship Dynamics in Supervision

Loganbill, Hardy, and Dellworth (1982) define supervision as “an intensive interpersonally focused, one-to-one relationship in which one person is designated to facilitate the development of therapeutic competence of another person” (p. 4). This definition is further clarified by defining “one-to-one” as a process that requires individual attention focused on the personal characteristics and training needs of the supervisee. Loganbill et al. described supervision as an interpersonal process similar to the process occurring between therapist and clients in counseling. They conclude that beneficial changes and learning can occur in supervision through the interpersonal relationship of the supervisor and supervisee. This makes the supervisory relationship a vital component of counselor training in which interpersonal interactions become a potential source of modeling and transfer of appropriate counseling behaviors. The interpersonal interactions between dyads (supervisors and supervisees) may define the
level of participation and collaboration occurring between supervisor and supervisee.

Thus, the supervisory relationship can serve as a powerful training venue for supervisee's development of counseling competence. In the same light, supervision can also be regarded as a strong potential venue for supervisee's development of cultural counseling competencies (i.e., development of cultural knowledge, awareness, and skills). The following exploration of dynamics of supervision will describe, power dynamics in supervision, the importance of supervisor experience, collaboration in supervision, and how supervisees’ perceptions of the relationship may be influenced by their view of supervisor’s competence.

*Power Dynamics in Supervision.*

Regardless of its similarity to client/therapist relationships, the interpersonal process in supervision is made unique by the authority endowed in the supervisor as the person responsible for the professional development of the supervisee. This authority introduces power dynamics into this relationship because the level of responsibility and knowledge is unbalanced. Authority in the working relationship becomes more apparent in the supervisor’s evaluative function of the supervisee’s progress. The use of evaluative/expert authority in the relationship can lead to two supervision outcomes (Loganbill, 1982). The first involves an accepting relationship in which the supervisee recognizes the authority of the supervisor because the supervisor exemplifies maturity, experience and competence that are at higher levels. The second outcome may involve the non-acceptance of the authority inherent in the definition of the supervisory relationship. The latter outcome occurs when the competence, maturity and experience differential is small or non-existent between supervisor and supervisees. Loganbill et
al.’s developmental definition of supervision highlights the importance of assessing the perceptions of competence of both members of the supervisory dyad, because their learning interactions could be highly affected by each other’s self-perceptions.

*Experience Level of Supervisors and Supervisees.*

According to Worthington and Stern (1985), little attention has been given to the effect of supervisees experience in the supervisor relationship as it relates to supervisor competence and experience status. Until their study, little research had investigated supervisor competence or the quality of supervision relationships that were formed. Worthington and Stern found support for their hypothesis that supervision is influenced by fixed “structural” (i.e., non-alterable) supervisor variables that may include experience level or dispositional characteristics like gender, participants’ personalities or context of supervision. Their study focused on counselors-in-training perceptions of effective supervision. They did not find significant effects for supervisor’s gender, level of experience (defined by years of experience in supervision and counseling practica) on supervisee’s perceived quality of the relationship. Nonetheless, supervisors' activity level, goal orientation and supportive behaviors influenced counselors-in-training ratings of effective supervision.

Marikis, Russell, and Dell (1985) also examined the effects of supervisor experience and planning behavior in supervision within the supervised-counselor and supervisor dyad. They compared supervisors with no previous experience in supervision, low experience (16-100 hours of supervision), and high experience (500 hours of supervision or more). Supervisors were asked to plan for supervision sessions by listening to a tape of previous client-counselor interactions. They were directed to plan
their supervision interventions, and later they conducted a supervision session with the counselor. The researchers analyzed the sessions and measured the supervisors’ planning statements and compared those with their actual in session behaviors. The results suggested that supervisors with experience made more statements than their inexperienced counterparts in the domains of subject matter, supervisor, and productivity categories. Experienced supervisors spoke more about their role as supervisors and counseling skills in sessions. These studies show that supervisor counseling experience, activity level and support, may influence supervisee’s perceptions or opinions about their effectiveness and performance.

Numerous studies have focused on the interpersonal supervisory relationship as an integral basis for the transfer of knowledge about counseling skills to supervisees (Loganbill et al., 1982, Karr & Geist, 1977; Lambert, 1980; Worthington & Roehlke, 1979). Loganbill et al. described the supervisor as a source of skill and knowledge. Supervisor’s may vary in terms of their competence, experience, and approach to counseling. Therefore, they suggest supervisors evaluate their competence and level of experience. This self-evaluation may help supervisors select and supervise only those students whose level of competence could be advanced by working with someone of their experience level. Further, they assign supervisors with the ethical responsibility of facilitating learning for the supervisee, and focusing interventions to enhance their development and ensure the welfare of the client. This can lead us to conclude that supervisors are obligated to be aware of their experience level, to recognize their limitations and to only work with trainees in areas in which they are competent and knowledgeable. This ethical responsibility applies to overall counseling skill training and
therapy interventions as well as having competence to deal with special populations (children, the disabled, etc.), and people belonging to diverse cultural backgrounds.

Heppner and Handley (1982) assessed the relationship between supervisory behaviors and supervisee’s (beginning practica graduate students) perceptions of supervisor (advanced level doctoral students) expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness. The purpose of their study was to explore the relationship between various supervisor behaviors and trainee perceptions of supervisors. Their results suggested that trainees’ perceptions of supervisors’ evaluative supervisory behaviors correlated with perceptions of more expertness, attractiveness and trustworthiness, making supervisor evaluative behaviors consistent with effectiveness in supervision.

Earlier, Karr and Geiss (1977) evaluated recordings of supervision dyads over a semester to assess supervisory behaviors that facilitated supervisees’ functioning in therapy. They found significant relationships between supervisory conditions of genuineness, respect and concreteness and therapy conditions created by trainees.

Lambert (1980) broadly defined the major goals of supervision as supervisee personal growth and skill development. The first involves numerous changes in cognitions and feelings brought by increased self-awareness of supervisees’ behaviors in therapy, as they become more knowledgeable of the process. The goal of skill development involves the process of gaining greater counseling competence by learning specific client interventions as well as the skills involved in personal growth. In summary, supervision and supervisors themselves can contribute expertise, therapeutics skills, and facilitative interventions that can contribute to the personal and professional growth of supervisees. Previous research also shows support for the connection between
supervisor behaviors and supervisee’s perceptions of their expertness and other performance related characteristics. There is also support to infer that supervision is a central component of counselor training. Supervisor’s knowledge, expertise and the working relationship can be strong tools to help develop trainee’s expertise in overall therapeutic skills as well as the development of multicultural counseling competencies. It appears that supervisor’s behaviors in supervision influence supervisee’s perceptions of their performance and training ability. Therefore, it is imperative that supervisors are aware of their level of knowledge and expertise in counseling activities in dealing with majority/White clients as well as clients belonging to diverse cultural groups and only supervise trainees who are at lower levels of skill. In this study, *multicultural competence in supervision* is defined as an activity centered on fostering the trainee’s personal, professional, and skill development while focusing on how the supervisor and supervisee’s cultural identity and level of cultural competence affect the supervision processes.

*Theoretical Literature in Multicultural Supervision*

*Multicultural Competence in Supervision.*

Writings that have addressed the effect of culture in supervision are predominantly theoretical in nature (Leong & Wagner, 1994). Research in this area has been termed “cross-cultural” and/or “multicultural.” D’Andrea and Daniels (1997) authored a theoretical piece that serves as a useful introduction to the definition, central issues, and challenges for supervisors, and they suggest strategies for more effective multicultural supervision. D’Andrea and Daniels defined multicultural counseling as both a professional movement and area of study and practice. The authors also provided
explanations for the trends that led to the emergence of the multicultural competency area of study and specialty. Influential factors for its development include the rapid cultural diversification of the United States, which may translate into increased levels of diverse clientele populations for psychologists and the profession’s increased awareness of practitioners need to develop innovative ways to respond to this trend (Sue et al., 1992).

A culturally competent counselor needs to develop knowledge, awareness, and skills around three areas. The first involves awareness of the counselor’s own cultural values and biases. The second is awareness of the client’s worldview and the third, involves the use of culturally appropriate counseling strategies (Arredondo et al., 1996). Multicultural supervision is described as “the process whereby counseling practitioners collaborate with other counseling experts in ways that enhance their overall understanding and effectiveness in working with culturally different clients,” (D’Andrea & Daniels, p.293).

D’Andrea and Daniels highlight the importance of assessing supervisors’ levels of multicultural competence, and the development of a collaborative working relationship between supervisor and supervisees with similar levels of cultural training. They define the collaborative working relationship as a co-equal, collegial relationship between supervisors and supervisees. This mutually involved working relationship fosters an atmosphere that may help supervisors and supervisees recognize their level of multicultural competence and work on understanding how culture impacts counseling and supervision, even if this process is risky and vulnerable because limitations in one’s cultural knowledge may be discussed. They recommended that supervisors with low cultural competency levels actively search for information and guidance from supervisees or colleagues whose levels of competence exceed their own. This collaborative and co-
equal approach to multicultural supervisory relationships is differentiated from traditional definitions of supervision in which the supervisor is the “one person is designated to facilitate the development of therapeutic competence of another person” (Loganbill et al., p. 4). D’Andrea & Daniel’s definition proposes that in multicultural supervisory relationships there is a possibility that both supervisors and supervisees can initiate and facilitate the development of multicultural competence within the working relationship. This definition continues to place emphasis on supervisor’s role and responsibility in fostering trainee’s therapeutic and multicultural competence highlighting the need for research tools centered on assessing supervisor’s multicultural competence.

Stone (1997) described the definitional dilemma of inclusiveness and exclusiveness in the term multicultural as it applies to counseling activities and supervision by defining and discussing the implications of the “cultural affiliation” and “cultural difference” perspectives. According to Stone, inclusives (i.e. those adopting the cultural affiliation views) espouse a broad (etic) and universalistic approach to defining multicultural, which may include race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, gender, age, socioeconomic status, ability status, and sexual orientation. In this broad definition, the possibility of therapists and supervisors having to recognize and effectively manage the experiences of clients who belong to overlapping cultural groups is recognized (for example-dealing with a woman who is Asian American, bisexual, and is suffering from depression). The inclusive definition is broad and does not make distinction between affiliated and ascribed cultural statuses. Affiliated cultural statuses include characteristics and/or membership in cultural groups due to choice not force or birth and may or may not be visible to others, for example religion and optional immigration status.
Ascribed statuses on the other hand involve characteristics or membership in cultural
groups that cannot be controlled by the individual due to birth or other powerful societal
structures. These ascribed statuses may include sex, race and ethnicity. The exclusive
(“cultural difference”) perspective often restricts the focus of culture to those members of
“visible racial ethnic minority groups” in the United States including African American,
Native American, Latino and Asian Americans. Stone states that those espousing an
exclusive definition argue that broad and over-inclusive definitions of multiculturalism
obscure race and the fact that members of ascribed minority groups have been subjected
to racism and injustice in this society. This study will adopt the inclusive or cultural
affiliation definition of multiculturalism in therapy. I believe it is important to have a
broad definition of culture when studying experiences in counseling and supervision
because interactions may be influenced by more than just visible characteristics of sex,
ethnic, and racial group membership. Experiences of difference and similarity may be
shaped by the existence and intersection of multiple cultural memberships that exist due
to both affiliated and ascribed statuses (e.g., sex, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation,
religion, and ability status). Counselors, supervisors and clients may also be different
from each other along multiple cultural dimensions making the presence of multiple
cultural issues inevitable.

In order to provide an organizing framework to the existing literature in
multicultural supervision, it will be divided into three categories. The first is made up of
theoretical writings identifying the importance of addressing multicultural issues in the
supervision process. The second line of theoretical literature includes articles that
propose stage models or developmental frameworks regarding culture in supervision.

Third, I will review empirical works in this area.

Numerous theoretical writings have focused on identifying and understanding the implication of culture in supervision. These include identifying problems and making recommendations for training. Theoretical themes in this literature focus on racial identity, the cultural affiliation and cultural difference perspectives, and multicultural issues affecting majority and minority supervisors. Cook (1994) applied Helms’ (1990) Racial Identity Theory to the supervisory context in order to provide insight in to how the relationship between supervisors and supervisees is affected by their racial identity development. Cook also used Helms’ (1994) People of Color and White Racial Identity model to discuss how interactions in supervision are affected by personal identity factors. According to Cook and Helms (1999), *Racial Identity* is a multidimensional psychological construct that captures how people think and feel about their race within the dynamic process of society. Helms (1990) explained the implications of racial identity development for interpersonal relationships in her racial identity interaction model. Her model depicts the nature of individual’s relationships based on their expression of their racial identity as they experience a series of developmental processes she described as statuses. Because supervisors and supervisees learning interactions are centered on their working relationship, racial identity interactions may play an important role when dealing with culture in therapy. Cook (1994) suggested that the ways in which racial issues may be addressed and avoided in supervision depend on the racial or ethnic identity development of the supervisor and supervisee.
In using Helms’ (1990) interaction model, Cook proposed that interactions between supervisory pairs may be “parallel” or “crossed.” Parallel interactions occur when two individuals who may belong to different or similar racial/ethnic backgrounds exhibit behaviors related to similar ego statuses, whereas crossed pairs occur when individuals exhibit behaviors related to opposite ego statuses. Ego statuses are defined by Helms (1995), as mutually interactive dynamic processes that reflect people’s expressions or manifestations of their racial identity. The crossed pairs could either be “progressive” if the person with the most power in the relationship; the supervisor is more advanced in racial/ethnic identity development than the supervisee. The pair is considered “regressive” when the one in power is less advanced. Cook also explores how power dynamics are in effect according to identity status. The application of racial identity theory to the supervisory context may help provide insight into how the relationship between the supervisor and supervisee is affected by their expression of their racial identity development. Further, awareness of these statuses in turn describes how race is identified and dealt with in the relationship.

Fong and Lease (1997) attempted to provide the White supervisor with guidelines and information about conducting cross-cultural supervision. They described ways in which historic, cultural, and role-related issues might interfere with White supervisors’ attempts to effectively deal with culture in supervision. These interfering factors may include unintentional racism, White racial identity, White privilege, power dynamics in the supervisory relationship, and relationship issues, such as trust vulnerability and communication issues. They offered suggestions for enhancing supervisors’ professional development in acquiring the knowledge, awareness and skills required for
multicultural competence. In terms of supervisors’ professional development, Fong and Lease recommended a self-assessment of supervisor cultural competence to help supervisors identify their own level of racial consciousness and areas of multicultural knowledge that need further attention. They advised supervisors to develop a formal professional activity plan to achieve competence as a counselor and supervisor. They concluded by providing suggestions for assisting the development of their counselors around multicultural counseling activities in individual and group supervision settings. Fong and Lease, outline the importance of supervisors’ self-assessment and development of their multicultural competence in order to help White supervisors become multiculturally competent.

Priest (1994) presented an overview of issues that may arise in supervision when supervisors belong to ethnic minority groups and their supervisees are ethnic majority members. Priest described specific strategies minority supervisors might use to help their trainees become effective cross-cultural counselors. The goals include: (a) enhancing supervisee’s respect for diversity, (b) increasing cultural awareness of supervisors, (c) addressing possible impasses that may occur in the supervisor-supervisee relationship, (d) addressing differences in communication styles and using existing models of cross-cultural development to understand trainee’s progress and conceptualizations. Priest concluded by making recommendations to include multicultural counseling courses and training experiences in graduate curricula.

Garrett et al. (2001) brought forth superVISION a model of cultural responsiveness as a tool to deal with opportunities and obstacles in supervision in practical ways. The V in superVISION means taking a look at the supervisor and
supervisee’s *value systems* and the match or mismatch between them; the *I* involves the *interpretation* of experiences; the *S* stands for *structural preferences* for the process of supervision; the second *I*, highlights *interactional* style or preferred mode of communication; the *O* stands for *operational strategies* or intentionality of strategies used to work for chosen goals, and the *N* refers to the mental, physical, spiritual and emotional *needs* toward achieving outcomes. This model highlights the need for supervisors self-aware and proactive and address cultural influences at the start of the supervisory relationship. The authors also believe that this model allows for the discussion of cultural issues within supervision that may be perceived as opportunities or obstacles.

In summary, Priest’s recommendations highlighted the important role of open communication about events occurring in the supervisory relationship (events that are both positive and negative) and understanding differences in communication styles in the training of supervisees. Brown and Landum-Brown (1995) provide support for the central role that communication plays in supervision when they hold supervisors responsible for creating an atmosphere in which the supervisee is able to explore personal ideas, and beliefs about racial and cultural matters in supervision. These theoretical writings highlight the need for supervisor and supervisee experiences in multicultural supervision to be investigated from both perspectives. Open communication between supervisors and supervisees is considered a vital part of the multicultural competency learning process, as well as the assessment of personal competence and awareness. This personal competency assessment is crucial for the identification of areas in need for improvement and expertise. There is a genuine need for an empirically validated tool
grounded in the knowledge awareness and skill model proposed by Sue et al. (1992) to assess supervisor’s competency, from their own perception and that of their supervisees. Because, supervisors are responsible for the skill development of their trainees, and in this area there is the potential that supervisor and supervisee multicultural awareness and competence may be at different levels, which can be a cause for disagreements or misunderstandings regarding the role of culture in this training experience.

*Developmental Models.*

The second line of theoretical inquiry in multicultural supervision is made up of conceptual models or frameworks attempting to explain its development. The first Carney and Kahn’s (1984) integrative model of supervision, focuses on supervisees’ development of competency in multicultural situations. Carney and Kahn’s model (1984) has four stages. In Stage One, the supervisee possesses little knowledge about multicultural counseling. The supervisor’s interventions in this stage may focus on helping supervisees explore the personal impact of belonging to or interacting with a particular cultural group for both themselves and their clients. In Stage 2, supervisees demonstrate an increased but limited understanding and awareness of cultural, ethnic, or racial issues. They have limited understanding of how their own or their supervisor’s identity development affects the counseling or supervisory process.

In Stage 3 supervisees express conflicting emotions about working with culturally different clients. In this stage they usually experience genuine interest in being more culturally responsive, but they feel frustrated by the limitations of their culturally biased training and professional value orientation. In Stage 4 supervisees embark on the process of developing their own identity as a multicultural counselor by being highly aware of
their own identity as well as their client’s identity development. Overall, Carney and Kahn’s model directs attention to the importance of supervisees’ level of multicultural competence, the supervisory strategies to further their development, and the role supervisors play in working with trainees at differing levels of the model (D’Andrea & Daniels, 1997). However, this model has limitations because it does not explore how cultural factors evolve and are handled within the supervisory relationship, or the supervisor’s own process of multicultural development.

Porter (1994) presented a culturally responsive approach to therapy supervision to help supervisees empower their clients. This model aims to integrate anti-racist, feminist, and multicultural aspects into supervision to increase cultural competence and awareness of socio-cultural issues. The author based their model on Lopez and Hernandez’s (1986) model for developing culturally sensitive therapists. The first stage focuses on increasing the trainee’s awareness of ethnic, cultural and socio-economic issues and the ways in which they experience personal beliefs, values and behaviors. Supervisor’s goals in this stage include promoting the supervisee’s increased cultural knowledge through reading new material and promoting alternative conceptualizations of clients based on cultural factors. The goal of the second stage involves introducing the supervisee to a socio-cultural framework and analysis of oppression and their influence on mental health issues. The goal is for the supervisee to learn to recognize and understand client’s behaviors within a cultural context.

The goal of stage three is to help the supervisee become self-aware around culture and oppression. The supervisor guides the supervisee in becoming aware of his/her biases, assumptions and stereotypes in order to help him/her understand the social aspects
of counter transference. Porter (1994) also suggested supervisors must take active steps to examine their own assumptions and stereotypes prior to working with supervisees and to be cautious of their position of power within the relationship. Finally in stage four, the supervisee is encouraged to expand his/her understanding of interventions to generate alternative social-action or collective approaches. This model is useful in helping supervisees become aware of the contextual and social factors influencing his/her worldviews and his/her perceptions influence a supervisee’s understanding of client’s experience and case conceptualizations.

Martinez and Holloway (1997) addressed the interpersonal process of the supervision relationship in multicultural training. They described the supervision process, “as one of the avenues whereby cultural expertise can be developed because, ideally behaviors can be observed, analyzed, and evaluated in a safe and individualized relationship” (p. 326). They used Holloway’s (1995) Systems Approach to Supervision (SAS) to describe how training in supervision may be influenced by the quality of the supervisor-supervisee working relationship. According to SAS, the supervisor must empower trainees to assess their level of multicultural competence (knowledge, awareness, and skills) by building a conducive learning environment. The second assumption of the model is that supervision occurs within a complex mutually involving professional relationship. The third assumption describes the supervisory context as the primary mode of facilitating the involvement of the supervisee-learner. Both members belong to this interpersonal relationship; both have power and their experiences and needs are validated and recognized. The fourth assumption of the SAS model for multicultural supervision states that both content and process in supervision are a part of
the instructional structure. The final assumption states that the trainee is empowered by experiencing and articulating interpersonal situations and acquiring new knowledge and skills.

Martinez and Holloway’s (1997) model is highly complex and centered in the moment-to-moment interactions of the supervisor and supervisee. The interacting system is made up of the nature of the task, the function the supervisor carries out, the character of the relationship, and the contextual factors relevant to the process. The model can help guide supervisors to ask questions about how their multicultural teaching is affected by their thoughts and actions. Martinez and Holloway recognized that because the supervisory relationship is a multicultural training system, the knowledge, awareness and skills of those individuals involved in it define its training potential. Especially, because developing multicultural competence involves an ongoing process (Sue et al., 1992) in which supervisors may be undergoing their own process of developing knowledge, awareness, and skills. The Systems Approach to Supervision recognizes the challenges that may occur in the supervision context as a result of a supervisor’s limited worldview and cultural experience. Therefore, it is valuable to assess a supervisor’s and a supervisee’s multicultural competency in order to assess their levels of development.

The multicultural relationship in the SAS (Systems Approach to Supervision) model has, as its central goal, to promote the empowerment and collaboration between supervisors and supervisees within the supervisory relationship. In this relationship, participants’ cultural and interpersonal factors influence how individuals present themselves in forming the working relationship. The second goal involves helping trainees to develop the ability to apply and integrate cultural knowledge within the
relationship. Even though this working relationship is collaborative, it is also hierarchical due to the supervisor’s responsibility to impart knowledge, evaluating supervisee performance, and role as gatekeeper of the profession (Holloway, 1995). A collaborative working relationship in supervision is defined as one involving both supervisor and supervisee in the assessment of training needs, setting goals for supervision, and cooperation in learning tasks. The final goal of the interpersonal collaborative teaching approach is to enhance trainees’ communication skills both in terms of their personal understanding and ability to communicate with clients who hold different views.

According to Ivey (1977), a culturally effective individual is one who can communicate in various cultural situations and environments.

The last theoretical model suggested that multicultural supervision has five critical components (Bernard & Goodyear, 1992). These components include a pluralistic philosophy, culture specific knowledge, awareness or consciousness raising, experiential learning, contact with culturally diverse individuals, as well as practice experience with diverse clients.

In summary, these conceptual models outline the developmental nature of the process of becoming multiculturally competent. They place the supervisor as the person responsible for fostering supervisees’ effectiveness in dealing with culture in therapy. The stages are centered in describing supervisee characteristics at different levels of progress, and try to define the specific interpersonal processes in the working relationship that must take place in order for this learning to occur (Martinez & Holloway, 1997). Most models also assume that supervisors are at a higher multicultural developmental state than their supervisees, and center on discussing actions supervisors should take to
increase their knowledge and transfer it on to supervisees. Constantine (1997) found great discrepancies between supervisors’ and supervisees’ levels of formal multicultural training. Her findings suggest that more supervisees have participated in multicultural training courses than supervisors. This finding attests to the danger of assuming that supervisors are qualified to train and increase others’ development of multicultural competencies without assessing their actual competence and experience in this area.

*Empirical Literature in Multicultural Supervision*

Leong and Wagner (1994) noted that the “scarcity of empirical information on which to base our understanding of cross-cultural supervision is striking (p. 117).” Most of the existing theoretical articles and models of multicultural supervision have not had their constructs validated or tested empirically. Few aspects of multicultural supervision have been investigated empirically. The existing studies include a case study that examined communication problems due to not addressing cross-cultural issues in supervision (Daniels, D’Andrea & Kim, 1999); trainee’s experiences in multicultural supervision by observing positive and negative critical incidents (Fukuyama, 1994); the effects of supervisor’s race and support on supervisee’s perceptions of supervision (Hilton, Russell & Salmi, 1995); trainee’s perceptions of satisfaction in cross-cultural supervision (Cook & Helms, 1988) and an examination of supervisor’s multicultural competence (Constantine, 1997).

Daniels, D’Andrea, and Kim (1999) presented a case study of cross-cultural supervision involving an Asian American supervisee and a European American supervisor. In this cross-cultural supervision situation various culturally based conflicts and misunderstandings arose between the supervisor and supervisee due to differences in
cultural values that were manifested in the interactions and meetings, in their conceptualizations of clients, and in their expectations of supervision. The lead researcher served as instructor of a counseling internship placement course in which the supervisee, a first semester community internship was enrolled. The supervisor contacted her because the supervisee was not performing to the supervisor’s expectations and changes needed to be made. The lead researcher played an investigative role and met with the supervisor and supervisee to discuss the situation. She identified numerous differences between the supervisor and supervisee that were connected to the different cultural worldviews and values that had never been discussed in supervision.

In terms of interpersonal differences, the supervisor had a more direct and confrontational interpersonal style that reflected the style of interaction of people from European-American backgrounds, whereas the supervisee had a less confrontational interpersonal approach that shows deference to authority figures characterized in Asian-American cultures. The supervisor interpreted the supervisee’s interpersonal approach as lack of assertiveness in his internship placement. The pair also reflected different counseling goals: the supervisor was interested in identifying problems, and helping the clients resolve the problems as soon as possible, whereas the supervisee believed that establishing rapport and a trusting counseling relationship needed to occur before problem solving took place in therapy. The supervisor expressed frustration with the supervisee’s goals and felt that this was due to the time limitations of the school internship setting. The last source of conflict between the supervision pair involved the supervisor’s expectation that supervision would be collaborative and the supervisee’s expectation that his supervisor was an expert and authority figure and therefore placed
himself at a distance due to his sense of respect. The instructor/lead researchers discussed the cultural conflicts and themes that were at the root of their relationship problems. The researchers pointed out the multiple roles of the lead researchers, limits to generalization, and the possibility of alternative interpretations of the data as limitations to this study. Nonetheless, this study recommended supervisors take the time to initiate discussions about multicultural issues early in supervision, discuss roles, responsibilities and expectations of counseling and supervision, and take interest in learning about the racial and cultural perspectives of their trainees.

Fukuyama (1994) investigated multicultural experiences in supervision from a phenomenological approach. Participants were 18 ethnic minority interns in psychology, who were asked to describe a positive and a negative critical incident related to multicultural issues that occurred during individual supervision while on internship. Responses describing negative critical incidents were grouped in two categories: lack of supervisor cultural awareness and questioning trainee abilities. Only four of the eighteen respondents included a negative critical incident’s in describing their experience. The descriptions of positive critical incidents were grouped in to three categories: opportunities to work in multicultural activities, openness and support, and culturally relevant supervision.

The openness and support category included descriptions of encouragement and belief in supervisee’s competence in the part of supervisors, having a supervisory experience free of biased or stereotyped thinking about supervisee or client, and encouragement to work with culturally diverse clients. The culturally relevant supervision category described situations in which the supervisor used their cultural
knowledge and awareness to provide culture specific guidance to trainees. Other reported positive incidents included acknowledging trainee’s cultural identity as a valid part of their professional identity, recognition of trainee’s cultural traditions and helping supervisees increase his/her self-awareness in terms of cultural values and their effect on the counseling relationship. Regardless of the limitations in terms of external validity of this pilot study (N=18), and the specific intern training context, the use of critical incidents to explore this phenomena provided information on emerging themes in multicultural supervision. These themes include the need for supervisors to support multiculturalism and hold expertise of knowledge in this area, the influence of culture on the supervisory relationship (i.e., perceptions of encouragement, competence and support), as well as the need for increased training and investigations on the role of multicultural knowledge and therapeutic effectiveness.

Hird, Cavalieri, Dulko, Felice and Ho (2001) also provided a qualitative narrative of the experiences of four psychologists in training within multicultural supervision relationships. Supervisees were asked how they experienced and conceptualized multicultural supervision; how cultural differences affect the dynamics of supervision relationships; and how cultural issues may be introduced into the supervisory relationship. The authors made the following recommendations: supervisors would benefit from personal assessments of their multicultural competency in order to enhance their self-awareness; and supervisors could also use these tools to assess the multicultural competence of supervisees. The authors concluded by highlighting the need for continued education in the form of course work, practical experience, consultations and professional workshops or conferences.
Cook and Helms (1988) found that five factors were related to satisfaction with cross-cultural supervision among visible ethnic minority supervisees. The factors included perceived supervisor liking, perceived emotional discomfort, perceived conditional interest, perceived conditional liking, and perceived unconditional liking. For most respondents, satisfaction with supervision was related to perceptions of being liked by their supervisor. In terms of perceived levels of supervisors’ liking Black, Native American, and Latino supervisees perceived lower levels than Asian American supervisees did. Blacks and Native Americans expressed the highest levels of perceived unconditional liking, and Native Americans perceived the highest level of discomfort in multicultural interactions.

Ladany, Brittan-Powell, and Pannu (1997a) studied the influence of racial identity interactions in supervision with racial matching, supervisory working alliance, and multicultural competence. Data gathered from 105 counselor trainees indicated that the racial identity interactions of supervisors and supervisee’s were related to the supervisory alliance. The researchers asked supervisees to identify their own racial identity development and that of their supervisor, and then the dyad was assigned a racial identity interaction category. They found racial identity interactions and racial matching influenced supervisee’s development of multicultural competence. However, the researcher’s matching of supervision pairs were based on the supervisee’s estimate of the racial identity of their supervisor, not the supervisor’s own rating. Since people respond to racial identity interactions from his/her own racial identity status and perspective, supervisee’s ratings in the supervisor’s racial identity may differ from the supervisor’s own ratings for him/herself.
Ladany, Inman, Constantine and Hofheinz, (1997) analyzed the relationship of supervisee self-reported multicultural competence and case conceptualization ability as a function of racial identity and supervisor’s focus. Data collected from 116 (White N =75, and Person of Color N = 41) supervisees indicated that the sample’s racial identity was significantly related to self-reported multicultural competence. They did not find significant relationships between self-reported multicultural case conceptualization and racial identity and self-reported multicultural competence. However, supervisor’s guidance in focusing on multicultural issues was significantly related to multicultural case conceptualization.

Hilton, Russell and Salmi (1995) investigated the effect of supervisor’s race and level of support in trainee perceptions of supervision through an analogue study. Supervisor’s race and supportive behaviors were varied in role-plays of supervision. Their results suggest that level of supervisor support significantly influenced supervisory evaluations of the process. It was also found that supervisor’s race did not significantly influence participant’s perceptions of the supervisory interactions.

Constantine (1997) conducted an exploratory study to identify salient issues in multicultural counseling supervision. Thirty pairs of supervisors and interns who were found to be multiculturally different in at least two demographic characteristics were included in the study. Constantine sought to explore the extent of multicultural differences in the supervisory relationship, supervisor’s level of formal training in multicultural counseling, perceptions of communication about multicultural issues in supervision, and suggestions to improve dealing with multicultural issues in supervision. Supervisors and interns varied in their perceptions of the importance of addressing
multicultural issues within supervision. They reported that at least 15% of supervision time involved discussing multicultural issues. Constantine created a framework to address multicultural issues in the supervisory relationship as a result of the study.

Gatmon et al. (2001) explored the influence of discussions of how ethnic, gender and sexual orientation variables impacted supervisee satisfaction and working alliance for 289 pre-doctoral interns. They were interested in the following questions: (1) Are similarities and differences in terms of these cultural variables discussed, and if so, who takes initiative? (2) Do trainees that discuss these similarities and differences report higher satisfaction and working alliance than trainees who do not discuss these issues? (3) Does the quality of the discussions relate to the working alliance and satisfaction with supervision? (4) Does cultural match in the supervisory relationship relate to working alliance and satisfaction?

Gatmon et al. (2001) were the first to explore in depth how discussions or communication related to cultural variables ensue and influence supervision. This study also expanded the cultural focus in the investigation to include gender and sexual orientation discussions that have been termed meaningful theoretically but not previously explored empirically. The findings indicate that limited discussions occurred. Lack of initiation by supervisors, and low frequency were prevalent in all cultural areas explored with only 12.5% to 37.9% of pairs engaging in discussions of similarities and differences. It was found that when discussions of cultural variables took place supervisees reported significantly higher satisfaction with supervision and enhanced working alliance. The researchers also found that the quality of safety, depth, and opportunities for dialogue significantly increased both alliance and satisfaction within supervision. In conclusion,
the results of this study highlight the notion that discussions of cultural variables in the supervisory relationships are likely to enhance supervisee’s satisfaction and working alliance (bond).

Duan and Roehlke (2001) surveyed cross-racial supervision dyads at counseling centers in universities in order to provide descriptive data on the present status of cross-racial supervision in internship sites. Fifty-four dyads from 49 APA accredited sites participated in the study. The authors developed a supervisee and supervisor version of the cross-racial supervision survey that included both scaled items and open-ended questions. The researchers found that supervisees and supervisors who participated in supervision with an individual from a different racial background were generally satisfied. This finding is positive considering that most supervisors reported not having much previous experience working with racially different individuals. Findings indicated that supervisees felt it was important for their supervisors to express interest in the cultural background of the supervisee, and genuinely like, respect and value their supervisee. It was also found that supervisees confirmed supervisors’ reports of positive interactions and in turn reported respecting, valuing and liking their racially different supervisor. In terms of differences in perceptions, it was found that significantly more supervisors reported making efforts to address cultural differences than supervisees seemed to perceive. This highlights the need to address social desirability in future explorations of supervisor experiences in supervision. The meaningfulness of this study stems from its empirical support for these participants to experience and build a satisfactory relationship within a racially different supervision dyad. The authors highlight the need for further research aimed at understanding the perceptual differences
that exist and that may be lead to impasses in interactions in supervision. Some limitations of this study centered on the lack of testing of the construct validity of the two versions of the instrument, and the lack of fit of some items into the proposed subscales. The other limitations discussed revolved around the potential influence of social desirability that was not accounted for in the data collection efforts.

Martinez and Holloway (1997) and Fong and Lease (1997) have outlined the importance of having a collaborative relationship in supervision, of promoting effective multicultural communication, and of having supervisors who are culturally aware, knowledgeable, and skilled. D’Andrea and Daniels (1997) emphasized the need to assess supervisor’s level of multicultural competence because multicultural supervision training should be conducted by individuals who have developed a broad awareness and knowledge base in this specialty. Unfortunately, they cite research by Brown and Landrum-Brown (1995), Fukuyama (1994), and Priest (1994) that raised questions about supervisors’ lack of multicultural competence in the supervisory process. Constantine (1997) conducted a study with a national sample of supervisor and supervisee pairs exploring the extent of multicultural differences, level of training, and suggestions for improvements in addressing culture in the supervisory relationship. She found strong discrepancies in supervisor and supervisee formal training experience. Seventy percent of trainee respondents reported having had at least one multicultural counseling course, whereas 70% percent of supervisor’s reported not taken such a course. Due to the relative “newness” of the multicultural counseling movement, few supervisors have received formal training in this area when compared to supervisees. This discrepancy in multicultural training between supervisor and supervisee may affect various aspects of
the supervisory relationship (i.e., levels of collaboration and communication). If multicultural competency levels are highly discrepant in the supervisory dyad the supervisor’s effectiveness/competence may be perceived as low and inadequate. Duan and Roehlke (2001) found that cross-racial supervision experiences could be perceived as satisfactory by both supervisors and supervisees even if supervisees reported minimal experiences. These findings are encouraging yet, the authors did not perform specific analyses on the effects that course work/training, length of experience, and multicultural counseling competence may have on ratings of satisfaction or expertness.

Leong and Wagner (1994) conducted a systematic review of the existing literature in the area of cross-cultural supervision. Even though their review occurred almost ten years ago their findings still hold true today. In asking what is known about cross-cultural supervision, the answer is “very little” (p. 128). Several conceptual models have been proposed. Many appear to have similar theoretical foundations, yet they remain untested. Based on the existing empirical articles it can be concluded with caution that race and culture can have a strong influence on the supervisory process, particularly in terms of trainees’ expectations of their supervisors’ characteristics. According to Leong and Wagner the field’s empirically based knowledge is very limited; stage and integrative models await validation. There is also a need for further exploration of techniques that promote competence, as well as how differences in personality and psychological interpretations of race and culture unfold within supervision. Finally, they recommend that researchers focus on supervisory relationship factors and elements of supervisor and supervisee interaction.
The training interactions in the supervisory relationship (e.g., communication, transfer of skills) need to be explored because they may be influenced by the similarities or differences in multicultural counseling competence expressed by supervisors and supervisees. Therefore, it is crucial that an empirical tool is developed and validated to rate the perceived multicultural supervision competence of supervisors, from both the perspectives of the supervisor and supervisee.
CHAPTER 3

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Theoretical writings addressing multicultural factors in supervision are abundant. Cook (1994) discussed the interaction of supervisor and supervisee racial identity development in supervision. Carney and Kahn (1984) presented a four-stage model of supervisee multicultural competency development. Porter (1994) described steps to help supervisees become aware of cultural variables and the need to empower clients through a responsive stage-approach to supervision. Bernard and Goodyear (1992) described five critical components of multicultural supervision. To date, empirical research focused on multicultural factors in supervision has been limited (Leong & Wagner, 1994). Findings by Cook and Helms (1988), Fukayama (1994), Hilton, Russell and Salmi (1995), Constantine (1997), Gatmon et al. (2001), and Duan and Roehlke (2001), have identified aspects of the supervisory relationship that are influenced by culture (i.e., supervisory liking, support, belief in competence, discussion and communication of multicultural issues within sessions, perceived supervisor multicultural competence).

D’ Andrea and Daniels (1997) stated that “multicultural supervision should be conducted by persons who have developed a broad awareness and knowledge base in multicultural counseling” (p. 303). These perspectives emphasize the importance of assessing the supervisors’ level of multicultural competence since they are responsible for the quality of their supervisees’ training. “The tasks of the supervisor include
imparting expert knowledge, making judgment’s of trainee’s performance, and acting as a gatekeeper to the profession” (Holloway, 1995, p. 50 as cited in Martinez & Holloway, 1997). Therefore, it is crucial that tools are created to begin to empirically investigate the influence of supervisor’s multicultural competence within specific supervisory relationships. Since supervisors are responsible for trainee development, it is crucial that the supervisee's perspectives regarding their supervisor's ability to handle multicultural issues in supervision are captured since they provide a valuable outlook on how the relationship interactions and learning are influenced by relevant multicultural variables.

Multicultural competence in supervision focuses on the supervisor’s ability to address cultural aspects within the supervisory relationship. Although this construct may be very similar to multicultural competence in counseling (focused on client-therapist relationship), the relationship between trainee and supervisor is unique and deserves further exploration. The present study will assess the multicultural competence of supervisors from the perspective of both supervisors and supervisees with the development of the Multicultural Supervision Inventory-MSI, (Pope-Davis et al., 1999). The MSI is intended to be useful both as a research tool and to aid program planning regarding the role of supervisors in training. This measure was designed to be consistent with Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis’ (1992) conceptualization of multicultural counseling competencies. Two additional aspects were included in the MSI to address the supervisory relationship and social desirability.

Martinez and Holloway (1997) suggested that “the supervisory relationship has the potential to translate counselor’s multicultural theoretical knowledge into actual practice” (p. 325). Existing multicultural supervision training models may be limited due
to the lack of attention paid to the perspectives and needs of both the supervisors and 
supervisees in discussing cultural differences within this teaching relationship (Leong & 
Wagner, 1994). The MSI scale addresses these limitations in the literature by including 
supervisory relationship interactions within the content of its items and consisting of two 
versions aimed at gathering information from both supervisors and supervisees.

Investigations of the relationship between socially desirable response patterns and 
self-reported multicultural counseling competence have yielded mixed findings. Ladany, 
Inman, et al. (1997), and Constantine and Ladany (2000) found that the relationship 
between self reported multicultural competence and multicultural case conceptualization 
ability disappeared when they controlled for social desirability. Ladany et al. (1997) 
suggested that counselors in their study may have overestimated their multicultural 
counseling abilities. These finding have led to the strong suggestions that these 
instrument appear to measure self-efficacy for multicultural counseling competence 
(Atkinson & Israel, 2003). Constantine (2000), conducted an empirical investigation of 
social desirability attitudes, sex, and affective and cognitive empathy as predictors of 
perceived multicultural competence in counseling and found that scores on the Marlow-
Crowne Social Desirability Scale did not contribute significantly to the variance of the 
Multicultural Counseling Knowledge and Awareness Scale-MCKAS (Ponterotto, 
Gretchen, Utsey, Rieger, & Austin, 2002). Sodowsky (1994, 1996) found repeatedly that 
social desirability as measured by the Marlowe-Crowne was not a predictor of self 
reported multicultural counseling competence measured with the MCI. These mixed 
findings highlight the need continue to investigate the relationship of social desirability 
with self report multicultural competence instruments (Sodowsky et al., 1998;
Constantine, 2000). The relationship between social desirability and multicultural supervision competence as measured with the MSI will be explored in this study.

Methods

Participants and Procedures

Sample 1 of this study included 160 cases of data collected during the 1999 and 2000 fall semesters, which represented a return rate of 37%. Seventy four supervisors and 86 supervisees at American Psychological Association (APA) accredited internship sites and counseling training programs across the United States participated. Training directors in these programs were asked to distribute the counterbalanced and coded questionnaire packets to pairs of supervisors and supervisees. The packets contained the MSI, the Multicultural Competence Inventory (MCI; Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin & Wise, 1994), Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire (SQ; Ladany, Hill, Corbett, & Nutt, 1996), the Short Form C of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCFC; Reynolds, 1982), and a demographic questionnaire. Reminder postcards were sent to each site 14 days after the initial mailing to encourage participation.

Sample two of this study was obtained through two methods of data collection. The primary method involved collection through an anonymous, password secured web survey consisting of counterbalanced versions of the study’s instruments. Participants were recruited through e-mail letters, which outlined the purpose of the study and instructions, and provided a statement of privacy and a link to the research website. E-mail requests for participation were sent to American Psychological Association (APA) and other professional organization listservs that included: APA organizations--Division 45 (society for the psychological study of ethnic minority issues), Division 17
The website packet contained an introductory statement outlining the criteria for participation, including informed consent information. Participants were provided the option of participating in a lottery for $100 dollars and two $25 dollar gift certificates as an incentive for participation in the study. Multiple security procedures were integrated in the website’s design to protect the privacy of the data. However, unknown computer malfunctions resulted in the massive failure of the supervisor data collection website and the loss of data. To offset the loss in data, the researcher collected additional data from a convenience sample. The convenience sample was made up of supervisors in two APA accredited counseling psychology programs, and a sample of licensed supervisors in Northwest Indiana, following the paper and pencil data collection procedures used for sample one.

Sample two consisted of 120 participants: 92 supervisees recruited from a national sample completed from the web survey (51 supervisee surveys were incomplete, deemed unusable, and were excluded from the total used) and 28 supervisors (7 from the website method, 21 from the paper & pencil method) The rate of return for participation through the web survey could not be computed due to the nature of the email requests, but the return rate for sample two’s paper and pencil method was 43%.

Table 1 provides a summary of sex, race/ethnicity and age demographic characteristics for the samples. Supervisors’ years of experience in counseling ranged from four to 37 years, with an average of 15 years (SD = 8 years). Additionally, their
supervision experience levels ranged from one month to 30 years of supervision experience with nine years as the average (SD = 7.6 years). Eighty-six percent of supervisors attended workshops or seminars in multicultural counseling; of those who attended 26% had received less than 10 hours of training, 31% received 11-25 hours, 20% received 26-50 hours, and 21% completed 50 hours or more of training. Fifty-one percent of supervisors had completed one or more courses in multicultural or cross-cultural counseling. This sample reflects an increase in the percentage of supervisors who have completed such a course from the findings reported by Constantine (1997). She found that only 30% of a national sample of intern supervisors had completed a course in multicultural counseling.

Supervisee’s years of experience in counseling ranged from zero to 20, with a mean of four years (SD = 3 years). Seventy-nine percent of supervisee’s were/ or had been enrolled in doctoral degree programs. Forty-four percent belonged to counseling psychology programs, 30% were in clinical, 2% were in Psy.D, and 3% were in school counseling and college student personnel doctoral programs. Twenty percent belonged to master’s level degree programs, with 16% in psychology, 3% in counseling, and 1% in career counseling. Eighty-five percent of supervisees had attended workshops or seminars in multicultural counseling; 56 % of supervisees had attended less than 10 hours
TABLE 1. PARTICIPANT DESCRIPTIVES FOR SAMPLES 1 AND 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptives</th>
<th>Samples</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Supervisee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial/Multiracial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-61</td>
<td>22-56</td>
<td>23-68</td>
<td>22-54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of training, 14% had attended 11-25 hours, 11% had attended 26-50 hours, and 14% had attended more than 50 hours. Seventy-six percent of supervisees in this sample reported they had completed one or more courses in multicultural counseling.

Measures

The measures used in this study were the following: the Multicultural Counseling Inventory (Sodowsky et al., 1994), a self-report measure of counselor multicultural competence; the Multicultural Supervision Inventory –(MSI; Pope-Davis et al., 1999), a measure of supervisor’s competence in dealing with cultural aspects in the supervision setting; the Supervision Questionnaire (Ladany et al., 1996), a measure of supervisee satisfaction in supervision; a social desirability measure was (the short -C form of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale; Reynolds, 1982) and a demographic background questionnaire.

Demographic Background Questionnaire. A demographic section was included in the questionnaire packet to gain background information on supervisor and supervisee’s age, sex, racial/ethnic background, counseling experience, experience with supervision, as well as differences within their supervisory dyad along race or ethnicity, sex physical ability, religion, and sexual orientation. On the demographic questionnaire, participants were also asked to describe their level of multicultural training experiences in terms of the amount of coursework completed, the number of workshops and seminars attended, and the percentage of persons of color in their case load. These sets of questions have been used to assess multicultural competency experiences in previous studies (Constantine, 1997; Sodowsky, Kuo-Jackson, Richardson, & Corey, 1998). Additionally, the questionnaire asked participants to describe the emphasis their site placed on
multiculturalism, the diversity of clients and supervisors, and the extent to which multicultural issues were intentionally addressed in their program. A copy of the demographic background questionnaire is contained in Appendix A.

The Multicultural Counseling Inventory was developed “in order to operationalize… the proposed constructs of multicultural counseling competencies” (Sodowsky et al., 1994, p. 139). The inventory was developed through extensive review of the multicultural counseling competency literature and was aimed at identifying the qualities of multiculturally skilled counselors. The mean Cronbach’s alpha for the full MCI scale score is .87 (Pope-Davis & Dings, 1994; Sodowsky et al., 1994, 1998). Factor analysis procedures resulted in the development of four scales named Multicultural Counseling Skills, Awareness, Knowledge, and Relationship. Themes represented in the 11-item Skills Scale include “references to (perceived) success with retention of minority clients, recognition and recovery from cultural mistakes, use of non-traditional methods of assessment, counselor self-monitoring, and tailoring structured versus unstructured therapy to the needs of minority clients” and other items relating to general counseling skills (Sodowsky et al., 1994, p.141). The Awareness Scale has 10 items that reflect personal multicultural awareness, sensitivity, responsiveness, experience and understanding gained from personal interactions with diverse individuals. A sample item from this scale is “I examine my own cultural biases.” The Knowledge Scale has 11 items that refer to culture specific knowledge and information relating to case conceptualization and treatment. A sample item from the Knowledge Scale is "I have a working understanding of certain cultures.” The Relationship Scale is made up of eight items that address the personal interaction of the therapist and the minority client,
including issues of comfort, trust, stereotypes and worldview. A sample item from the relationship scale is “I perceive that my race causes the client to mistrust me.”

The items are self-report statements that are rated on a 4-point Likert-type scale (1 = very inaccurate, 2 = somewhat inaccurate, 3 = somewhat accurate, and 4 = very accurate). Item ratings are added into one total score ranging from 40 to 160. Higher MCI scores reflect higher levels of perceived multicultural competence. The mean Cronbach alphas for the scale scores over 8 different studies ranged from .70 to .80: Skills .80, Awareness .78, Relationship .68, and Knowledge .77 (Sodowsky, 1998). Pope-Davis and Dings (1995) recommended the use of the MCI because “in general its items focus more explicitly on behaviors than attitudes... In this regard, the MCI may provide the most behaviorally based assessment of self-reported multicultural counseling competencies” (p.300) in comparison to other existing scales at the time of their review. Multicultural counseling competency as measured by the MCI has been significantly related to counselor self-assigned race, White racial identity (Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994), multicultural counseling training and experiential variables, attitudes and feelings of social adequacy and locus of control racial ideology (Pope-Davis & Dings, 1995; Sodowsky, 1998). Additionally, multiple studies by the author (Sodowsky, 1996; Sodowsky, O’Dell, Hagemoser, Kwan & Tonemah, 1993) have found there is no significant relationship between multicultural counseling competence measured with the MCI, and social desirability measured with the Marlow-Crowne (1960). To reflect the present study’s broad definition of culture the use of the word “minority” within the MCI was altered to read “multicultural.” No validity information is available for the adapted version of the MCI. A copy of the adapted MCI is included in Appendix B.
Multicultural Supervision Inventory (MSI). Item development for the Multicultural Supervision Inventory (Pope-Davis et al., 1999) was grounded on an extensive review of the theoretical and empirical literature in multicultural and cross-cultural supervision (Fukuyama, 1994; Daniels, D’Andrea & Kim, 1994; Constantine, 1997). The three areas of item content are: multicultural supervision competence, the supervisory relationship and social desirability. The 29 items developed to assess multicultural competence in supervision were grounded on the authors’ adaptation of Sue, Arredondo, and McDavis’ (1992) Multicultural Counseling Competencies for supervisors (see Appendix C). These items were conceptualized in terms of knowledge, awareness, and skills. Thirteen items were created to address supervisor’s knowledge of the impact of cultural variables in the process of counseling and supervision. Eleven items addressed supervisor’s awareness and beliefs of their own cultural values, and the cultural worldview of their supervisees. Five items addressed supervisor’s skills in negotiating multicultural interactions in supervision.

Eight items were developed to assess the characteristics of the supervisory relationship in terms of communication, collaboration, mutual learning, and support in supervision. Four items were developed to address participant’s tendency to respond in socially desirable ways, a concern inherent to multicultural competence self-report measures (Constantine, 2000). Two additional items were created to assess the relevance of multicultural issues in the counseling and supervision sessions.

A unique characteristic of the item content of the MSI is its inclusive definition of multicultural experiences focused on race or ethnicity, sex, sexual orientation, class, religion and physical ability. This broad definition of culture is congruent with an
evolution in the field that has expanded the meaning of multicultural away from a sole focus on the impact of race, to provide a deeper conceptualization of difference (Fuertes, Bartolomeo and Nichols, 2001).

Two, 43 item parallel forms of the MSI were developed: one for supervisors and one for supervisees. Both contained Likert-type items, asking participants to indicate the extent to which each statement reflected their experience with their current or most recent supervision dyad (1 = Strongly disagree; 5 = Strongly agree). The retention of items for the measure was contingent on consensual agreement from the three developers; an African American male, a White American female, and a Chicana. The supervisor version included items such as, “I demonstrated that I respected my supervisees’ cultural beliefs and practices” and, “I had confidence in my supervisees’ ability to work (or to learn to work) with clients who are culturally different from them.” The supervisee version contained items with similar content, but language that reflected the perspective of the supervisee, “My supervisor demonstrated that he/she respects my cultural beliefs and practices,” and “My supervisor had confidence in my ability to work (or learn to work) with clients who are culturally different from myself.” Total scores for the MSI ranged from 43 to 215, with higher scores reflecting greater supervisor multicultural competence. Testing the validity of the MSI is the primary goal of this research and findings are contained in chapter 4. The two versions of the MSI are included in appendixes D and E.

The Supervision Questionnaire (SQ). The SQ was developed by Ladany et al. (1996) to assess supervisee perceptions of the quality and outcomes of supervision. The Supervision Questionnaire is an eight-item self-report inventory with a four-point scale
ranging from 1 (low satisfaction) to 4 (high satisfaction). The scores can range from 8 (satisfied in all areas) to 32 (dissatisfied in all areas). The following is a sample item for this measure: “To what extent does supervision fit your needs?” Research by the author found that supervisee satisfaction was related to the degree of supervisee nondisclosures (Ladany et al., 1996) and the frequency of supervisor adherence to ethical practices (Ladany, Lehrman-Waterman, Molinaro, & Wolgast, 1999). These studies have reported the internal consistency reliability of SQ scores to be .96 and .97. A copy of the Supervision Questionnaire is included in Appendix F.

*Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale-Short Form C.* This study used the short form-C of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Reynolds, 1982). The Marlowe-Crowne was developed to measure social desirability response bias, or respondents’ tendencies to answer questions in a socially positive manner rather than stating the truth. The scale consists of 13 items, depicting responses to life situations that are socially desirable but probably not true of most respondents (e.g., “No matter who I am talking to, I am always a good listener”), and items that are not highly desirable and are probably true (e.g., There have been situations when I took advantage of someone). The scale is rated on a true or false response dichotomy, scores range from 0 to 13, with higher scores indicating socially desirable response patterns. Concurrent validity has been established between the Short Form-C and the original 33 item Marlowe-Crowne with correlations ranging from .91 to .97, supporting the use of the short form in measuring social desirability constructs (Reynolds, 1982; Fischer & Fick, 1993). Internal consistency estimates for scores on the short form-C of the Marlowe-Crowne have ranged from .62 to .76 (Andrews & Meyer, 2003). Reynolds’ (1982) Short Forms of the
Marlowe-Crowne have been cited in approximately 128 studies, and have been widely used to test the discriminant validity of multiple constructs including body image, interpersonal sense of control, and quality of life scales for breast cancer (Barger, 2002).
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The results for the supervisor sample will be presented first in their entirety, and will be followed by the results of the analyses conducted with the supervisee sample. Cohen’s (1988) classification was used as the guideline to describe the effect sizes observed, in this classification $r < .3$ is considered a small effect size, $r$ ranging from .3 to .49 is considered a medium effect size, and $r > .5$ is considered large. The same classification was used to determine the size of the effect when reporting $r^2$.

Preliminary Analyses for the Supervisor Sample

Upon examination of the distribution of total MSI scores, it was determined that supervisor MSI scores were negatively skewed, therefore, scores were reflected in order to shift the skew of the distribution (subtracted each score from the largest score plus one), and a square root transformation was applied to the data (Tabachnik & Fidell, 1996). The distribution of the transformed MSI total scores approximated normality. The transformed supervisor MSI scores were used for all subsequent analyses.

Exploratory analyses were conducted to assess the relationship between supervisor demographic variables and MSI scores. Results from a regression analysis indicated that months of supervision experience significantly predicted supervisor MSI scores. However, this relationship accounted for only a minimal proportion of the variance at 4% ($R^2 = .04$, Adjusted $R^2 = .03$), ($B = .003$, $SE B = .001$, $t = .21$, $p < .05$). A supervisor’s racial
and ethnic background was found to be significantly related to MSI scores. A univariate analysis of variance revealed the large effect size of this relationship, \( R^2 = .19, \) Adjusted \( R^2 = .13 \). Additionally, the means, standard deviations, and internal consistency reliability estimates were computed for supervisor scores on the Multicultural Counseling Inventory, and the Short Form-C of the Marlowe-Crowne. Results are presented in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCI</td>
<td>119.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFCMC</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exploration of the Factor Structure

The reliability coefficients for scores on the MSI full scale and each of its factors were estimated by computing the G-C alpha coefficient. Clark and Watson (1995) outlined the usefulness of using the inter-item correlations of variables as a clear measure of internal consistency. They suggested that in the development of valid measures of narrow constructs researchers should aim for high inter-item correlations above .40 (Clark & Watson, 1995). Following these guidelines, inter-item, and corrected item total correlations were examined. After reviewing the results of this initial internal consistency analysis, six items with corrected item total correlations bellow .30 were eliminated (i.e., 2, 5, 18, 22, 27, and 19). Additionally, items 42 and 43 of the MSI scale were also excluded from the item analysis pool due to their differential purpose in serving as barometer items. Items 42 and 43 rated the relevance of multicultural issues in counseling sessions and supervision.

Factors in this study were defined according to Zwick and Velicer’s (1986) definition of a useful component. A useful factor is one that contains at least three items with substantial non-zero loadings and has an eigen value that is greater than one. Substantial items in this study were defined as those with loadings or pattern coefficients greater than .45 (20% of overlapping variance). This is considered a fair correlation between the item and the factor based on Comrey and Lee’s (1992) classification. This study’s preference to use conservative criteria for the retention of items was motivated by Zwick and Velicer’s finding (1986) that factors made up of loadings below .40 were less likely to be retained consistently across various factor retention methods.
The common Factor Analysis method has been identified as the preferred exploratory factor analysis method to use in the development of new measures (Merenda, 1997; Floyd & Widaman, 1995). Factor Analysis (Principal Axis Factor Analysis-PAF) was conducted on 96 supervisor cases in order to explore the relationships among measured MSI items in terms of underlying latent variables (Floyd & Widaman, 1995). The criteria used to determine the number of factors extracted for the factor analysis was influenced by Thompson and Daniel’s (1996) recommendation that researchers use multiple decision methods. The decision criteria included: (a) the parallel analysis method (Horn, 1965), (b) the Catell “scree” method (Catell, 1966), (c) the examination of the variance accounted for by each factor, and (d) the interpretability of each factor (Thompson & Daniel, 1996; Zwick & Velicer, 1986). The parallel analysis method (Horn, 1965) is considered an accurate and reliable factor extraction procedure in comparison to other existing rules; and has shown to be less likely to underestimate factors even in sample sizes of less than 100 (Zwick & Velicer, 1986; Thompson & Daniel, 1986), a characteristic that made this method and ideal criteria for the extraction of factors with this sample.

It was expected that the MSI’s extracted factors would be correlated due to the theoretical assumptions of Sue et al’s (1992) conceptualization of multicultural counseling competencies that grounded the definition of multicultural supervision competence, and centered item development. The multicultural counseling competency constructs are based on descriptions of interrelated practice guidelines outlining multicultural knowledge, awareness and skills. Due to the expected relationships among
extracted factors an oblique-oblimin rotation was conducted. Additionally, an orthogonal-varimax rotation was also performed due to the exploratory nature of this investigation.

A common factor analysis was conducted on 35 MSI items that were retained after the initial internal consistency analysis. In using the parallel analysis method, factors were considered for retention only if their eigen values exceed the eigen values of the randomly generated normally distributed independent sample (Zwick & Velicer, 1986). The results of the parallel analysis and the interpretation of the scree-test yielded a three factor initial solution consisting of 36 items that accounted for 51% of the measured variance. The rotated pattern coefficients of MSI items were examined, items that had pattern coefficients below the .45 criteria, loaded on more than one factor, and did not contribute to the interpretability of the factors due to redundancy, were eliminated from further analysis. Additional, factor analyses were conducted in order to continue evaluating and eliminating ineffective items. The item evaluation process was guided primarily by the statistical criteria outlined and was followed by the assessment of each item’s interpretability and content fit. Ten items were eliminated because they did not meet statistical criteria in having pattern coefficients lower than .45, or loading on more than one factor (i.e., 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 25, 30, 36, 37, and 41). The remaining 25 items were reviewed for content in order to assess their interpretability and fit. Items eight and 24 were eliminated due to their redundancy in mirroring the themes of items 13 and 34. Consequently, items 13 and 34 were chosen for retention due to their higher pattern coefficients. Items 16 (racial identity), 20 (gender identity), 23 (sexual orientation identity), 31 (socio-economic class), and 32 (religious background), were eliminated because they described supervisors helping supervisees consider specific aspects of their
cultural identity in counseling. These items were replaced by item 12 deemed to achieve a similar purpose—“I helped my supervisee(s) think about how their cultural identity is relevant to their identity as a counselor.”

A final exploratory factor analysis was conducted to explore the underlying structure of the 17 items retained. The sample size to number of item ratio was 5:1 (N=96). The emergent three factor solution accounted for 59% of the total measured variance, with factors one through three accounting for 38%, 11%, and 10% of the measured variance respectively. The values of the supervisor MSI extracted communalities ranged from .28 to .89 (Mdn= .51). The three factor inter-correlations ranged from .24 to .46, confirming the theoretical prediction of interrelatedness among multicultural supervision competence constructs. Pattern coefficients for the final 17-item MSI supervisor scale ranged from .89 to .47. The yielded pattern coefficient matrix, means, standard deviations, the factor correlation matrix, and the MSI supervisor items retained are presented in Tables 3, 4 and 5.

**Definition of the Subscales**

The interpretation and definition of each factor focused on evaluating the items with the highest pattern coefficients (loadings) in each factor. Variables with high “loadings” in each factor are considered “marker variables” in their interpretation (Zwick & Velicer, 1986, p. 441). The first supervisor MSI factor accounted for 38% of the measured variance, and consisted of 9 MSI variables with pattern coefficients ranging from .58 to .77. This factor was named “Fostering Multicultural Competence in Supervisees”, because it is made up of items describing supervisor interventions directed at developing multicultural counseling competence in supervisees. The marker variables
for this factor included the following descriptors: “I was aware of certain cultural beliefs and norms that are important to my supervisee; I understood how cultural communication styles might affect the interactions between my supervisee’s and myself; and I helped my supervisee think about how their cultural identity is relevant to their identity as a counselor.” Additional competence areas of this subscale included awareness of the influence of cultural issues in the supervisory relationship, helping supervisees identify additional multicultural counseling experiences and learning resources, and guiding the supervisee in understanding the impact of major theoretical orientations on multicultural counseling.

The second supervisor MSI factor, accounted for 11% of the measured variance, it consisted of 5 MSI items, with pattern coefficients ranging from .47 to .89. The second factor was named “Culturally Sensitive Collaboration.” It contained items focused on Supervisors’ encouragement of supervisees “to express his/her opinions and concerns regarding client conceptualization freely,” fostering a collaborative working relationship, valuing learning from the supervisory experience, being knowledgeable about different cultural groups, and not stereotyping supervisee.

The third supervisor MSI factor, accounted for 10% of the variance, and consisted of 3 items, with pattern coefficients .49, .54, and .89. This factor was named “Valuing Multiculturalism in Supervision”. This factor also included the following supervisory relationship interventions such as: “I demonstrated I respected my supervisee’s cultural beliefs and practices,” and “I brought up discussions about potential cultural differences in the supervisor relationship.” The overall scale alpha coefficient for scores on the
refined 17-item supervisor MSI was (α = .88), and the three-factor subscale alphas ranged from .71 to .90, and are presented in Table 4.

### TABLE 3. PATTERN COEFFICIENTS AND DESCRIPTIVES FOR MSI SUPERVISOR SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Descriptives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=96

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.
TABLE 4. MSI SUPERVISOR SAMPLE FACTOR INTER-CORRELATIONS AND
RELIABILITY ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full Scale .88

Supervisor (N=96)
Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

Concurrent Validity

Hypothesis 1: A significant relationship will be observed between supervisors’ MCI scores and MSI scores.

Evidence for the MSI’s concurrent validity was obtained by examining its relationship with the Multicultural Counseling Inventory-MCI through conducting a Pearson correlation (Sodowsky et al., 1994). The MCI is a self-report instrument that measures multicultural counseling competency grounded on the Sue et al. (1992) model describing the triad of knowledge, awareness, and skills, and the counseling relationship. Since therapy supervisors are themselves trained counselors who impart guidance and knowledge regarding counseling principles in supervision, it was hypothesized that counselor’s scores on multicultural counseling competence as measured by the MCI
would be significantly related to multicultural competence in supervision as measured by the MSI. This hypothesis was upheld. A large effect size was observed in the correlation between total MCI scores, and transformed MSI scores ($r (96) = .47$, $p < .001$), accounting for 22% of the variance ($r^2 = .224$).

A post-hoc analysis of this positive relationship was conducted in order to examine the contribution of multicultural counseling competence scores (MCI) to the total variance, while controlling for social desirability scores. A hierarchical linear regression analysis was conducted in which Marlowe-Crowne Short Form-C scores, were entered in the first step as the independent variable to hold constant, followed by total MCI scores—the independent variable entered on the second step, and MSI total scores entered as the dependent variable. Table 6, displays the correlations between the variables, the unstandardized regression coefficients ($B$), intercept, the standard error of ($B$), the standardized regression coefficients ($\beta$), the semi-partial correlations ($sr^2_i$), and $R$, $R^2$, and adjusted $R^2$ after entry of both IVs. The correlation between MCI and Marlowe-Crowne scores entered in the same step was moderate $R = .51$, and accounted for 26% of the variance, $F (2, 93) = 16.09$, $p < .001$. After step one, Marlowe-Crowne short form-C scores, accounted for only three percent of the variance $R^2 = .03$, $F_{inc} (1, 94) = 2.71$, $p < .103$. After step 2, with MCI scores added to the prediction of multicultural supervision competence scores, $R^2 = .26$, Adjusted $R^2 = .24$, $R$ square change$= .23$, $F_{inc} (1, 93) = 28.67$, $p < .001$. The results suggest that social desirability scores only contributed 3% of the measured variance at a non-significant level $p = .10$, whereas, MCI-multicultural counseling competency scores significantly accounted for 23% of the total variance in this prediction at a significant level ($p = .001$).
TABLE 5. MSI SUPERVISOR SCALE RETAINED ITEMS AND PATTERN COEFFICIENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>P.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 1-Fostering Multicultural Competence in Supervisees</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I helped my supervisee(s) think about how their cultural identity is relevant to their identity as a counselor</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I helped my supervisee(s) understand how cultural communication styles might affect their interaction with their clients.</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I helped my supervisee(s) identify other opportunities for multicultural counseling experiences.</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I am knowledgeable about resources that my supervisee(s) can use to learn more about cultural issues in counseling.</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I am aware of how cultural issues may have influenced our supervisory relationship.</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>My supervisee(s) felt comfortable talking to me about differing opinions due to our cultural differences.</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I helped my supervisee(s) understand how the major theoretical orientations in psychology have value related assumptions that affect multicultural counseling.</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I understood how cultural communication styles might affect the interaction between my supervisee and myself.</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I was aware of certain cultural beliefs and norms that are important to my supervisee(s).</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 2-Culturally Sensitive Collaboration</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I interacted with my supervisee(s) in ways that did not stereotype them.</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I am knowledgeable about groups who are different from me culturally (e.g. race, gender, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, religion, disabilities).</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I encouraged my supervisee to express his/her opinions and concerns about client conceptualization freely.</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>I fostered a collaborative working relationship with my supervisee.</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I valued learning from our supervisory relationship as much as my supervisee valued learning from me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 3-Valuing Multiculturalism in Supervision</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I demonstrated I respected my supervisee’s cultural beliefs and practices</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I encouraged my supervisee to think about cultural issues when working with clients</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I brought up discussions about potential cultural differences in our supervisory relationship</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6. SEQUENTIAL REGRESSION OF MCI AND MSI SCORES WHILE CONTROLLING FOR MCFC SCORES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>transMSI</th>
<th>MCFC</th>
<th>MCI</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>sr²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(DV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCSFC</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transMCI</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.479</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>118.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .26
Adjusted R² = .24
R = .51

*p<.05

**p<.01

**Discriminant Validity**

*Hypothesis 2: A non-significant relationship will be observed between MSI scores and Marlowe-Crowne Short Form C (MCFC) scores.*
The discriminant validity between the MCFC (Reynolds, 1992; Crown-Marlowe, 1960), and transformed MSI scores was evaluated by conducting a Pearson correlation to test whether MSI scores measure constructs distinct from socially desirable response patterns. The hypothesis that no correlation would be found between multicultural supervision competence (MSI) scores and MCFC scores, was not upheld, $r (97) = .16$, $p > .05$. The observed relationship had a small effect size accounting for only 2% of the total variance ($R^2 = .02$, Adjusted $R^2 = .01$).

**Predictive Validity**

The first set of predictive validity hypotheses tested centered on the MSI’s ability to differentiate between supervisors with different levels of multicultural experiences.

_Hypothesis 3: Supervisors’ level of completion of coursework in multicultural counseling will be significantly related to their score on the MSI._

A univariate analysis of variance, followed by pre-planned Bonferroni pair wise comparisons was conducted to test whether supervisor’s multicultural counseling training experiences were significantly related to their MSI scores. Supervisors were asked to specify their level of multicultural training among the following options: “have never completed a multicultural/cross-cultural counseling course”, “have never completed a multicultural/cross-counseling course, but have had these topics covered in other counseling courses”, “have completed 1 multicultural/cross-cultural counseling course”, and “have completed 2 or more multicultural/cross-cultural counseling courses”. It was hypothesized that supervisors who had completed 1 course or more in the area of multicultural counseling competence would differ significantly in MSI scores from supervisors who had not completed such a course. As predicted, a significant main effect
was observed, $F(3, 97) = 8.51$, $p < .001$, that accounted for 22% of the variance ($R^2 = .22$, Adjusted $R^2 = .19$). The Bonferroni pair wise comparisons indicated statistically significant mean differences between supervisors who completed 2 or more courses in multicultural training, and those supervisors who had never completed such a course ($M$ difference = 1.47, $p < .001$), and those who had multicultural topics covered in other courses ($M = -.96$, $p < .01$).

**Hypothesis 4**: Supervisors’ attendance to workshops or seminars in multicultural counseling will be significantly related to their scores on the MSI.

A regression analysis was conducted in which supervisors’ attendance to workshops or seminars in multicultural counseling served as the predictor variable and supervisors’ MSI scores were entered as the dependent variable. Results of this analysis supported this hypothesis, ($B = -.95$, $SE B = .36$, $b = .26$, $p < .01$), and accounted for 7% of the total variance ($R^2 = .07$, Adjusted $R^2 = .06$).

**Hypothesis 5**: The range of hours of training a supervisor received through attending workshops or seminars in multicultural counseling is significantly related to supervisor’s MSI scores.

A univariate analysis of variance was conducted to assess whether group differences existed between supervisors that had attended varying numbers of hours of workshops or seminars in multicultural counseling. The groups compared through the independent variable included supervisors who completed 0, 1-10 hours of training, 11-25 hours of training, 26-50 hours of training, 51-100 hours of training, and over 100 hours of training. It was hypothesized that supervisors who completed a greater number of hours of workshop training would have greater MSI total scores. Pre-planned
Bonferroni comparisons were conducted. The results revealed a significant main effect $F(5, 97) = 3.99$, $p < .01$, and accounted for 18% of the variance ($R^2 = .18$, Adjusted $R^2 = .14$). Pair-wise comparisons indicated significant differences between individuals who had not attended workshops or seminars ($M$ difference $= -1.89$, $p = .001$), and those who completed 10 or less hours ($M$ difference $= -1.34$, $p < .05$), to supervisors attended over 100 hours of seminars multicultural counseling.

*Hypothesis 6: Supervisors’ experience with clients of color (African American, Asian American, Latino, and Native American), measured by their own determination of the percentage of clients in their caseload will significantly predict their MSI scores.*

Supervisors were asked to report the percentage of their client caseload that identified themselves as people of color (African American, Asian American, Latino, and Native American). The results upheld the hypothesis, supervisors’ degree of experience with clients of color significantly predicted their scores on the MSI ($B = -.021$, $SE B = .004$, $b = -.45$, $p < .001$), and accounted for 20% of the variance ($R^2 = .20$, Adjusted $R^2 = .19$).

*Hypothesis 7: Supervisors’ degree of experience with clients who differed from them in terms of race or ethnicity will significantly predict their MSI scores.*

Supervisors were asked to report the percentage of their own client case-load that differed from themselves along race or ethnicity. The results confirmed the hypothesis ($B = -.011$, $SE B = .004$, $b = -.29$, $p < .003$), and accounted for 9% of the variance ($R^2 = .09$, Adjusted $R^2 = .08$).

The second set of validity questions focused on variables describing the multicultural interactions that took place within the supervisory relationship.
Hypothesis 8: The degree of difference along cultural dimensions for supervisors and supervisee pairs will significantly predict supervisor MSI scores.

Supervisors were asked whether they differed from their supervisee along the following cultural dimensions: race or ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation and physical ability. These five questions had dichotomous response options (1= yes, 0= no), allowing for the variables to be entered into a “regression approach to ANOVA analysis” (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2000). The five cultural difference variables were entered in the same step, as an independent variable. It was hypothesized that the supervisor’s scores on the MSI would significantly predict the degree of cultural difference experienced in the dyad. The results of this analysis did not support the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 9: Supervisors’ interaction with supervisees who identify with a racially or ethnically different group, will significantly predict their MSI score.

Supervisors were asked to report whether they differed from their supervisees along race or ethnicity, and they answered (1= Yes, 0= No). The results of a regression analysis failed to support the hypothesis that supervisors’ interactions with a racial or ethnically different supervisee predicted their multicultural supervision competence score in this sample.

Hypothesis 10: The level in which supervisors addressed multicultural issues intentionally in supervision will be significantly related to the supervisors’ MSI scores.

This hypothesis was tested through a univariate analysis of variance and pre-planned Bonferroni pair-wise comparisons. Supervisors answered the following question: “to what extent are multicultural issues intentionally addressed in supervision.”
The response options ranged from 1=none, to 5=a lot. The analysis supported the hypothesis $F (3, 97) = 6.99$, $p<.001$, and accounted for 18% of the variance ($R^2=.18$, Adjusted $R^2=.16$). Pair wise comparisons identified statistically significant differences in the MSI scores of supervisors that intentionally addressed cultural issues in supervision a little ($M$ difference = -1.13, $p<.05$), and average ($M$ difference = -.73, $p<.01$), from those who addressed these issues at above average levels. Supervisors who addressed multicultural issues a little and average also differed significantly from those supervisors who addressed multicultural issues a lot respectively ($M$ difference = -1.45, $p<.01$; $M$ difference = -1.04, $p<.01$).

**Hypothesis 14:** Supervisors’ ratings of the level of importance of multicultural training will be significantly related to their MSI scores.

This hypothesis was tested by conducting a univariate analysis of variance with Bonferroni pre-planned pair wise comparisons. Supervisors answered the following question: “how important is multicultural training to you.” The response options ranged from 1=none, to 5=a lot. The analysis supported the hypothesis $F (3, 97) = 13.10$, $p<.001$, and accounted for 30% of the variance ($R^2=.30$, Adjusted $R^2=.27$). Pair-wise comparisons identified statistically significant differences between supervisors who rated the level of importance of multicultural training as “a lot,” and those supervisors who rated it above average ($M$ difference = -.636, $P<.05$) and average importance ($M$ difference = -1.59, $P<.001$).

**Supervisee Sample**

**Preliminary Analyses**
Exploratory analyses were conducted to investigate the relationship of supervisee personal variables to their ratings of their supervisor’s multicultural supervision competence. Supervisee’s race/ethnicity was found to be significantly related to supervisee’s MSI scores F (8, 176) = 2.16, p< .05. This relationship accounted for 9% of the variance (R²=.09, Adjusted R²=.05). Supervisees’ age, sex, years of counseling experience, and months of supervision experience, were not significantly related to their MSI scores. Additionally, the means, standard deviations, and internal consistency reliability estimates were computed for supervisee scores on the Multicultural Counseling Inventory, and the Short Form-C of the Marlowe-Crown, and the Supervision Satisfaction Questionnaire. Results are presented in Table 7.

Exploration of the Factor Structure

Initial assessment of the supervisee MSI’s reliability, iter-item correlations, and corrected item-total correlations, led to the elimination of items with correlations below .30. An initial factor analysis was conducted on 40 MSI items due to the elimination of one item that did not meet the outlined reliability criteria (Item 22) and the exclusion of items 42 and 43 due to their differential purpose.

The underlying factor structure of the supervisee sample was analyzed following the methods conducted on the supervisor data sample. An initial Exploratory Factor
### Table 7. Supervisee MCI, MCFC and SQ Descriptives and Reliability Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCI</td>
<td>120.1</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFCMC</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis (Principal Axis Factoring) was conducted on 176 complete cases, due to the list-wise elimination of missing data. The examination of the factor retention criteria—Horn’s parallel analysis (1965), the scree-plot, the interpretability, and the variance explained by each factor led to a two-factor solution. The two factors retained accounted for 56% of the measured variance. The item evaluation process led to the elimination of items with less than fair correlations and redundant themes. Eleven items were eliminated because they did not meet statistical criteria in having pattern coefficients lower than .45, or loading on more than one factor (i.e., 5, 6, 17, 18, 19, 25, 29, 30, 35, 36, and 40). The remaining 29 items were reviewed for content in order to assess their interpretability and
fit. Items seven, eight, 27 and 34, were eliminated due to their redundancy in mirroring the themes of items 13 and 24. Items 13 and 24 were chosen for retention due to their higher pattern coefficients. Items: three (ethnic identity), 16 (racial identity), 20 (gender identity), 23 (sexual orientation identity), 31 (socio-economic class), and 32 (religious background), were eliminated because they described supervisors helping supervisees consider specific aspects of their cultural identity in counseling. These items were replaced by item 12 deemed to achieve a similar purpose—“My supervisor helped me think about how my cultural identity is relevant to my identity as a counselor.”

A final factor analysis was conducted on the refined 18-item supervisee MSI. The sample size to number of item ratio for this exploratory factor analysis was 9:1 (N=176). The two factor solution accounted for 57% of the measured variance (n=176), with factors one and two accounting for 45% and 12% of the measured variance respectively. The extracted communalities had a median of .52. The inter-factor correlation was .53. The overall scale reliability for supervisee scores was estimated at (α=.92). The yielded pattern coefficient matrix, the factor correlations, reliability estimates for scores, and the MSI supervisee items retained are presented in Tables 8, 9, and 10.

The interpretation and definition of each factor involved assessing the “marker variables” and the overall make up of the variables comprising each component (Zwick & Velicer, 1986, p. 441). The first supervisee factor accounted for 45% of the measured variance, and consisted of 11 MSI variables with pattern coefficients ranging from .59 to .89. This factor was named “Fostering Multicultural Competence.” It described supervisor’s awareness of how cultural issues influenced the supervisory relationship,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=176

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.
supervisors understanding the impact of cultural communication styles, supervisors helping supervisees understand how their cultural identity relates to their identity as counselors, and the impact of cultural interactions within the supervision dyad. The second factor, accounted for 12% of the measured variance and consisted of 7 MSI items with pattern coefficients ranging from .50 to .82. This factor was labeled “Collaborative and Culturally Respectful Interactions.” Items making up this factor focused on supervisors’ understanding supervisee’s point of view, fostering collaboration, encouraging supervisees to express their opinions regarding client conceptualization freely, interacting in ways that did not stereotype supervisees, respecting supervisees’
### TABLE 10. MSI SUPERVISEE SCALE RETAINED ITEMS AND PATTERN COEFFICIENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>P.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My supervisor encouraged me to think about cultural issues when working with clients.</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My supervisor helped me think about how my cultural identity is relevant to my identity as a counselor.</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>My supervisor helped me understand how cultural communication styles might affect my interaction with my clients.</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>My supervisor brought up discussions about potential cultural differences in our supervisory relationship.</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>My supervisor helped me to identify other opportunities for multicultural counseling experiences.</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>My supervisor was knowledgeable about resources that I can use to learn more about cultural issues in counseling.</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>My supervisor was aware of how cultural issues influenced our supervisory relationship.</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>My supervisor helped me understand how the major theoretical orientations in psychology have value assumptions that affect multicultural counseling.</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>My supervisor understood how cultural communication styles might affect the interaction between my supervisor and myself.</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>My supervisor understands his/her own racial/cultural identity and how it influences supervision.</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>My supervisor emphasized my strengths and capacities in dealing with multicultural issues in counseling.</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Factor 1-Fostering Multicultural Competence

1. My supervisor demonstrated that he/she respects my cultural beliefs and practices.
2. My supervisor had confidence in my ability to work (or learn to work) with clients who are culturally different from myself.
3. It was always easy for my supervisor to understand my point of view.
4. I felt comfortable telling my supervisor when we had misunderstandings due to our cultural differences.
5. My supervisor interacted in ways that did not stereotype me.
6. My supervisor encouraged me to express my opinions and concerns about client conceptualization freely.
7. My supervisor fostered a collaborative working relationship.

The subscale (factor) reliability estimates for scores are as follows, Fostering Multicultural Competence ($\alpha = .92$), and Collaborative and Culturally Respectful Interactions ($\alpha = .85$).
Concurrent Validity

No concurrent validity hypotheses were explored with the supervisee sample.

Discriminant Validity

Hypothesis 1: No significant relationship will be observed between MSI scores and Marlowe Crowne Short Form-C (MCFC) score.

The Discriminant validity between the MCFC (Reynolds, 1992; Crown-Marlowe, 1960) and the MSI was evaluated by conducting a Pearson correlation. The hypothesis was not upheld, \( r_{178} = -.126, p<.05 \), this relationship had a small effect size and only accounted for 2% of the total variance (\( R^2 = .02 \), Adjusted \( R^2 = .01 \)).

Predictive Validity

The predictive validity hypotheses for the supervisee MSI sample explored the relationship between trainee multicultural counseling competence (MCI scores), the impact of cultural differences within the supervision dyad, the extent to which supervisors addressed multicultural issues in supervision, and the relationship between satisfaction with supervision and MSI scores.

Hypothesis 2: A significant relationship will be found between supervisees’ MCI scores and their ratings of their supervisors’ MSI scores.

This hypothesis states that supervisees’ perceived multicultural counseling competence will be significantly related to their assessment of their supervisor’s multicultural competence in supervision as measured by the MSI. It was predicted that the supervisee’s own perceived awareness, knowledge, and skills in addressing cultural issues in counseling impact their assessment and perception of their supervisor’s
management of cultural variables in supervision. The results of a Pearson correlation did not support this hypothesis (r (155) = .117, p= .07).

Hypothesis 3: The degree of difference along cultural dimensions for supervisee and supervisor dyads will significantly predict MSI scores.

Supervises were asked whether they differed from their supervisor along the following cultural dimensions: ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation and physical ability. The cultural variable questions had dichotomous response options (1= yes, 0= no), allowing for the variables to be entered into a “regression approach to ANOVA” (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2000), as an independent variable group labeled degree of difference along cultural dimensions. It was hypothesized that supervisee scores on the MSI, would be significantly predicted by the degree of cultural difference experienced in the dyad. The results of this analysis did not support the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4: Supervisees’ contact with a racial or ethnically different supervisor will significantly predict their MSI scores.

Supervisees were asked to report whether they differed from their supervisors along race or ethnicity, and they answered (1= Yes, 0= No). The results of a regression analysis failed to support the hypothesis that supervisee’s contact and work with a racial or ethnically different supervisor will predict their multicultural supervision competence scores.

Hypothesis 5: The extent in which supervisors addressed multicultural issues intentionally will be significantly related to supervisees’ MSI scores.

This hypothesis was tested through a univariate analysis of variance and Bonferroni multiple comparisons. Supervisees answered the following question: “to
what extent are multicultural issues intentionally addressed in supervision.” The
response options ranged from 1=none, to 5=a lot. The analysis supported the hypothesis
$F(4,177)=4.028, p<.01$, and accounted for 9% of the variance ($R^2=.09$, Adjusted $R^2$
$=.06$). Pair wise comparisons identified statistically significant mean differences in the
MSI scores given by supervisees. Supervisees gave their supervisors higher MSI scores
in situations in which multicultural issues were addressed “above average” and “a lot”,
than in those in which multicultural issues were only addressed “a little” ($M$ difference
$=-13.53, p<.01$; & $M$ difference $=-13.58, p<.05$).

**Hypothesis 6:** *Supervisees’ ratings of their supervisor’s multicultural supervision competence as measured by the MSI will significantly predict their satisfaction with supervision measured by the SQ (Ladany et al., 1996).*

Theoretically, it was expected that supervisees would experience greater satisfaction
in multicultural supervision situations if they perceived their supervisors to be
multiculturally competent. Results of this regression analysis provided mild support for
this hypothesis, ($B=.07$, $SE B=.03$, $B=.18, p<.05$), with a small effect size that
accounted for 3% of the variance ($R^2=.03$, Adjusted $R^2=.03$).
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

In outlining future directions for multicultural competencies in the fields of counseling and psychology, Atkinson and Israel (2003) highlighted the urgent need to conduct empirical research that validates Sue et al.’s (1992) 31 proposed multicultural competencies. The authors urged researchers to develop and validate instruments that assess multicultural competencies in terms of actual behaviors and performance of skills and to include the perspective of those who receive services. These recipients commonly include clients and supervisees. Pope-Davis et al. (2002), investigated client’s perspectives in multicultural counseling, and found that multicultural counseling competence was preferred and sometimes demanded by clients, providing support for the recent professional mandate to teach multicultural competencies to counseling trainees and practitioners. Developing tools aimed at measuring supervisor’s competence in multicultural supervision is a necessary step in facilitating trainee’s development toward that goal in considering that “supervision and the supervisory relationship are the medium through which therapy is taught” (Kaiser, p. 294).

This study explored the psychometric properties of the Multicultural Supervision Inventory-MSI (Pope-Davis et al., 1999). The MSI was developed to assess the competence of supervisors in multicultural supervision activities from the perspective of both supervisors and supervisees. In its development the MSI differed from existing
efforts to investigate cultural experiences in supervision because of its focus on capturing the perceptions of both members of the supervision dyad. Additionally, this instrument was developed with an inclusive approach to defining cultural experiences beyond cross-racial variables by encompassing, sex, sexual orientation, religion, and physical ability.

Results from internal consistency reliability analyses, indicated adequate reliability estimates for scores on the supervisor MSI (α = .88), and supervisee MSI (α = .92) and their subscales (α’s ranging from .70 to .92) see Tables 4 and 9. Exploratory factor analyses supported the existence of different underlying factor structures for supervisors and supervisees. The supervisor MSI scale consisted of three subscales, accounting for 60% of the total variance. The supervisor MSI subscales were named: “fostering multicultural competence in supervisees”, “culturally sensitive collaboration”, and “valuing multiculturalism in supervision.” The supervisee MSI consisted of two subscales accounting for 57% of the variance that were named “fostering multicultural competence” and “collaborative and culturally respectful interactions.” In reviewing the items retained and the themes of each subscale it is apparent that both the refined supervisor and supervisee MSI scales describe similar underlying experiences in multicultural supervision. This shared experience is attributed to the fact that a majority of the items (13) retained in each version are equivalent. For a list of the items encompassing each subscale and the respective pattern coefficients please see Tables 5 and 10.

The differences in the item content of the updated versions of the MSI, highlight that despite of the shared experiences supervisors and supervisees may have distinct perspectives and conceptualizations of multicultural competence in supervision.
Toporek, Ortega-Villalobos, and Pope-Davis’ (in press) conducted a phenomenological investigation of critical incidents in supervision in a sample of counseling trainees and their supervisors, and found that supervisors had richer and more elaborate descriptions of critical incidents, suggesting supervisors may be more sophisticated in their conceptualization of culturally meaningful events as a result of their training and experience.

Analysis of the factor structure demonstrated that although item development was influenced by the multicultural competency conceptualization of Sue et al. (1992), the results from the factor analysis did not support this tripartite conceptualization. MSI subscales reflected the function of the interactions between supervisors and supervisees. Supervisor subscales centered on developing their supervisee multicultural competence in counseling, encouraging collaboration, and including multicultural issues within supervision. Supervisee subscales also centered on supervisor’s activities in developing multicultural competence, and culturally respectful collaboration. Small to medium inter-factor correlations supported the theoretical assumption that MSI subscales would be interrelated. Items created to assess the supervisory working relationship in multicultural supervision were retained within the finalized factor structure for both MSI scales. The majority of items intended to measure socially desirable responses were removed entirely from the scales because they did not meet the outlined statistical item retention criteria, eliminating this expected subscale.

Strong support for the supervisor MSI’s concurrent validity was evidenced by a large correlation of its total scores with the Multicultural Counseling Inventory. No concurrent validity hypotheses were established for the supervisee sample. A small
relationship that accounted for only two percent of the variance was observed between social desirability scores both supervisor and supervisee MSI scores. For supervisors, the relationship was a positive one, and for supervisees the relationship was negative. In this study it can be hypothesized that due to supervisor’s greater responsibilities in supervision, their motivation to appear competent may increase the likelihood of responding in socially desirable responses. Supervisee’s in turn may not be as invested to respond socially desirable ways due to the non-existent professional consequences to their ratings. Constantine (2000) and Sodowsky (1998), have addressed the need to continue to investigate the association between social desirability and self-report measures of multicultural competence. Future measure development studies with the MSI should continue to explore the relationship between social desirability and multicultural supervision competence through the use of reliable social desirability scales. Due to the less than adequate reliability of the Short Form-C of the Marlowe Crowne (Reynolds, 1982), there is a possibility that the relationship observed in these samples may have been attenuated.

Validity hypotheses in this study focused on the relationship of multicultural experience and training variables, supervisory relationship variables, and the level of attention paid to multicultural issues on ratings of supervisor multicultural competence. It was hypothesized that the MSI scores would be differentiated between supervisors at different degrees of multicultural training and experiences. Results reflected large effect sizes when supervisor’s level of completion of coursework in multicultural/cross-cultural training, and attendance to workshops or seminars in multicultural counseling predicted MSI scores. Pair wise comparisons indicated that supervisors who completed 2 or more
courses in multicultural counseling had higher ratings of multicultural supervision competence. The number of hours supervisors spent in workshops or seminars in multicultural counseling also reflected large effects on MSI scores. Comparisons of groups indicated that supervisors who had attended over 100 hours of training differed significantly from those supervisors that had completed 10 or less hours of such training. As expected, completing coursework and seminars in multicultural issues in counseling was found to be significantly related to supervisor’s ratings of their own multicultural supervision competence. These results supported previous findings by Pope-Davis, Reynolds et al. (1994) outlining that counseling interns who had taken more coursework reported more knowledge, awareness, and skills in multicultural counseling situations. In this sample, supervisors who had attended workshops or seminars, and completed coursework in multicultural counseling, had greater MSI scores, and were significantly different from those at the lowest level of exposure to this training.

Results suggested that a supervisor’s degree of experience with clients of color and their experience with clients of a different racial/ethnic group, significantly predicted their scores on the MSI with large main effects. These findings highlight the importance of supervisor’s experiential learning. The behavioral integration of multicultural principles may be significant aspect of a supervisor’s ability to guide and train multiculturally competent supervisees. These significant relationships between multicultural experience in counseling and ratings of supervisor competence were not observed in the supervisee sample.

In assessing the impact of supervisory interactions in multicultural supervision competence, it was found that supervisor’s who worked with a supervisee who differed
from them in terms of race and ethnicity did not have greater MSI scores in this sample. This unexpected finding may reflect that conceptualizing multicultural issues from a broad multicultural perspective may decrease an instrument’s ability to assess interactions specific to variability along one cultural dimension (i.e.: race). Additionally, supervisors were only asked whether they differed from a supervisee along cultural dimensions, and they were not asked to rate or assess how meaningful this cultural difference became in their working relationship. These results highlight the need for future predictive validity questions of this nature to ask participants to specify the relevance and meaning of cultural differences within their interactions, and to move beyond the assumption that cultural differences will be perceived as meaningful in all diverse relationships.

The degree in which supervisor’s addressed multicultural issues intentionally in supervision and the importance of multicultural training for the supervisor significantly predicted their multicultural supervision competence scores. The observed effects for this relationship were large and accounted for 19%, and 30% of the variance respectively. These results propose that a supervisor’s value and degree of commitment to addressing multicultural issues may be a strong determinant of their behavior in supervision and counseling activities. In turn a supervisor’s degree of valuing multicultural issues also may impact their assessment of their own multicultural competence. Pair wise comparisons reflected that supervisors who frequently addressed multicultural issues had greater MSI scores than supervisors addressed issues at an average or below average level. This predictive relationship between a supervisor’s intentionality in addressing multicultural issues in supervision accounted for 18% of the variance in MSI scores.
This relationship was also observed in the supervisee sample to a lesser degree (accounted for 9% of the variance). Additionally, supervisees’ ratings of their supervisor’s competence were found to significantly predict their satisfaction in supervision. This prediction had a medium effect size, leading us to hypothesize that although supervisor’s multicultural competence in supervision may be a significant predictor, other aspects of the supervisees’ experience may impact supervisee’s ratings of satisfaction. For example, supervisees’ satisfaction in supervision may be impacted by other factors like the working alliance, supervisor’s general counseling competence, and supervisory style.

For supervisors, sex, and months of supervision experience were modestly related to their MSI scores. Supervisor’s race/ethnic background was significantly related to supervisor MSI scores and accounted for 19% of the variance, supporting a large main effect for this variable. This significant relationship between race/ethnic background and MSI scores was also observed in the supervisee sample, however it only accounted for 3% of the variance. These results highlight the need for research to continue to assess how personal characteristics, level of experience, impact perceptions of multicultural competence in supervision.

Future Directions for the MSI

This initial exploration of the psychometric qualities of the MSI, helped provide a foundation for further development of the scales. The finding that the supervisor and supervisee scales have distinct yet similar factor structures has raised the need to consider the theoretical and functional implications of these scales separately. This initial validation study was conducted predominantly from the perspective of the supervisor,
concurrent validity hypotheses, and predictive validity hypotheses reflected this
tendency. It is important to gather more information on variables that may impact 
supervisee’s needs in supervision, as well as supervisee’s perspective of their
supervisor’s ability to do therapy, to train, communicate, guide and evaluate. Future item
development for both scales should include items devoted to central supervision concerns
like the impact of evaluation on this training relationship, power dynamics,
communication, and ethical decision making. Although, the focus of the MSI rests in
assessing the multicultural competence of supervisors, these interactions are imbedded
within general supervision training activities. Additionally, future measure development
studies with the MSI should include attempts to compare its subscales to validated
multicultural competency constructs, due to the fact that Sue et al.’s (1992)
conceptualization of multicultural competence has not been empirically validated.

Additionally, future research with the MSI should aim to assess the relationship of
multicultural supervision competence to the outcomes of supervision. Studies that focus
on the training benefits for supervisees, client’s ratings of quality of counseling services,
perceptions of the working alliance, would help counseling professionals and trainees
understand the potential benefits of intentionally addressing multicultural issues in
supervision.

Limitations

The limitations of the generalizability of the findings of this study rest in its
defined purpose, a preliminary exploration of the psychometric qualities of the MSI. As
such, conclusions made regarding multicultural competence supervision as measured by
the MSI should be interpreted with caution, due to the fact that the scale needs further

validation through confirmatory factor analysis and further testing of its reliability and construct validity with larger samples.

Additionally, the supervisor sample used for this study had serious sample size limitations due to the small number of respondents. The low response rates may reflect that supervisors engaged in multicultural supervision are a small fraction of the total supervisor population invited to participate. In reviewing the cultural diversity of this sample it is apparent that the majority of participants define themselves as White American, with other groups comprising 34% and 26% of participants, lending support to the possibility that this may be a small research population. Additionally, the procedures for data collection for the supervisor sample were changed and adapted to address the malfunction of the survey website. The supervisor sample included approximately one third of its cases from a limited geographic area (Midwest and East Coast), whereas the supervisee sample was recruited from a national pool of participants. Finally, the scores obtained from the Short Form-C of the Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale, had less than adequate reliabilities for both samples.
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APPENDIX A

Supervisee Background Questionnaire

Supervision information:
How many hours/week did supervision occur? __________
How many supervisions sessions occurred with your supervisor? __________

Did you and your supervisor differ along any cultural dimensions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical ableness</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other: __________

What were the characteristics of your supervisor? (Circle your answers)

Status and position at the institution:
- Ph.D Student
- Counseling Psychology PhD Student
- Graduate Student
- Master’s Level Counselor
- Career Counselor
- Counselor
- Professor/Faculty Member
- Adjunct/Affiliate Supervisor

Race/Ethnic background:
- Asian American/Pacific Islander
- African American/Black
- Latino(a)/Hispanic
- Native American/American Indian
- White/Caucasian
- International Student
- Biracial/Multiracial
- Other

Approximate age: _______

Sex: Male    Female

Please write in the percentage of your client case load that differ from you along the following cultural dimensions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race or Ethnicity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical ableness</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What percentage of your clients are people of color (e.g., African American, Asian American, Latino, Native American) _______

What percentage of your clients are women _______ are men _______

Supervisee information:
What is your Age: _____
Years of counseling experience: _____
Months of supervision experience: _____

Type of program and degree are you enrolled in?

What is your Race/Ethnic Background:
- Asian American/Pacific Islander
- African American/Black
- Latino(a)/Hispanic
- Native American/American Indian
- White/Caucasian
- International Student
- Biracial/Multiracial
- Other
Supervisor Background Questionnaire

Supervision information:
How many hours/week did supervision occur? __________

How many supervisions sessions occurred with your supervisees? _______________________

Please write in the percentage of your supervisees who differ from you along the following cultural dimensions?

Race or Ethnicity __________  Religion __________  Gender __________

Sexual orientation __________  Physical ability __________

What is the race/ethnic background of your supervisees?

__Asian American/Pacific Islander
__African American/Black
__Latino(a)/Hispanic
__Native American/American Indian
__White/Caucasian
__International Student
__Biracial/Multiracial
__Other

What percentage of your supervisees are people of color (e.g., African American, Asian American, Latino, Native American) __________

What percentage of your clients are women _____  men _______

Supervisor information:

What is your Age: _____  Sex: ____Male       ___Female
Years of counseling experience: _____  Months of supervision experience: _____

What is your Race/Ethnic Background:

__Asian American/Pacific Islander
__African American/Black
__Latino(a)/Hispanic
__Native American/American Indian
__White/Caucasian
__International Student
__Biracial/Multiracial
__Other

Please specify your level of multicultural/cross-cultural training:

___ Have never completed a multicultural or cross-cultural counseling course.
___ Have never completed a multicultural or cross-cultural counseling course but have had these topics covered in other counseling courses.
___ Have completed one multicultural or cross-cultural counseling course.
___ Have completed two or more multicultural or cross-cultural counseling courses.

Have you attended any workshops/seminars on multicultural counseling: Yes  No

If yes, how many hours of training have you received:
0-10  11-25  26-50  51-100  over 100

In what year did you receive/ or plan to receive your doctorate? __________
Site information:
Is your site urban or rural? (please circle one) urban rural

Please answer the following questions using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How much emphasis does your site put on multicultural counseling? 1 2 3 4 5
To what extent is there ethnic/racial diversity among clients at site? 1 2 3 4 5
To what extent is there ethnic/racial diversity among supervisors at site? 1 2 3 4 5
To what extent are multicultural issues intentionally addressed in supervision? 1 2 3 4 5
How important is multicultural training to you? 1 2 3 4 5
APPENDIX B
Multicultural Counseling Inventory (MCI)

The following statements cover counselor practices in multicultural counseling. Indicate how accurately each statement describes you as a counselor, psychologist, or student in a mental health-training program when working in a multicultural counseling situation. Give ratings that you actually believe to be true rather than those that you wish were true.

1 - very inaccurate
2 - somewhat inaccurate
3 - somewhat accurate
4 - very accurate

When working with multicultural clients:

1. I perceive that my race causes the client to mistrust me. 1 2 3 4
2. I have feelings of overcompensation, over solicitation, and guilt that I do not have when working with majority clients. 1 2 3 4
3. I am confident that my conceptualization of client problems do not consist of stereotypes and value-oriented biases. 1 2 3 4
4. I find that differences between my worldviews and 1 2 3 4
5. I have difficulties communicating with clients who use a perceptual, reasoning, or decision-making style that is different from mine. 1 2 3 4
6. I include the facts of age, gender roles, and socioeconomic status in my understanding of different cultures. 1 2 3 4
7. I use innovative concepts and treatment methods. 1 2 3 4
8. I manifest an outlook on life that is best described as "world-minded" or pluralistic. 1 2 3 4
9. I examine my own cultural biases. 1 2 3 4
10. I tend to compare the client behaviors with those of majority group members. 1 2 3 4
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I keep in mind research findings about multicultural clients’ preferences in counseling.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I know what are the changing practices, views, and interests of people at the present time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I consider the range of behaviors, values, and individual differences within a cultural group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I make referrals or seek consultations based on the clients’ cultural identity development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I feel my confidence is shaken by the self-examination of my personal limitations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I monitor and correct my defensiveness (e.g. anxiety, denial, anger, fear, minimizing, overconfidence).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I apply the sociopolitical history of the clients’ respective cultural groups to understand them better.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I am successful at seeing 50% of minority clients more than once, not including intake.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I experience discomfort because of different physical appearance, color, dress, or socioeconomic status.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I am able to quickly recognize and recover from cultural mistakes or misunderstandings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I use several methods of assessment (including free response questions, observations, and varied sources of information and excluding standardized test(s)).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I have experience at solving problems in unfamiliar settings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I learn about clients’ different ways of acculturation to the dominant society to understand the clients better.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I understand my own philosophical preferences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. I have a working understanding of certain cultures (including African American, Native American, Hispanic, Asian American, new Third World immigrants, and international students).

26. I am able to distinguish between those who need brief, problem-solving, structured therapy and those who need long-term, process-oriented, unstructured therapy.

27. When working with international students or immigrants, I understand the importance of the legalities of visa, passport, green card and naturalization.

*Evaluate the degree to which the following multicultural statements can be applied to you.*

28. My professional or collegial interactions with multicultural individuals are extensive.

29. In the past year, I have had a 50% increase in my multicultural case load.

30. I enjoy multicultural interactions as much as interactions with people of my own culture.

31. I am involved in advocacy efforts against institutional barriers in mental health services for multicultural clients (e.g. lack of bilingual staff, multiculturally skilled counselors, racial and ethnic minority counselors, minority professional leadership, and outpatient counseling facilities).

32. I am familiar with nonstandard English.

33. My life experiences with multicultural individuals are extensive (e.g. via ethnically integrated neighborhoods, marriage, and friendship).

34. In order to be able to work with multicultural clients, I frequently seek consultation with multicultural experts and attend multicultural workshops or training sessions.

When working with all clients:

35. I am effective at crisis interventions (e.g. suicide attempt, tragedy, broken relationship).

36. I use varied counseling techniques and skills.

37. I am able to be concise and to the point when reflecting, clarifying, and probing.

38. I am comfortable with exploring sexual issues.

39. I am skilled at getting a client to be specific in defining and clarifying problems.

40. I make my nonverbal and verbal responses congruent.

Copyright, 1993, Gargi Sodowsky. All rights reserved (This version adapted by permission of the author)
APPENDIX C

Multicultural Counseling Competencies
(Sue et al., 1992; Arredondo et al., 1996)
Adapted for Supervisors

Note: it is assumed that supervisors also adhere to the Multicultural Counseling Competencies as they apply to clients (see Sue et al., 1992) in addition to the following.

I. Supervisor Awareness of Own Cultural Values and Biases
   A. Attitudes and Beliefs
      1. Culturally skilled supervisors believe that cultural self-awareness and sensitivity to one’s own cultural heritage is essential.
      2.a. Culturally skilled supervisors are aware of how their own cultural background and experiences have influenced attitudes, values, and biases about psychological practices.
           b. Culturally skilled supervisors are aware of how their own cultural background and experiences have influenced attitudes, values, and biases about supervision practices.
      3. Culturally skilled supervisors are able to recognize the limits of their multicultural supervision competency.
      4.a. Culturally skilled supervisors recognize their sources of discomfort with differences that exist between themselves and supervisees in terms of race, ethnicity and culture.
           b. Culturally skilled supervisors recognize their sources of discomfort with differences that exist between themselves and their supervisees’ clients in terms of race, ethnicity and culture.
   B. Knowledge
      1. Culturally skilled supervisors have specific knowledge about their own racial and cultural heritage and how it personally and professionally affects their definitions of and biases about normality/abnormality and the process of counseling.
      2. Culturally skilled supervisors possess knowledge and understanding about how oppression, racism, discrimination, and stereotyping affect them personally and in their work. This allows individuals to acknowledge their own racist attitudes, beliefs and feelings. Although this standard applies to all groups, for White supervisors, it may mean that they understand how they may have directly or indirectly benefited from individual, institutional, and cultural racism as outlined in White identity development models.
      3.a. Culturally skilled supervisors possess knowledge about their social impact on others. They are knowledgeable about communication style differences, how their style may clash with or foster the counseling process with persons of color or others different from themselves and how to anticipate the impact it may have on others.
           *b. Culturally skilled supervisors understand the interaction between the power differentials in supervision and the power differentials that exist due to historical oppression of various cultural groups and how that impacts supervision
   C. Skills
      1. Culturally skilled supervisors seek out educational, consultative, and training experiences to improve their understanding and effectiveness in working with cultural different supervisees. Being able to recognize the limits of their competence, they (a) seek consultation; (b) seek further training or education (c) refer to more qualified individuals or resources, or (d) engage in a combination of these.
      2. Culturally skilled supervisors are constantly seeking to understand themselves as racial and cultural beings and are actively seeking a nonracist identity

II. Supervisor Awareness of Supervisee’s Worldview
   A. Attitudes and Beliefs
1. Culturally skilled supervisors are aware of their negative and positive emotional reactions toward other racial and ethnic groups that may prove detrimental to the supervisory relationship. They are willing to contrast their own beliefs and attitudes with those of their culturally different clients in a nonjudgmental fashion.

2. Culturally skilled supervisors are aware of their stereotypes and preconceived notions that they may hold toward other racial and ethnic minority groups.

B. Knowledge

1. Culturally skilled counselors possess specific knowledge and information about the particular group with which their supervisees are working. They are aware of the life experiences, cultural heritage, racial and ethnic identity development models, and historical background of the culturally different clients.

2. Culturally skilled supervisors understand how race, cultural and ethnicity and so forth may affect supervisee development, supervisee communication style, and supervisee values.

3. Culturally skilled supervisors understand and have knowledge about sociopolitical influences that impinge on the life of racial and ethnic minority individuals and how that may impact the supervision process and content. Powerlessness, racism, stereotyping, attitudes toward affirmative action may affect self-esteem and self-concept in the supervision process.

C. Skills

1. Culturally skilled supervisors familiarize themselves with relevant research and the latest findings regarding multicultural supervision. They actively seek out educational experiences that enrich their knowledge, understanding and cross-cultural skills for more effective supervisory behavior.

2. Culturally skilled supervisors become actively involved with People of Color outside the supervision and counseling settings (e.g. community events, social and political functions, celebrations, friendships, neighborhood groups) so that their perspective is more than an academic or helping exercise.

III. Culturally Appropriate Supervision Strategies

A. Beliefs and Attitudes

1.a. Culturally skilled supervisors respect supervisee’s religious and spiritual beliefs and values because these affect attributions and worldview.

*b. Culturally skilled supervisors are able to distinguish between supervisee’s beliefs that are simply different from their own versus beliefs that may need to be addressed in terms of the supervisee’s cultural counseling competence (e.g. issues around sexual orientation and religion).

2. Culturally skilled supervisors respect indigenous helping practices among communities of color and can provide supervisees with information and/or resources when appropriate.

3. Culturally skilled supervisors value bilingualism and address the strengths and special needs that may present themselves when working with a bilingual supervisee.

B. Knowledge

1.a. Culturally skilled supervisors have a clear and explicit knowledge and understanding of generic characteristics of counseling and therapy and how they may clash with the cultural values of various cultural groups.

*b. Culturally skilled supervisors recognize the cultural context from which models of supervision have been developed and have an awareness of how cultural issues may moderate the appropriateness or relevance of these models.

2. Culturally skilled supervisors are aware of institutional barriers and conditions that may inhibit supervisee’s growth and utilization of the supervisory relationship.

3. Culturally skilled supervisors have knowledge of the potential bias in assessment instruments and share this knowledge with supervisees to assist them in using instruments, procedures and interpret findings in ways that recognize the cultural and linguistic characteristics of their clients.

4. Culturally skilled supervisors facilitate supervisees in gaining knowledge about family structures, hierarchies, values, and beliefs from various cultural perspectives. They are knowledgeable about the community where a supervisee’s clients may reside and are able to assist the supervisee in learning about the resources in those communities.
5. Culturally skilled supervisors facilitate supervisee’s awareness of relevant discriminatory practices at the social and community level that may be affecting the psychological welfare of the population being served.

*6. Culturally skilled supervisors understand the cultural issues that may arise as a result of the triadic relationship between client, counselor and supervisor.

C. Skills

1.a. Culturally skilled supervisors engage in a variety of verbal and nonverbal skills in supervision.

*1.b. Culturally skilled supervisors recognize and are able to interact with a variety of verbal and nonverbal communication styles among supervisees.

*1.c. Culturally skilled supervisors are able to distinguish when a supervisee’s style of communicating in counseling sessions is appropriate or inappropriate based on the cultural style of clients rather than simply determining appropriateness based on traditional theory of helping skills.

2.a. Culturally skilled supervisors are able to exercise institutional intervention skills on behalf of their supervisee’s and or facilitate their supervisee’s interventions on behalf of clients.

*2.b. Culturally skilled supervisors facilitate supervisee’s understanding of when and how it may be appropriate to intervene on a client’s behalf versus encouraging clients to act on their own behalf without the involvement of the supervisee or supervisor.

*2.c. Culturally skilled supervisors seek consultation regarding racial or cultural issues that arise in the supervisory relationship.

4. Culturally skilled supervisors attend to and work to eliminate biases, prejudices, and discriminatory contexts in conducting supervisory evaluations.

5. Culturally skilled supervisors take responsibility for educating their supervisees to the processes of supervision and evaluation including goals, expectations, legal rights, and the supervisor’s orientation.

*6. Culturally skilled supervisors are able to assess and facilitate the supervisee’s development of multicultural counseling competence

*Note: Items that were developed by Rebecca L. Toporek and Lideth Ortega-Villalobos
APPENDIX D

Multicultural Supervision Inventory - SR

(Version SR) Please read the following questions and respond reflecting on your role as a counseling supervisor. Please think of your current or a recent supervisee and your supervision with him/her when completing the questionnaires. If you had more than one supervisee choose one and complete the questionnaires with that experience in mind. Consider the term "culture" to include gender, class, religion, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, and physical disability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I demonstrated that I respected my supervisee(s)’ cultural beliefs and practices.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I had confidence in my supervisee(s)’ ability to work (or to learn to work) with clients who are culturally different from them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I helped my supervisee(s) to understand ethnic identity and how that relates to their counseling.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I encouraged my supervisee(s) to think about cultural issues when working with clients.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I said and did things in culturally sensitive ways.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I helped my supervisee(s) understand how to work with clients who are culturally different from them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I supported my supervisee(s) in learning about and addressing important cultural issues with clients.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I interacted with my supervisee(s) in ways that did not stereotype them based on race, gender or sexual orientation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>It was always easy understanding my supervisee’s point of view.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I helped my supervisee(s) to become aware of their cultural values and beliefs and how they influence the way they view their clients.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>My supervisee(s) would feel comfortable telling me if we had misunderstandings due to our cultural differences.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I helped my supervisee(s) think about how their cultural identity is relevant to their identity as a counselor.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I interacted with my supervisee(s) in ways that did not stereotype them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I helped my supervisee(s) understand how cultural communication styles might affect their interaction with their clients.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I brought up discussions about potential cultural differences in our supervisory relationship.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I helped my supervisee(s) understand their racial identity and how that relates to their counseling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I am knowledgeable about groups who are different from me culturally (e.g. race, gender, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, religion, disabilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I know everything necessary to competently provide counseling to culturally diverse clients.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I helped my supervisee(s) develop interventions that would be culturally appropriate for their clients.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I helped my supervisee(s) understand their gender identity and how that relates to their counseling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I helped my supervisee(s) identify other opportunities for multicultural counseling experiences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>My supervisee(s) competence is constrained by their race, gender, sexual orientation, or other cultural aspects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I helped my supervisee(s) understand how their sexual orientation related to their counseling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I adapted my communication style to allow for better communication in supervision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I believe I have more knowledge and experience in the process of multicultural counseling than my supervisee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I am knowledgeable about resources that my supervisee(s) can use to learn more about cultural issues in counseling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I do not hold stereotypes or biases in my perceptions of my supervisee(s) or their clients.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I am aware of how cultural issues may have influenced our supervisory relationship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>My supervisee(s) felt comfortable talking to me about differing opinions due to our cultural differences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I believe that competence in dealing with multicultural issues is important in counseling training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I helped my supervisee(s) understand how their socioeconomic status affects their values and beliefs, and how that affects their counseling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I helped my supervisee(s) understand how their religious background affects their counseling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I helped my supervisee(s) understand how the major theoretical orientations in psychology have value related assumptions that affect multicultural counseling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I understood how cultural communication styles might affect the interaction between my supervisee and myself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I was aware of certain cultural beliefs and norms that are important to my supervisee(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I was always willing to admit to my supervisee(s) when I was inadequate in supervision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>I understand my own racial/cultural identity and how it influences my supervision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I encouraged my supervisee to express his/her opinions and concerns about client conceptualization freely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I fostered a collaborative working relationship with my supervisee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I valued learning from our supervisory relationship as much as my supervisee valued learning from me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I emphasized my supervisee’s strengths and capacities in dealing with multicultural issues in counseling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>I often felt that cultural issues (e.g., gender, class, religion, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity) were relevant in my supervisee(s)’ therapy sessions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>I often felt that cultural issues were relevant in our supervision sessions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you wish to comment on any of the items or the instrument in general please do so below:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX E

Multicultural Supervision Inventory

(Version SE) Please read the following questions and respond in light your experiences with your most recent counseling supervisor. Please answer each item to the best of your ability. Consider the term "culture" to include gender, class, religion, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, and physical disability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Dissagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My supervisor demonstrated that he/she respects my cultural beliefs and practices.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My supervisor had confidence in my ability to work (or to learn to work) with clients who are culturally different from myself.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>My supervisor helped me to understand ethnic identity and how that relates to my counseling.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My supervisor encouraged me to think about cultural issues when working with clients.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My supervisor said or did things that felt culturally sensitive to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My supervisor helped me understand how to work with clients who are culturally different from myself.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>My supervisor supported me in learning about and addressing important cultural issues with my clients.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>My supervisor interacted with me in ways that does not stereotype my clients based on race, gender or sexual orientation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>It was always easy for my supervisor to understand my point of view.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>My supervisor helped me to become aware of my cultural values and beliefs and how they influence the way I view my clients.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I felt comfortable telling my supervisor when we had misunderstandings due to our cultural differences.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>My supervisor helped me think about how my cultural identity is relevant to my identity as a counselor.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>My supervisor interacted in ways that did not stereotype me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>My supervisor helped me understand how cultural communication styles might affect my interaction with my clients.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>My supervisor brought up discussions about potential cultural differences in our supervisory relationship.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Dissagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>My supervisor helped me to understand my racial identity and how that relates to my counseling.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>My supervisor seemed knowledgeable about groups who are different from him/her culturally (e.g. race, gender, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, religion, disabilities)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>My supervisor knows everything necessary to competently provide counseling to culturally diverse clients.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>My supervisor was able to help me develop interventions that would be culturally appropriate for my clients.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>My supervisor helped me to understand my gender identity and how that relates to my counseling.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>My supervisor helped me to identify other opportunities for multicultural counseling experiences.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>My supervisor questioned my abilities and believed I was less competent because of my race, gender, sexual orientation, or other cultural aspects.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>My supervisor helped me to understand how my sexual orientation identity related to my counseling.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>My supervisor was able to adapt his/her communication style to allow for better communication in our supervision.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I believe my supervisor is more qualified or experienced in the process of multicultural counseling than I am.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>My supervisor was knowledgeable about resources that I can use to learn more about cultural issues in counseling.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>My supervisor does not hold stereotypes or biases in his/her perceptions of my clients/or myself.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>My supervisor was aware of how cultural issues influenced our supervisory relationship.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I felt comfortable taking to my supervisor about differing opinions due to our cultural differences.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>My supervisor believed that competence in dealing with multicultural issues is important in counseling training.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>My supervisor helped me understand how my socioeconomic class affects my values and beliefs and how that affects my counseling.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>My supervisor helped me understand how my religious background affects my counseling.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>My supervisor helped me understand how the major theoretical orientations in psychology have value assumptions that affect multicultural counseling.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>My supervisor understood how cultural communication styles might affect the interaction between my supervisor and myself.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Dissagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>My supervisor seemed to be aware of certain cultural beliefs and norms that are important to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>My supervisor was always willing to admit to me when he/she was inadequate in supervision.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>My supervisor understands his/her own racial/cultural identity and how it influences supervision.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>My supervisor encouraged me to express my opinions and concerns about client conceptualization freely.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>My supervisor fostered a collaborative working relationship.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>My supervisor valued learning from our supervisory relationship as much as I valued learning from him or her.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>My supervisor emphasized my strengths and capacities in dealing with multicultural issues in counseling.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>My supervisor often felt that cultural issues (e.g., gender, class, religion, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity) were relevant in my therapy sessions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>My supervisor often felt that cultural issues were relevant in our supervision sessions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you wish to comment on any of the items or the instrument in general please do so below:
APPENDIX F

Supervision Questionnaire (Ladany, et al., 1996).

Please circle the appropriate response for each question below.

1. How would you rate the quality of the supervision you have received?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Did you get the kind of supervision you wanted?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, definitely not</td>
<td>No, not really</td>
<td>Yes, generally</td>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. To what extent has this supervision fit your needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost all of my needs have been met</td>
<td>Most of my needs have been met</td>
<td>Only a few of my needs have been met</td>
<td>None of my needs have been met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. If a friend were in need of supervision, would you recommend this supervisor to him or her?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, definitely not</td>
<td>No, I don’t think so</td>
<td>Yes, I think so</td>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How satisfied are you with the amount of supervision you have received?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Quite satisfied</td>
<td>Indifferent or mildly satisfied</td>
<td>Mostly satisfied</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Has the supervision you received helped you to deal more effectively in your role as a counselor or therapist?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>Yes, generally</td>
<td>No, not really</td>
<td>No, definitely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. In an overall, general sense, how satisfied are you with the supervision you have received?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>Mostly satisfied</td>
<td>Indifferent or mildly satisfied</td>
<td>Quite dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. If you were to seek supervision again, would you come back to this supervisor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, definitely not</td>
<td>No, I don’t think so</td>
<td>Yes, I think so</td>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G

Personal Reaction Inventory

Listed below are a number of statements concerning attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it pertains to you personally.

1. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged. T F
2. I sometimes feel resentful when I don’t get my way. T F
3. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability. T F
4. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I know they were right. T F
5. No matter who I’m talking to, I’m always a good listener. T F
6. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. T F
7. I’m always willing to admit it when I make a mistake. T F
8. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget. T F
9. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. T F
10. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. T F
11. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. T F
12. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me. T F
13. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone’s feelings. T F